EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a bill which I introduced in the 91st Congress to amend the loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This amendment would extend cancellation of such loans at the rate of 10 percent a year—up to a 50-percent cancellation—to teachers in American schools abroad that are supported by the State Department or AID. Such cancellation provisions now apply for loans made prior to July 1, 1970, to students who became teachers in nonprofit State elementary or secondary schools, institutions of higher education, or overseas elementary and secondary schools of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Having served as a member of the investigating committee that looked into the educational opportunities for dependents of American personnel on overseas assignment, I had opportunity to observe the serious problems faced by the American parents, the teachers, and the overseas schools who are struggling to provide American children with decent educations.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage highly qualified American teachers to accept foreign teaching assignments. Students receiving NDEA loans are often the brightest and the best prepared teachers from among our recent graduates. A student who now graduates with NDEA loan repayments to make is reluctant to accept a foreign teaching assignment in an American or international school. To teach in such a school would, in effect, cost him 50 percent of his loan repayment—when compared to teaching in a stateside or Department of Defense school. Since the mission of all these schools is basically the same, this discrimination should not continue.

It is my hope that this bill will receive the prompt and favorable consideration of my colleagues in the House of Representatives during this session of the 92d Congress. At this point I would like to insert the text of this bill into the RECORD:

A bill to amend the loan program in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to extend the forgiveness for teaching benefit to teachers in American schools abroad supported by the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 (b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "or" after "institution of higher education," and by inserting after "Armed Forces of the United States," the following: "or in an American-sponsored elementary or secondary school overseas which is eligible for assistance by the Department of State or the Agency for International Development.".

COLLEGE-LEVEL AND NON-COLLEGE-LEVEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to make the same criteria for determining satisfactory pursuance of course work apply in the case of college-level and non-college-level educational institutions. I request consent to revise and extend my remarks about this and to include extraneous matter.

My bill, I hope, will abolish the discrimination now practiced against those veterans who enroll in technical and vocational schools. Until now, the standards for classroom attendance have been such that those veterans who choose a school offering courses leading to a college degree are only required to notify the Veterans' Administration as to the school in which they have enrolled, and the school itself certifies this. On the other hand, students in technical or vocational schools not only must be certified, but also must meet an attendance standard of hours spent in a classroom for a particular course.

This is patently unjust and unfair—and it tells the vocational student that he is not able to decide for himself whether he can master the lessons without putting in the required hours—an obligation not required of the college-attending veteran. It is an insult to his intelligence and ability. Are we not speaking down to these veterans, telling them that they are second-class citizens, not entitled to the benefits and privileges reserved for the college students? Are we not saying to them that their service to our country should be equal, but the benefits to them as veterans should not be?

I do not agree that we should have established this as a standard of practice, and I believe that the time is here to change it. My bill will require that the attendance standards for all veterans will be the same; that the schools that certify, be they college level or technical-vocational, be only obliged to attest to enrollment. Surely this is not a great deal to ask, especially for those of us who have done so much for so many.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6042

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make the same criteria for determining satisfactory pursuance of course work apply in the case of college level and noncollege level educational institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1681(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(3) by inserting immediately before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in a course (except programs of apprenticeship and programs of other on-job training authorized by section 1683 of this title) for any period when such veteran is not pursuing such course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the educational institution and the requirements of this chapter, or of chapter 36, of this title; or".

(b) The first sentence of section 1681(d) of such title is amended to read as follows: "No educational assistance allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education by correspondence for any period until the Administrator receives—

"(1) from the eligible veteran a certificate as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the institution furnishing such education by correspondence, a certificate, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1731(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "shall be paid—" and all that follows thereafter and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be paid on behalf of any person enrolled in a course for any period when such person is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the educational institution and the requirements of this chapter."

(b) Section 1731(d) of such title is repealed.

SEC. 3. This Act applies with respect to the administration of educational assistance allowances under chapters 34 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, during semesters or quarters beginning after June 30, 1971.

BREWING SASSAFRAS TEA, THE HOOSIER WAY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following delightful account of a dying rural custom, that of preparing sassafras tea.

Mr. Elmer Shaw, a native of southeastern Indiana who is now with the Library of Congress, reflects on his Hoosier heritage in describing the preparation of this traditional spring tonic.

As we approach the greening season, perhaps we can take a moment to reflect on the art of brewing sassafras tea—Hoosier style.

An article from the Indiana Acres International Clubs Pow-Wow follows:

THE GENTLE ART OF BREWING SASSAFRAS TEA—HOOSIER STYLE

(By Elmer Shaw)

Sassafras team is a traditional spring tonic in Indiana. Old-time Hoosiers still claim that it helps thin the blood and put pep in your step. Besides, it's a mighty good drink regardless of its alleged medicinal value.

To make this delightful tea, you first of all need the bark of the sassafras root. Usually, you can buy it at Safeway or other large grocery stores, but it's more fun to dig your own. Besides, the brew from a store-bought package somehow never seems to taste quite so good as tea from bark you dig yourself.

You can do the digging any time you happen to feel like it, but the best time to grub out the roots is when the tree is dormant and the sap is down, because then the bark is more potent for tea brewing. As for me, I always preferred to dig sassafras early in the spring after the ground thaws but before the willow buds begin to swell and the green frogs start their serenade along the creek banks. At this time of year it is tonic enough just to tramp around in the hills and woods hunting for a good patch of sassafras. To a boy, the hunt is almost as invigorating as going barefoot for the first time each spring.

Identifying this sought-after tree is no problem. The easiest way is by smell. Leaves, stems, wood, bark, and roots, all have an unmistakable fragrance—so does the tea. One good sniff of its distinctive aroma and you are an identification expert.

Another identity clue is the green bark. On all the smaller twigs and young shoots the bark is smooth and pale green. On the trunk and large limbs the bark becomes rough and reddish gray.

The leaves, too, have their peculiarties. Part of them are shaped like mittens. On some, the lop-sided leaf lobe gives the appearance of a left-handed mitten. On others, the pattern is right-handed. And some have two lobes or no lobes at all, as shown in the illustration.

Sassafras trees grow wild in most parts of eastern United States, especially in the hill country, along fence rows, and on abandoned farms. As a boy I grubbed many a sassafras patch out of my dad's fence rows on his 80-acre clay farm near Holton, Indiana down in the Ohio-Kentucky corner of the State. Actually, I did two jobs at one time—cleaned the fence rows and got plenty of root bark for tea.

Also I used to chew the fresh bark mixed with slippery elm as a substitute for chewing gum. A good chaw of this slick, tasty mix helped keep me from getting too thirsty while cutting green briars, sumac, and witch hazel along the fences.

Not until I became a land owner myself could I understand why dad was so particular about his fence rows. Other farmers didn't seem to care how many briars and bushes grew along their fences. They figured a little extra brush made good cover for quail. But not dad; he was different. He wanted the fences clear so all the neighbors could see how straight his corn rows were. I could never keep the team in hand well enough myself to plant a straight row of corn.

"You spend too much time daydreaming," dad would say as he sighted down the tracks of the corn planter.

"Old Tom is too bullheaded," I would say. "That horse is downright ornery!"

But dad had a way with horses. He made them mind. And when he plowed a deadfurrow. I'm sure it was the straightest ditch in Otter Creek Township if not in all of Ripley County. I never did learn to plow the way he did. I reckon I just didn't care as much. Anyhow, I was good at digging sassafras.

Grubbing out the small trees to get at the roots was hard work, but it was worth it. After the roots were exposed, I would cut them up in short lengths, trim away the small fibers, scrub the root sections vigorously to remove the yellow clay, then peel off the bark and dry it slowly to prevent mildew.

Brewing the tea is the easiest part of the whole procedure. I still do it just about the way my mother did 40 years ago—except I use a modern electric range. She would take about one-fourth teacup of dried bark, tie it up in cheesecloth, place it in a kettle, add about one quart of water, and then let it simmer on the old cook stove until the water took on a deep pink color.

I always wanted to put more kindling in the stove, but mother would say, "Don't hurry the first brewing. It takes a while for the bark to soak and give up its flavor. No need to boil the water. Slow and easy does it."

In an hour or so she was ready to serve the fragrant drink. She would pour it into a cup and add plenty of sugar—at least a couple of teaspoons. Even before it was cool enough, I would start sipping. There's nothing quite like sassafras tea made in the old-fashioned Hoosier way.

The same tea bag can be used for two or three brewings or until the bark loses its strength. Then it's time to fix another tea bag and start over again. If you have plenty of bark, you can have the tea all year long. But for me, the brewing urge comes on about the time the dogwood begins to bloom, and usually lasts all spring.

But even in Indiana, the time-honored tonic isn't cherished the way it used to be. Times are changing. The family farms are disappearing. The team and plow has given way to huge tractors. And nowadays most country boys have other things to think about besides fence rows, sassafras, and making tea.

Now that I live in Washington, D.C., I can no longer dig my own tea roots—except on rare vacations at the old home place. Yet, for me, the flavor and the lift from the tea is still there; and with it, the boyhood memories of limestone ledges, cool beech woods, and whippoorwills.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION: THE NEED FOR PLANNING AND "IMAGINATIVE REDIRECTION"

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, ours is a war economy. The past 30 years have witnessed a ravenous increase in our military appetite until the projection for weaponry in our 1972 budget is almost 34 percent of our total anticipated spending.

The care and feeding of the military has come in many guises: Not only increased weapons expenditures, but the gorging of our defense industries with fat Government contracts. We have made weaponry construction so profitable, we have created such an effective propaganda mystique regarding national security, we have fostered such a strong economic need based upon a weapons culture that the reversal of this trend has become increasingly difficult.

Economic conversion, however, is a necessity. Our floundering economy is witness to this fact. We have 6 percent of our employable population unemployed with the possibility that this figure will reach 10 percent. As we attempt to move in the direction of a less defense oriented economy we can only expect increasing strains on the employment market unless we provide for effective conversion.

Conversion will only move ahead effectively if planning, initiative, and innovation are the basic ingredients. To date there has really been no concerted conversion planning. There has been no national goal to move our economy in the direction of conversion. There must be an imaginative redirection of our funding priorities as has been called for by Prof. Ronald F. Probstein of MIT. This must be done most importantly by the administration. The need is for new markets and reallocated funds.

The conversion market must be created, and as such groups as the National Urban Coalition realistically inform us, the market is potentially there. We need 3 million new homes a year, we need better and more mass transit, we need more schools, we need a new control system in the airways.

Allocation of our national funds must be seen in the light of our total societal needs, as Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, board chairman of Arthur D. Little, Inc., has said. Conversion can be effected, our social needs can be met, and military spending can be cut if the needed innovation and planning that has been applied to building a military machine is applied to building a domestic market.

I commend the following five-part series of editorials from the Boston Globe regarding conversion to my colleagues' attention. They delineate the overall conversion problems we are now faced with and provide some important food for thought and action.

[From the Boston Globe, March 1, 1971]

CONVERSION: HOW, WHEN, IF—1

There has been no lack of official "assurances" that all is well or soon will be, on the industrial conversion front. But all is not well, and assurances to the contrary could be disastrous.

"We shall plan now," said President Nixon in his inaugural address on Jan. 20, 1969, "for the day when our wealth can be transferred from the destruction of war abroad to the urgent needs of our people at home."

Again, last June, the President declared his intention "to deal with the problems of a nation in transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. . . . The cuts in defense spending mean a shift of job opportunities away from defense production to the kind of production that meets social needs. This will require adjustments for many employees and businesses."

As the President spoke, unemployment was at five percent; 400,000 military and civilian employees had been released from the armed forces; defense spending cutbacks had reduced the job supply by 300,000.

"Many workers in defense industries," said the Labor Department, taking its falsely optimistic cue from the President, "could shift easily to civilian goods."

WORSE IS FORESEEN

Neither the planning of which Mr. Nixon spoke nor the ease of the workers' shift to civilian production is much in evidence. Unemployment has risen to more than six percent and is heading, by some calculations, toward the eight to 10 percent level. Jobless rolls for the first time in decades include thousands of scientists, engineers and managerial personnel. Ten thousand such in Boston's Route 128 and 495 complex of aerospace and electronic industries will be the first to attest that the ease of the shift to new jobs has been somewhat overstated, to put it mildly.

The problem is far from simple. It is complicated by one of the great economic curios—inflation in the midst of recession, a recession which will in no way be eased by

the estimated 1.9 million job closeouts anticipated in the military, civil service and defense areas in 1971–72. So it well may be that something more fundamental than conversion is involved, a possibility that will be explored in the final editorial of this series. Conversion, in any event, is a nut that does not easily yield to cracking. The nation for approximately 30 years has been living in a war and defense economy, spending up to one-third or more of its national budget on weaponry (34 percent of $229.2 billion in Mr. Nixon's '72 projection), and there is little indication of the defense industry's desire to change things.

The problem of converting or trying to convert from war to peace is not new. As contrasted with other periods, it is merely more difficult because of the sophistication of today's weaponry. Some 80 percent of the military supplies in World War I consisted of "standard goods" easily produced by normal peacetime production lines, as Assistant Treasury Secretary Murray L. Weidenbaum has noted.

SENATE TESTIMONY CITED

The special purpose portion climbed to almost 50 percent in World War II. It climbed to 90 percent as the Indochina war escalated. Whereas defense or war contractors after World War I welcomed the opportunity to return to familiar civilian markets (that being all there then was), the civilian marketplace today is a mystery for industries and businesses that were born in a defense and war economy and have dealt with none but the military throughout their entire lifetime.

Illustrative is the experience of a Senate committee studying a proposal for a national economic conversion commission. It solicited the opinions of 118 major defense industries, the mayors of 18 major cities and the leaders of seven labor unions. The committee had anticipated an enthusiastic response to the proposition that the technology and ingenuity of the space and war industries, as well as some defense expenditures, could be converted, with government help, to equally dramatic accomplishments in the area of such public needs as housing, hospitals, schools, pollution control and the design of adequate mass transit systems. But responses were received from only about half of those whose interest, it was hoped, might be stimulated—69 industries, five mayors, two labor unions. And of these, the great majority was negative.

"The responses," says Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), chairman of the committee, "indicate that private industry is not interested in initiating any major attempts at meeting critical public needs. Most industries have no plans or projects designed to apply their resources to civilian problems. They indicated an unwillingness to initiate such actions without a firm commitment from the government that their efforts will quickly reap the financial rewards to which they are accustomed. Otherwise they are eager to pursue greater defense contracts."

The National Security Industrial Association, founded in 1944 as the spokesman for 300 defense contractors, said much the same thing in a letter to President Nixon last September:

"We find that national policy makers are naturally and understandably preoccupied with meeting today's fiscal and social problems and thus do not find it possible to give weight in procurement funding and contract placement to the maintenance of a properly balanced minimum industrial mobilization base required to meet the unique military needs of national security. . . . It is respectfully and urgently recommended that you establish a high priority program to determine the size and state of the industrial base needed to support the force and materiel requirements for defense during the '70s, and take the steps necessary to protect and maintain that base . . ."

UNHAPPY ALTERNATIVE

The letter was written by H. B. Chapman 3rd, the NSIA chairman, whose AAI Corporation in Baltimore has been manufacturing test equipment, weapons and munitions for 21 years. His contracts totaled $30.2 million last year. His letter expresses the view of the defense industry as such. But he is himself greatly concerned as he views the emphasis placed on defense contracts to the comparative exclusion of other imperatives. He stresses the need "for a viable program to satisfy our domestic wants" and wonders, as Government itself should be wondering, "what we will have left in this country 20 or 30 years from now if government and industrial leaders do not soon put their heads together." Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, chairman of the board of Arthur D. Little Inc. thinks we may not have even that long. The view does not appear to be far removed from that of Sen. George S. McGovern (D-S.D.), author of a pending bill to create a national economic conversion commission:

"Unless alternatives to war industry are found, we may find ourselves one or two years hence casting routine votes for more outlandish military devices than anything we can conceive today, done with the usual proclamation about 'national security' but with an even keener sense of the potential for economic collapse among our constituencies."

[From the Boston Globe Mar. 2 1971]

CONVERSION: HOW, WHEN, IF—2

The conversion of the defense industry to civilian pursuits will remain a will-o'-the-wisp so long as the industry and its Midas client, the Department of Defense, are able to keep the American people convinced that the nation's only security lies in the expenditure of $70 billion to $80 billion and more every year for the weapons of war. History, as so often happens, is repeating itself.

At the close of World War II the nation had a right to expect that its resources would be devoted mainly to its domestic needs. The demand for demobilization (slowed to hold down the ranks of persons seeking nonexistent jobs) rose to clamorous heights. The war was over. It was time for peace.

To quiet public demand that the nation get on with the business of living, it was necessary, in the late Sen. Arthur Vandenberg's revealing phrase (as quoted in "The Pentagon Watchers," Doubleday), "to scare the hell out of the country." The then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, repeated the illuminating phrase, asserting that the country "had to be scared" into supporting the Truman Doctrine.

DEFENSE OR PUMP PRIMER?

"It is part of your responsibility," Mr. Acheson told the first graduating class of the Armed Forces Information School in 1948, "to make citizens aware of their responsibility to the services."

This was a new doctrine in a nation where the responsibility traditionally had been just the other way around. But Washington has been at it ever since, "scaring the hell out of the people," spending more than $1 trillion ($1000 thousand billion) on national security in the meantime, yet still frightening us with polemics on insecurity and spending, according to Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), up to $400 million a year on the propaganda to do it.

This is not to say that Mr. Vandenberg and Mr. Acheson or, for that matter, the munitions makers and their Defense Department client are or were evil men. It is to say only what need to be weighed carefully if conversion is to become possible. This is the claim of many that the defense industry is operating not only as a security or defense mechanism but as a device (demonstrably not a very good one) for pumping dollars into the economy.

"The United States," it was said two years ago by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, a Manhattan Project scientist and later a consulting physicist specializing in defense problems, "is becoming a weapons culture. The health of our entire economy has come to depend on the making of arms. The machinery of defense . . . has become a juggernaut in our society . . . Our commitment to weapons-making has distorted the free enterprise system into a kind of defense socialism, a system in which the welfare of the country is permanently tied to the continued growth of military technology and the continued stockpiling of military hardware."

EISENHOWER SAW DANGER

Dr. Lapp was breaking no new ground. The late President Eisenhower, hardly a professional pacifist, had said virtually the same thing years earlier not only in his familiar warning that the nation should beware the military-industrial complex, but in zeroing in even closer when he cut $5 billion from the Air Force budget in 1953:

"National survival rests on security with solvency, not in heeding noisy trumpeting about dazzling military schemes and untrustworthy programs."

It was for such utterances that Mr. Eisenhower was branded as a Communist agent by the Far Right.

Former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara was certainly no pinch-penny. But he, too, has bluntly stated the problem which confronts the nation now as it did in his own tenure at the money spout:

"There is a kind of mad momentum in such spending. If a weapons system works, there is a strong pressure from many quarters to procure and deploy it out of all proportion to the prudent level required."

There is not only "strong pressure." There are also cost-overruns estimated at $25 billion in one year.

The campaign to "scare the hell out of the country," and thus make it an instance of disloyalty and treachery to question official judgment, goes on apace despite President Truman's experience in 1948. At that time it was disclosed (U.S. News & World Report) that Mr. Truman was greatly concerned because the fear of Russia persisted in the nation after the official line had changed from war scares to the prospect of peace. It is easy to turn on a war psychology and a consequent escalation in defense spending, but very difficult to turn it off. Instead of security, it is the ultimate insecurity that it invited by the fright mongering which makes the squandering of billions acceptable.

"We are on the verge of turning into a military nation," Sen. Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, asserted last November in his book, "The Pentagon Propaganda Machine," (Liveright, New York), thus supporting retired Gen. David M. Shoup, one-time Marine commandant, in Gen. Shoup's warning that "we have become a militaristic and aggressive nation."

WEAPONS MEAN PROFITS

"For the industrialist," says Sen. Fulbright, "weapons means profits; for the worker, new jobs and the prospect of higher wages; for the politician, a new installation or defense order to ingratiate himself with his constituents. Military expenditures today provide a livelihood for some 10 percent of our work force. There are 22,000 major corporate defense contractors and another 100,000 subcontractors. Defense plants and installations are located in 363 of the country's 435 congressional districts . . . These millions of Americans who have a vested interest in the weapons system spawned by our global military involvements are as much a part of the military-industrial complex as are the generals and the corporation heads. They have had a direct influence on a weapons development policy that has driven the US into a spiraling arms race . . . The American public has

become so conditioned by crises, by warnings, by words that there are few, other than the young, who protest what is happening."

It is all this the American people will have to reverse before the nation can get on with the essential problem of conversion, assuring a reordering of national purpose so that public funds now squandered on defense that is not defense may be applied, instead, to housing, pollution, hunger, schools, health and other needs at home.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 3, 1971]

CONVERSION: HOW, WHEN, IF—3

In his testimony before a House Conservation and Natural Resources subcommittee, Prof. Ronald F. Probstein of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology made a point with regard to the jobless in Boston's aerospace and electronic industries that applies also to others, especially technicians, in the whole defense industry—not to mention New England's shoe and textile industries.

This is that the talents of these men would not now go begging, nor would the defense industry be so understandably concerned with the possibility of lost profits in a conversion to peacetime needs, if the role of technological research, development and production were better understood in the government agencies and industries dealing with environmental and other social problems. With better understanding and better planning and less frightmongering in Washington, the defense industry could convert without collapsing. The collapse to be feared is not of the defense industry when, as and if it converts, but of American democracy if it does not.

"What is not wholly understood," said Prof. Probstein, "is that aerospace firms, for example, do not require major retraining of personnel and great physical reconversion and dislocation, but, rather, they need imaginative redirection.

REDIRECTION IS LACKING

"After all, their technical and scientific personnel were not trained to develop lunar landers or design supersonic transports. They were trained as computer scientists, electric engineers, physicists, material engineers, chemists, mathematicians, designers, business administrators, labor managers and so forth. Not many of them studied manned space flight problems in the colleges and universities they attended. They represent an imaginative and successful conversion to the aerospace field. With redirection, this valuable resource of highly trained individuals could, along with their firms, reconvert in a very short time to the benefit not only of the affected individuals and concerns but, more importantly, to America as a whole."

The key phrase in Prof. Probstein's thesis is "imaginative redirection." It is this that is lacking.

The Administration, it is true, has made allowance in its '72 budget for a token increase in some of the federally funded science programs. This is in line with the insistence of George F. Shultz, director of the President's Office of Management and Budget, that "productivity and prosperity are linked closely in a technologically advanced society to job-creating advances." And Sen. Edward W. Brooke, noting that the proportion of the research and development budget devoted to domestic needs has risen only three percent in the last three years, has proposed "a substantial increase" in the funds with which the National Science Foundation can support research "into usable technical developments."

EFFECTS ARE SCATTERED

It is true, too, that sundry government agencies (Labor, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare, for instance) are touching at least lightly on conversion and related problems. The Office of Management and Budget has its own task force, Operation Transition, and so, also, does the Defense Department have its Office of Economic Adjustment. But there is little if any central direction. An observer looks in vain for cohesion and some factual evidence of something concrete rather than merely rhetorical, and he comes away from Washington with an impression of good intent and goodwill but of confused and scattered effort.

The Office of Economic Adjustment, for instance, deals with depressed communities in job training, job adjustment and techniques for attracting new industries. There is nothing wrong with this, nor is there any intent here to downgrade the office. Such efforts, however, help merely to adjust to a bad situation, not to correct it. Job training (there are more than 100 such programs) avails little when there is no job at the end of the training period. And while City A may benefit after it has wooed an industry from City B, City B then suffers in direct proportion to City A's gain. The national economy profits nothing from this game of musical chairs. Someone always remains chairless when the music stops. The problem of conversion, in short, is in no way solved, no can it be, so long as a diminishing civilian marketplace is less attractive and less manageable than is the comparatively unlimited defense market where the return on investment is (or has been) large.

What one looks for in vain is a concert of effort and a proper census of what needs to be done, how to do it and what it will cost, rather than enthusiastic but unproductive gibble-gabble about "enhancing the quality of life." It would cost an estimated $2 or $3 billion over five years to clean the Charles River, to cite just one purely parochial but typical example of how "the quality of life" could be enhanced. But such projects, as is true also of adequate low-cost housing and other needs, are still confined to oratorical flourishes and insufficient funding. It is of course easier to indict both government and industry for not doing what needs to be done than it is to lay out the specifics for doing it. But this does not alter or diminish the need, a need which government is pledged to satisfy.

It is said in Washington that the lead in matters of this kind must come from the Executive Branch, that half a thousand members of Congress cannot be expected to set policy. To this, the reply on Capitol Hill is that Congress, in that event, might as well go home. And several innovative members have indeed come forward with their own programs to get things started and help fill the void.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

Some of these amount merely to more job training, vital, of course, to the upgrading of skills demanded by the new technology (and especially useful in penology), but, as in the case of so many job training programs, providing no jobs at the end of the training period. One of the best of the legislative proposals is an Emergency Employment Act, proposed as a substitute for a similar act vetoed last year by the President but now endorsed in a somewhat similar proposal he himself made two weeks ago. It has been proposed by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) for himself and 27 other senators, including Senators Kennedy and Brooke of Massachusetts and Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.). Another is a proposal for a National Economic Conversion Commission drafted by Sen. George S. McGovern (D-S.D.) for himself and 29 others including, once again, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Muskie. Both are good tries.

But the jobs bill, funding city and state government needs, would provide only 200,000 jobs, a drop in the bucket with more then six percent of the workforce unemployed. It makes only a small bow to the theory that government is the essential employer of last resort, a theory with which taxpayers may query but the unemployed certainly will not.

The National Economic Conversion Commission should have been created when it was first proposed five years ago. But there is no way to recover the water that has gone over the dam. The commission, properly staffed, could at least be a clearing house of needs and ways to satisfy them. It could also supply the imaginative redirection so sorely needed.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 4, 1971]

CONVERSION: HOW, WHEN, IF—4

There are some encouraging successes in the Boston area that somewhat brighten the tragic overall picture of the defense industry's difficulty in converting from war to peace manufacturing. But they do not change the larger aspect.

Raytheon's development of a home heating plant scarcely larger than a shoebox is one. It was developed out of the company's work on power tubes for the defense establishment.

Itek Corp. of Lexington is another. When it was founded in 1957, it was a 100 percent defense industry. Now, two-thirds of its operations are non-defense and its sales last year totaled $156 million. It has broadened into vision products, prepress printing products, photocopiers and duplicators, microrecords systems, industrial measurement and automation products, and it now plans to go into microwave products. True, the acquisition of existing commercial companies by defense manufacturers is not precisely the kind of conversion that is required by the defense industry. What is required is not contraction but a widening of defense manufacturing into other areas, many of them untouched. Itek, however, by feeding in its own technology, has more than doubled the operations of its acquisitions.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE

ABT Associates Inc. of Cambridge is another. It was primarily a Defense Department think tank when it was organized six years ago. Now it is 100 percent devoted to domestic and international social problems because its president, Dr. Clark C. Abt, came to the decision that defense was overemphasized to the detriment of domestic needs.

Sanders Associates Inc. in Nashua, N.H., is still in defense production but has set up a subsidiary to manufacture computer peripherals and oceanographic instruments.

The Digital Equipment Corp. of Maynard, a spinoff of the Lincoln Laboratory, went immediately into the commercial field to make medium-sized computers.

The Damon Corp. five years ago was a 100 percent defense and space industry. Last year it converted almost 100 percent to scientific educational aids and other civilian products and services.

These and others like them are exceptions to the rule, however, in the Boston area as elsewhere. Of approximately 300 aerospace and electronics companies in the Route 128 and 495 complex, one-third are described as in financial trouble with some of them facing bankruptcy because of cutbacks and closeouts of defense and space contracts. Many of them were subcontractors and were hit a double blow when the out-of-state prime contractors pulled in their horns to do more work in-house and to subcontract less.

INFLATION TAKES OVER

There is, it is true, an increase in the Defense Department budget as projected by President Nixon for 1972. But it is mostly a consequence of inflation and salary and wage increases in both the uniformed and civilian Defense Department personnel. The research and development funds applicable to industries in this area have been cut back by 15 percent, as calculated by Dr. Albert J.

Kelley, dean of Boston College's School of Management, chairman of the state Board of Economic Advisers and a former NASA administrator. Moreover, total aerospace appropriations on which the Rtes. 128 and 495 communities had thrived are down from $20.5 billion in the peak year, 1968, to a projected $16.4 billion this year. Their consequent difficulties are reflected in the 12,600 unemployed Bostonians, many of them engineers and high level technicians, who line up every week to collect their unemployment compensation—so long as it lasts.

One of the difficulties on the local scene as elsewhere has been well put by Itek's president, Franklin A. Lindsay. It is not only that New England contracts have been cut back 24 percent, the largest of any geographic area (from $3.6 billion in 1969 to $2.7 billion last year). But also, as Mr. Lindsay puts it, "The Defense Department set up a world of its own. It created a way of doing business completely different from the commercial area, from the letting of contracts right through all of the legal, accounting and management steps. No great managerial skills are required. As orders shift back and forth, you hire like mad and then cut back. It is a kind of Yo-Yo business."

It obviously takes money, not yet in evidence, and planning, still in short supply, to get out of the Yo-Yo business where there are no great demands on managerial and marketing skills (especially, marketing skills) and into civilian production which can be likened, so far as the defense industry is concerned, to a foreign country where neither the language nor the customs are understood.

"There seems to be a feeling in Washington," says Dr. Kelley, "that the impact on industry is either not the Government's problem or will go away if we don't worry about it or will be taken care of by overly optimistic predictions of an upturn in the economy."

The Consulting Engineers Council has said much the same thing at a hearing by the House Committee on Government Operations:

"It takes money, far more than is being spent, to get the conversion job done . . . Engineering consultants across the nation are operating at only 50 to 60 percent of capacity with very little work on the horizon because of a lack of an orderly, non-duplicating administration of better coordinated programs directed at the attainment of specific goals."

SEED MONEY SOUGHT

How much money is needed has not even been estimated, nor is there agreement as to where the funds should go.

Dr. Kelley urges "seed money" and guaranteed government loans to industry. Labor unions and many liberal economists, fearing further concentration of wealth, object to this as "the trickle down theory" in what is poured in at the top. They make a good case, but so do Dr. Kelley and others of like mind.

Dr. Kelley argues that "the unemployed business creates the unemployed worker," that "the snowballing and multiplier effect of a high technology community out of business cannot be isolated, that it affects every element of the national society," and that the lack of "some form of adequate Federal assistance would deal a serious blow to our economy on a national scale."

The blow, indeed, already has been struck, wholly apart from the philosophical argument as to whether the chicken or the egg comes first.

"Marketing," says Dr. Kelley, "is a traumatic change for those who have been in the government side of business. The 'management shock' in assimilating new business methods and criteria is just too much to expect the defense industry to absorb unaided . . . It usually takes one to two years for planning, strategy, financing and garage work. It does not happen overnight, especially when cash is no longer flowing in."

[From The Boston Globe, March 5, 1971]

CONVERSION: HOW, WHEN, IF—5

An unidentified spokesman for the West Coast aerospace industry is quoted in Newsweek as saying, "It's a bunch of baloney, nothing but a big snow job on the American public . . . that aerospace has all this massive brainpower ready to be utilized on the great social problems."

An East Coast munitions maker, also not for attribution, has told The Globe, "I would have to have a customer before I would spend a penny on conversion."

And still another adds that his company "could desalinate Great Salt Lake if government put up the money."

The sum total of these observations defines the defense industry to a T. Some of its elements frankly confess mental sterility resulting from decades-long dependence on a one-purpose and wasteful bureaucracy. Others understandably look for a fair profit on their stockholders' investments. All are looking for markets and the funds that finance markets, whether it be in the area of low-cost housing and the restoration of life to the dying Great Lakes or in the area of more commonplace civilian commodities.

JOB IS NOT EASY

There is nothing easy about conversion. It cannot be done with a wave of the hand, let alone without a great investment of some of the billions now squandered by Defense, the greatest spending machine in history. But it is significant that not all in the industry are sitting tight, waiting for someone else to pass a miracle.

It is not easy to convert, for instance, to pollution control, as has been pointed out by Franklin A. Lindsay, president of Itek Corp., one of half a dozen or so local defense industries which have found that managerial ingenuity has its rewards even while Washington remains firmly fixed on the seat of its pants. But easy or not, it can be done.

North American Rockwell engineers are using nuclear energy to develop a Diesel muffler to reduce exhaust contaminants (Newsweek, March 1); Aerojet-General is using rocketry techniques to develop a water desalination program and design a $7.6 million pilot plant near Los Angeles; Boeing has moved into several non-aerospace areas, including a computer subsidiary that employs 2600 and grossed $1 million in its first year. But private and local commitment and initiative are not enough.

Boeing's vice president Oliver Boileau correctly states "We are going to have to spend big money—bigger than we ever spent in going to the moon . . . The only way to do it is for the country to set goals and decide that everyone will have pure drinking water by 1975 or that we'll eliminate smog by 1980."

But it is not only pollution and smog about which Washington talks a lot but does little. One would think the nation's housing needs would have been accurately defined by now. But for the most realistic estimates in this area as well as others, one turns to such non-government agencies as say the Committee for Economic Development a group of concerned industrialists and academicians with no political fish to fry.

PRODUCE FOR PEACE

"The nation," says CED trustee Lindsay "needs 3 million new homes a year and new techniques as well as moderized codes for building them. Our airways are at a saturation point; we need a whole new control system and local skills match completely the skills needed to provide it. And medical electronics is a whole new industry, or should be."

Adequate mass transit systems are an obvious national need. And if an aircraft company on the West Coast (Rohr Inc.) can convert to build San Francisco's subway why could not this be done on a national scale as in the case of superhighways? Since cost-plus contracts can produce defense weapons, why could they not also be used to tackle domestic problems? In short since business and industry can work together in building history's greatest war machine, why cannot they similarly work together producing for peace?

It is argued that it would cost a lot of money. Of course it would. The approximately $50 billion and probably more that will be spent on destruction in Indochina during Mr. Nixon's first three years could serve (or could have served) a host of constructive purposes at home.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, board chairman of Arthur D. Little Inc., is just one of the many experts who say the defense budget could be cut back to a maximum of $50 billion from Mr. Nixon's projected $77.5 billion without any risk to national security.

Even $50 billion seems high, inasmuch as our arsenal includes the weaponry either to zero in on and obliterate any world area of our choosing, as Gen. Gavin points out, or to kill everyone on earth several times over. There is room for a plethora of what Dr. Albert J. Kelley, dean of Boston College's School of Management and chairman of the state Board of Economic Advisers, calls "seed money" for conversion in the $27.5 billion that would be left over—just as (idle thought!) the nation's needs long before now could have been satisfied, with the nation all the stronger for it, if some appreciable part of the $1 trillion spent on arms since the Korean war had been spent for constructive rather than destructive purposes.

As to the civilian market for the consumer goods a converted defense industry would produce, the assessment of the National Security Industrial Association that "it isn't there" has to be taken at face value.

As private economists in Washington (Leon Keyserling, Robert Nathan and others) and some government economists, in private, point out, today's market is entirely different from the post-World War II market. There were unemployed then as now, millions of poor then as now. But industry largely had abandoned the production of civilian goods during the war. When the war ended (as this one surely will have to sometime), the civilian market was there to grab automobiles, nylons, refrigerators, radios, TVs and other goods as fast as industry could produce them.

MARKET'S ISN'T THERE

The civilian market today is confined tc absolute necessities for the many and luxuries for the few. But it is not on luxury purchases that the economy thrives. A "His" and "Hers" yacht is not the same as two chickens in every pot. The more than 6 percent of unemployed and as many more who are underemployed are not going to purchase new automobiles. (For young blacks in poverty neighborhoods, it should be noted, the unemployment rate is a catastrophic 42.3 percent, and for all job-seeking teenagers it is 27.8 percent, statistics which suggest a disastrous social upheaval potential.) Welfare recipients whose numbers increased to 12.2 million last year and are increasing at the rate of 200,000 per month are in no position to rush to market, nor would they be under the Administration's family assistance plan which would not elevate them even to the officially defined poverty level. Route 128's $15,000 and $20,000 a year technicians, now exhausting their unemployment compensation, are not rushing to the market place, either, nor are the parents of the 55 million Americans under 14 who, by Mr. Nixon's own estimate, are suffering the bitter consequences of the grossly uneven distribution of wealth.

But if the civilian market for conversion simply isn't there—and isn't even being planned—how can it be created? For one thing, the Administration had better start

planning soon—and realistically. And part of the planning must have to do with creating purchasing power at the lower levels through an equitable tax policy and the social techniques that are available but have never been utilized to the full—social security benefits, unemployment compensation, pensions and allowances for the poor and retired that will enable them not just to exist but to live decently. There is money for this in the defense budget, too.

"The allocation of our national resources to the country's needs," as Gen. Gavin told a Senate committee, "should be considered in the light of the total needs of all aspects of our society."

That was well said. It is not the absence of weaponry that threatens the nation. What threatens is its neglected utilities and social upheaval resulting from the cencentration of life's comforts and spending power in too few hands. The defense industry will convert and the nation will stabilize and prosper when government policies create the market for the goods industry can produce.

The nation has the resources to do all that needs to be done. What is needed is understanding, imagination and bold planning. As munitions maker R. B. Chapman 3rd has suggested, it could be that we will not have much to defend within 20 or 30 years "if government and industrial leaders do not soon put their heads together on a viable program to satisfy our domestic wants."

NEW ISOLATIONISTS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 12, 1971, the Washington Evening Star displayed the following words in two different stories on the lower half of its front page:

The President said he was familiar with the arguments of the "new isolationists" (column 3).

Mills helped negotiate the voluntary textile plan, which Nixon bluntly rejected yesterday. Besides calling the plan inadequate to protect U.S. textile companies against excessive competition from imports, the President . . . (column 8).

Mr. Speaker, it may be recalled that shortly prior to Pearl Harbor, Japanese envoys told Judge Cordell Hull that the trade restrictions by the United States against Japan were as severe, from the point of view of Japan, as a military attack.

There is nothing new about this kind of isolationism which most historians agree did in fact play a major role in getting us into the Pacific portion of World War II.

So what is the real lesson of history?

It is possible to deal with your neighbors who are not attacking you without attacking them.

And if those neighbors are attacking other neighbors, you should phone the police—as we did in the case of the North Korean aggression against South Korea—rather than take the law into your own hands, which is to say determine for yourself whether international aggression has occurred across a 17th parallel copiously, specifically, and clearly described in the 1954 Geneva accords as a military line of demarcation and also described in those same accords as not an international boundary.

REPORT ON THE AGING

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago my hometown newspaper, the Wausau Daily Record-Herald carried a series of articles on problems facing the elderly. The stories were the result of 6 weeks of investigating all aspects of the problems of our senior citizens by Record-Herald reporter Miss Geri Nikolai.

I am inserting several of those articles in the RECORD because I think they sum up very well the frustration and almost desperation experienced by many of our elderly citizens. I think they highlight better than any remarks I could make the needs for more adequate social security legislation, more comprehensive medicare programs—most especially including the cost of prescription drugs under medicare—the need for more adequate housing for the elderly, and the need for more old-fashioned concern on the part of all of us.

The articles follow:

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald, Feb. 11, 1971]

REPORT ON THE AGING

The Record-Herald today presents an in-depth study of the aging—their problems, their assistance, their feelings.

Miss Geri Nikolai, staff reporter, has spent the last six weeks investigating all aspects of this topic. From her interviews have come 12 stories, one on this page, the remainder on pages 4 and 5.

Miss Nikolai, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edmund Nikolai, Stratford Route 3, is a graduate of Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire and has been a staff reporter since Jan. 27, 1969.

Meet Mr. X.

Not much of a way to describe the elderly gentleman, but his story will provide all the description that is needed.

Mr. X and his wife live in that elite part of Wausau referred to as "the hill." His neighbors are among the most prominent of citizens in wealth and influence.

Not so Mr. X. His name isn't in the news paper's business pages or the Chamber of Commerce "past chairman of" list. He refuses to let it appear in this story to identify him. Mr. X may be afraid to see his name and story in print . . . he certainly need not be ashamed.

Born in Milwaukee, Mr. X was married in 1926 and moved to Wausau, his wife's hometown, a year later.

The couple rented quarters for a time, and in 1946 bought a modest Tenth Street home for $6,000.

"On the 10-year plan," Mr. X recalled. "And we never missed a payment," his wife added.

He worked for a drug store and later a dairy while she clerked at grocery stores and baby-sat. They made their payments and raised their only child to be a policeman.

The years flew by . . . and suddenly there was retirement. That happened one year before it was planned. Mr. X was only 64, but illness forced him to quit work.

That was in 1958. Mrs. X quit work then, too, because the couple could collect more in Social Security than they could with partial SS and her earnings.

Now it's 1971. Mr. and Mrs. X receives $182 a month in Social Security and $73 in rent for an upstairs apartment. Outside of a savings account of $300, that is all they have.

Now in their retirement years, the couple is involved in the biggest struggle of their 44 years together.

They want to spend the rest of their lives quietly and comfortably in their own home. Taxes and the cost of living make them fight for every day of that life.

New clothing of Mr. and Mrs. X consist of remade articles given them by the neighbors.

Shopping and going to church involve long walks. "We take a cab if its cold or if we buy something like a bag of flour, but we always walk one way," said Mrs. X. "It costs $1.35 for the two of us to take a cab one way to Salem Lutheran."

Food is purchased and prepared carefully in the X household. "I bought two chicken breasts and two chicken legs yesterday. That'll be three meals anyway.

"Our grandson gave us a small ham for Christmas. I stretched that along by making scalloped potatoes and pea soup. I do all our baking."

Gas bills come to $30 a month in the winter, electricity to about $8, and telephone, about $7.

But the big expense, said the couple, is medicine.

Mr. X, 76, has Parkinson's disease. His 74-year-old wife has a heart condition. Between the two of them, they require more than $40 a month in medication.

In the past, they received their medicine through Medicaid. Tightening of the financial eligibility standards, coupled with increased assessment on their home, changed that and the couple must now buy their medicines.

"I had to drop one prescription that was $7 a month for refills. The doctor said I need it, but . . ." said Mrs. X.

"He should have a new hearing aid . . . he just has a cheap one . . . but new ones are $600," she went on.

"It was an awful heartbreak when we lost medical assistance," she said.

The couple was due for still another such "heartbreak."

"Our taxes went up from $288 to $486 this year," said Mr. X.

"We went to the board of review. They said we live up on the hill among the well-to-do.

"What has that got to do with us? We've got to live somewhere.

"If I'd known that 25 years ago, I wouldn't have bought a house here."

The X's home needs a new roof, they say. It has only half a basement, and that is too low to walk in without stooping. A small home, it has two downstairs bedrooms and the one they rent upstairs.

The home was reassessed at $14,900.

"After we complained, they said they'd come and investigate," said Mrs. X. "He was here, but he never came in the house."

The visit and complaint did result in $1,000 being dropped from the assessment, Mr. X noted. But, he said, "when you almost double the taxes, what's $35?"

The couple plans to "scrape a lot" to come up with the tax money and hope for some Homestead Relief. (They will get less than a $100 rebate).

Sell the home?

"Where would we go?" asks Mrs. X.

The X's have a comrade on Kickbusch Street who is more angry when he speaks about taxes.

"Our assessment was more than doubled. Taxes went way up. We'll have to scrape the gutter all summer to pay the taxes. If

we need a new pair of shoes, it'll have to wait till the taxes are paid."

Sell the house?

"Where in the heck would I go otherwise?"

Over on North Sixth Avenue lives a man who considers himself lucky.

Now 75 years old, he is still healthy enough to climb the roof of his house and shovel off the snow when it gets deep enough to be dangerous.

"So far we've been very lucky. We're holding our own," he said.

The man has a retirement pension from his company in addition to Social Security.

He built his modest two-bedroom home himself. The recent reassessment raised its value from a little over $5,000 to $12,000.

"We went to the board of review. They wouldn't listen.

"The house needs paint and a new roof. I don't know if I can swing it . . . they overdid taxes."

Sell the home?

"I've lived here almost 50 years . . . now I'm thinking to sell the house.

"If taxes keep going up, I'll have to sell, I guess."

OLD, BROKE, AND UNABLE TO FIND WORK; HERE'S ASSISTANCE OFFERED TO ELDERLY

Picture this.

You're old. You're broke . . . like no money. You have no way of earning any.

So how did you get that way?

Maybe it was your fault. You spent money like it grew on trees and never saved for the golden years.

More than likely you did do some thinking about retirement. You may even have accumulated a neat little stack of savings, then spent it all on hospital and medical bills when a spouse was ill.

Maybe you're one of the at least 150 Marathon County elderly residents who spent their lives in employment not covered by Social Security . . . or maybe your earnings were low and your Social Security check amounts to $50 or less each month.

Maybe you're taking care of a retarded son or daughter who can't contribute to income but eat and wear clothing and need a place to sleep just the same.

Maybe you're disabled, but Disabled Aid stops at age 65.

So you hate it . . . or maybe you don't . . . but you're going to have to ask for some help. Off you go to the Marathon County Department of Social Services.

"How much is your rent," they ask. "Fifty dollars a month?"

"Then the state says you need another $63 a month to live."

That's it, friend. That's how much the government will give to support you if you have no other income.

Maybe you get $60 a month in Social Security. The county department then subtracts your $50 rental fee and that leaves you $10 to live on. Since you need $63, according to the government, the county will give you a monthly Old Age Assistance allotment of $53 to add to your Social Security.

So anyway, there you are with 63 bucks and from 28 to 31 days to use it up. That's roughly $2 a day for your food, clothing, utilities and any form of entertainment you may desire.

"Okay," the county says. "We've got a budget all figured out for you . . . and surplus foods, too.

"Our budget says you should spend $12 a month for fuel and $8 for utilities. You may have to close off some rooms if your fuel bill is too high. Eight dollars won't cover your phone, electricity and water bills? Well, we can give you an extra $5 for the phone if you may need it because of illness.

"Now you have $43 left. Spend $7 on clothing and $7 on household and personal items. That'll leave $29 for food . . . and that's your budget."

It doesn't take much pondering to figure that $29 for what should be about 90 meals is going to be a bit difficult . . . at 30 cents a meal. (Note—the food allotment for prisoners at the County Jail is 85 cents per meal).

But back to you. Thirty cents a meal might be rough. So enter the surplus foods.

In one month you are entitled to receive a maximum of: a one-pound can of fruit; a two-pound package of dry beans; two pounds of butter; a two-and-a-half pound can of either chicken, turkey, beef or pork; a 12-ounce can of egg mix; a can of fruit or vegetable juice; a pound or two of lard or shortening; a pound package of macaroni; a two-and-a-half pound can of chopped meat; two 14-ounce cans of evaporated milk; four pounds of instant milk; a pound of split peas; a pound package of instant mashed potatoes; a pound of raisins; two pounds of rice; 16 ounces of corn syrup, and a pound can of vegetables.

In addition, you may receive two pounds of cheese, five pounds of corn meal, 10 pounds of flour and three pounds of rolled oats every two months; two pounds of peanut butter and a pound of dried prunes every three months, and two pounds of bulgur (cracked wheat cereal) every four months.

That should help some, but when those five pounds of canned meat run out, you'll have to buy your own or go without. And if you run out of food money, you might take your $7 budgeted for clothes and use that, or a part of your $7 household and personal money.

Of course, if you have no cooking facilities and must eat out, you receive no surplus foods. You do, however, receive some added funds to pay restaurant checks . . . to the tune of $54 a month (soon to rise to $65) instead of the $29 for food. That gives you $1.80 (soon $2.15) a day to eat in a restaurant.

If there are two of you, the Old Age Assistance is increased. A couple is entitled to $99 a month, again in addition to their rent.

There are about 335 persons aged 65 or older on Old Age Assistance in Marathon County, according to Richard Delap, director of the county social services department.

The Old Age Assistance allotments and eligibility requirements are woefully inadequate, Delap feels.

"Even with Social Security and separate medical assistance, the people on OAA are only existing.

"They don't have a thing extra."

To qualify for OAA, a person must be over 65, have no more than $750 in an "exempt account," may own a home of reasonable value (the department figures from $10,000 to $15,000), and may have a cash value life insurance policy of up to $1,000. He is not eligible if there is a living relative who would be able to support him.

In addition, when a person is put on the OAA rolls, a lien is put on his real estate. His property is resold and the Social Service Department repaid at his death . . . if there is enough to repay, that is.

"The biggest collection in OAA I've made in 11 years was slightly more than $8,000," Delap said.

"Most are around $2,000 to $3,000 and many right around $1,000. Last month I sold a shack an OAA recipient had been living in for $760."

SO YOUTH ORIENTED—FAYE LAPORTE LAMENTS PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY

Mrs. Faye LaPorte is the last person in the world Wausau's senior citizens would expect to see in tears.

For them, the director of the Marathon County Office on Aging has nothing but a smile and some friendly advice and encouragement. But one recent day she "heard one sad story too many" and talked about the problems of aging through sadness and a touch of anger.

"This damn society of ours—it's so youth oriented. At the end of their lives there's no place for them."

Mrs. LaPorte spoke of the terrible sense of loneliness and uselessness that plagues so many elderly people.

"It doesn't just affect the poor. One gentleman used to stop in when we had offices in City Hall. He's a retired Employers Insurance executive who worked for Employers when it was located there.

" 'Retirement is hell,' he said. 'I've been appointed to this city committee . . . but we don't do anything.'

"You're shelved at retirement," said Mrs. LaPorte.

"If people are over 65, we put them in the retirement category . . . they lose status and feel the deterioration socially and economically.

"They lose a sense of belonging. Even our churches are so organized. Loneliness set in . . . nobody is terribly willing to talk to an older person . . . we all move too fast. If they're a little hard of hearing, people don't have patience with them.

"They don't have money to spend . . . it's the kids that do."

Not that life is one big bowl of cherries for young people, Mrs. LaPorte noted.

"Young people have great problems, but they also have their health, their youth . . . everything's going for them.

"Young people can play society's game better. When you're old, your personality, with all its human faults, is accented."

Having to face the modern world's pace and complications can discourage and frighten the elderly, she said.

"After the reassessment in Wausau, we had 131 people come to the office asking what to do. We tried to convince them to appeal . . . many of them wanted to, but they felt it wouldn't do any good.

"It was a traumatic experience for many of them, especially the women. They're from the generation where the husband did everything . . . they just don't know where they're going to turn.

"The thing that especially concerns me is the number of people considering selling their homes because of taxes.

"Where are they going to go?"

It is pride—not Medicare or Social Security or the committee on aging—but pride, that keeps the elderly going, said Mrs. LaPorte.

"They have a tremendous resistance to charity. They think 'I made it through the depression and I'll make it now.'

"There are more than 5,000 people in Wausau over 65 and think how few will accept welfare. I've seem them eat oatmeal twice a day but they will not accept public assistance."

Even suspicion of poverty is a terrible blow to the pride of most senior citizens, she added.

"One woman, who gives every appearance of being comfortably situated, said a few weeks before Christmas she had two more items to sell the Talent Shop and then she could buy herself a needed pair of new eyeglasses."

But money isn't the only reward of Talent Shop sales, Mrs. LaPorte noted.

"To sell something gives a sense of status. They have produced something that someone is willing to pay for.

"This is at least as important as the money."

LOW COST HOUSING IS WELL ACCEPTED

When low cost housing for the elderly was first proposed in Wausau, it met with some opposition.

Uncle Sam doesn't have to build homes for the elderly in our town, many people said. Some retired persons vowed they would never live in such a housing project.

No longer. If there are still objections to housing for the elderly, they are mighty quiet. And the only problem at River View Tower East is that it is not big enough.

"We could build another unit of the same size (149 apartments), fill it up and still have a waiting list," said Ray Bareis, executive director.

"Right now we have a waiting list of more than 140 requests. And for everyone who filed an application and was accepted as eligible, there are three or four who said 'to heck with it. With a list like that, I'll be dead before there's room.'

"All it takes is an obituary of someone who lived at 500 Grand Ave, and the phone is ringing off the wall."

Bareis noted calls have increased and the waiting list is growing faster since the recent reassessment in Wausau.

The applicants are often in a financial bind, he said. Others are living in "obnoxious" conditions or with children who don't want them.

All have heard talk of building River View Tower West, and all are anxiously waiting.

So are Bareis and members of the Housing Authority of Wausau.

An application has been submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for another unit of identical size. Bareis and Authority commissioners have been in frequent touch with HUD officials to convince them of the need.

That much has been accomplished, Bareis said.

"They agree we need another one, but all building projects of this type have been frozen. The government ran out of money . . . as I understand it, every dime designated for housing for the elderly is gone."

The government would approve additional housing, but not the type the Wausau Authority wants, Bareis said.

HUD gave approval for a 30-apartment unit, but this would be inadequate and commissioner feel it would jeopardize chances for a larger unit later, he said.

Approval would also be given if the unit would be a county project. However, the politics and complications of setting up a Marathon County housing authority could delay this for the same period the Wausau Authority will have to wait, he said.

HUD would also approve building 100 units if they were designated for low income families. Since this would virtually eliminate the elderly, this idea also has not gained acceptance, Bareis explained.

"We haven't given up," he said. "We'll get a second building, there's no question of that.

"The only question is when."

Bareis estimated it would be from one-and-a-half to two years before funding of elderly housing projects is rejuvenated. That would mean opening of another unit in Wausau is from three to four years away.

The Housing Authority is hoping to locate the planned Tower West on the city lot near the Riverside Shopping Plaza. The location would be ideal, Bareis noted, since it is within walking distance of medical assistance and grocery stores of suitable size to assure fair prices.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON: ONE OF 10 BEST-MANAGED FIRMS IN AMERICA

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Dun & Bradstreet conducted a poll among 2,300 top-ranking business executives on their choice for the 10 best-managed industrial companies in America.

One of the firms selected—and cited for innnovative management—is located in the congressional district I represent: Johnson & Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, Johnson & Johnson is not only preeminent in the production of health care products. It is also one of the most progressive and responsive firms in the Nation in many areas—ranging from harmonious labor—management relations, to a real and deep interest in environmental matters.

These enlightened policies were initiated by the late and great Gen. Robert W. Johnson, chairman of the J. & J. board for many years, and continued and expanded by the present chairman, Philip B. Hoffman, whose talents, compassion and leadership are leading J. & J. to even greater preeminence.

An article from Middlesex County Industry explains the award.

J&J: ONE OF BEST-MANAGED

Johnson & Johnson, the world's leading producer of heatlh care products, has been cited as one of the 10 best-managed companies in American industry in 1970.

The company, which maintains several major installations in Middlesex County, was singled out for innovative management, one of the 10 categories included in a poll conducted among 2,300 highest-ranking business executives by Dun & Bradstreet. Johnson & Johnson's leadership in developing and marketing new products was cited in the poll.

At the same time, the company reported substantial growth and expansion during the past year. Johnson & Johnson expanded operations in 1970 to include 70 separate companies with installations in 15 states at home and in 35 foreign nations.

Over the past five years, the companies sales increased by approximately 11 per cent each year.

Johnson & Johnson's Middlesex County operations include the headquarters in New Brunswick.

Cel-Fibe and Cellulose Products Corporation are located in Milltown, as are installations for Personal Products and Chicopee Manufacturing Company. The latter also has operations in New Brunswick. Permacel is located in North Brunswick and there are facilities for the Domestic Operating Company in both New Brunswick and North Brunswick.

DISPLAYING THE FLAG

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the many attacks on our national emblem in recent years by irresponsible elements in our society has, I am sure, had the adverse reaction expected by those guilty of these offenses: it has stimulated respect for the flag and brought about far more display and affection for Old Glory than ever existed before.

Veterans' organizations have particularly been active in encouraging activity in flying the flag. As a result, most congressional offices in 1970 had larger requests for U.S. flags than ever in recent memory and at one time the waiting list at the stationery room was so long that it was virtually impossible to get one for constituents in less than 6 weeks.

One of my constituents has been particularly active in this regard. Mr. Charles A. Moran of the Waldo M. Slaton Post of the American Legion in Atlanta, Ga., has for 7 years had a U.S. flag owned by him flown over the Georgia State Capitol on November 22 of those years in commemoration of the death of President John F. Kennedy. He recently sent me a copy of the certificate issued by the Honorable Ben W. Fortson, Jr., the Secretary of State for Georgia, and with the permission of the Chair I wish to insert it in the RECORD at this point so that all Members may become aware of this noble effort:

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Atlanta, Ga.

This is to certify that a special United States Flag, property of Charles A. Moran, Sr., a disabled foreign service veteran of World War One, was flown over the Georgia State Capitol building on November 22, 1970, to commemorate the seventh anniversary of the death of President John F. Kennedy.

To quote Commander Moran: "This was the seventh time this request was made to the Honorable Ben W. Fortson, Jr., Secretary of State and Flag Custodian, and was met with graceful compliance, to help focus attention to this important date in our history, to pay tribute to a patriot and to encourage our fellow-Georgians to display our flag more often."

BEN W. FORTSON, Jr.,
Secretary of State, Keeper, Building and Grounds.

GEORGE L. DEMENT

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad task to inform my colleagues in the House of the sudden passing last Saturday of one of America's leading experts in the field of metropolitan transportation, my good friend, Mr. George L. DeMent, chairman of the board of the Chicago Transit Authority.

Mr. DeMent, past president of the Institute for Rapid Transit, had been in Las Vegas, where he was attending an executive meeting of the American Transit Association, of which he had been president since last September.

George DeMent had been chairman of the board of the Chicago Transit Authority since 1963. During this period, under his guidance, he watched it grow to become one of the Nation's largest and most efficient metropolitan transit systems.

His career, which spanned 44 years, began in 1927, after his graduation from the University of Illinois, as an engineer with the metropolitan sanitary district. In 1939, he was among the engineers selected to plan and build Chicago's initial subway system.

From 1954 to 1963, he was commissioner of public works for the city of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago's loss is the Nation's loss.

Just last week, I had the occasion to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, his remarks before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, in which he expressed his strong disapproval of the administration's 1971 plans for urban mass transportation.

The record he made as chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority is so outstanding that it stands as a monument to the man who made it. He not only possessed all the attributes of leadership and statesmanship, but he also had the ability to place service above self as few men have been able to do.

To his lovely wife and daughter, LaVerne and I express our deepest sympathies.

THE RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, in view of President Nixon's rural community development message that was received by Congress last week, I think it is appropriate to focus attention on the Rural Job Development Act of 1971. This proposal initiated by Senator JAMES PEARSON has the bipartisan support of 50 Senators and over 40 Representatives.

As principle sponsor for this legislation in the House of Representatives, I am honored to have been joined by the following who are cosponsors of the Rural Job Development Act of 1971:

Mr. JAMES S. ABOUREZK, of South Dakota; Mr. BILL ALEXANDER, of Arkansas; Mr. MARK ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BILL ARCHER, of Texas; Mr. JOHN N. CAMP, of Oklahoma; Mr. W. C. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama; Mr. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts; Mr. JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee; Mr. BILL FRENZEL, of Minnesota; Mr. DON FUQUA, of Florida; Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; Mr. ORVAL HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MICHAEL HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts; Mr. JAMES F. HASTINGS, of New York; Mr. EDWARD HUTCHINSON, of Michigan; Mr. ED JONES of Tennessee, Mr. PETER N. KYROS, of Maine; Mr. ARTHUR A. LINK, of North Dakota; Mr. MANUEL LUJAN, of New Mexico; Mr. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, of Kentucky; Mr. JAMES A. MCCLURE of Idaho; Mr. JOHN MELCHER, of Montana; Mr. CLARENCE E. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WILMER MIZELL, of North Carolina; Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, of Indiana; Mr. BILL NICHOLS, of Alabama; Mr. WILLIAM R. ROY, of Kansas; Mr. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, of Iowa; Mr. GARNER SHRIVER, of Kansas; Mr. ROBERT L. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. ROBERT H. STEELE, of Connecticut; Mr. JOHN TERRY, of New York; Mr. CHARLES THONE, of Nebraska; Mr. AL ULLMAN, of Oregon; Mr. VICTOR V. VEYSEY, of California; Mr. RICHARD C. WHITE, of Texas; Mr. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania; Mr. JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, and Mr. JOHN M. ZWACH, of Minnesota.

Every day we hear of the crisis in our Nation's cities. Crime escalates, pollution threatens the health of urban life, complexities of everyday affairs multiply, and the quality of life in general continues to decline. No one disputes the severity and crucial nature of the urban crisis, but there is another and equally important related crisis in this country: The declining economy and eroded vitality of rural America.

These problem areas are distinct; however, in terms of cause and effect, they are related. Over the past several decades, rising production expenses, higher taxes and declining farm prices have forced millions of farmers out of business, as well as the closing of many business establishments in rural communities. This coupled with the lack of adequate housing, educational opportunity, water and sewer facilities, health care facilities, community services, and general economic opportunity has created the tremendous population migration from rural to urban America.

Into the cities have come the unskilled rural poor attracted by the lure of economic advancement. Many gain, but a tragically high number do not. Instead of economic salvation, too many of the rural poor, both white and black, find tenements, unemployment, welfare and the depersonalized, demoralized environments of the slum-ghetto.

Into the cities also come the young, the educated and the talented. They often do much better materially, but for this economic gain they pay the social costs of the loneliness of the crowd, the frustrations of congested streets and crowded stores, the stultifying sameness of the bedroom suburbs, the loss of community identity, and the lack of contact with nature.

These overcrowded conditions in our cities have imposed impossible demands on urban resources to meet the requirements of transportation, education, welfare, crime control, pollution control, health care, public services, and housing. If answers are not found, the pressure of people against the resources and services of our cities of the future may simply break them down.

In short, too many communities are underdeveloped. Too many of our metropolitan areas are overcrowded. This unequal distribution of population and economic activity will surely worsen unless we take strong positive action.

To underscore this fact, statistics show that even if today's rural population were doubled by the end of this century, there would still be up to 40 million people added to the metropolitan areas.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was one of the first to recognize this problem in the decade of the 1950's. His proposed solution included the location of industry in rural areas and the possibility of creating new towns in the country. This proposal, in part, reached fruition with the development of the new pilot city, Jonathan, located 20 miles southwest of Minneapolis, with an eventual population of 50,000 as it target.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. Clifford M. Hardin, in announcing the creation of President Nixon's Rural Affairs Council, succinctly outlined our task in solving the problems of rural and urban America. Secretary Hardin said:

> We have to make the whole of rural America more attractive, economically, culturally, and socially. We must expand opportunity not only for the ten million farm people, but for the other 45 million residents living in the countryside. It is not enough that we think in terms of improving conditions and opportunity for the people living today in rural America, and thereby stemming the flow of people to the cities. We must do much more. We must make it a matter of national policy that we create in, and around, the smaller cities and towns sufficiently good employment opportunities and living environments that large numbers of families will choose to rear their children there.

The Rural Job Development Act of 1971, whose principal author is Senator JIM PEARSON, my good friend and the distinguished senior Senator from my home State of Kansas, would encourage job-creating industries in our rural areas which would stimulate economic activity and create income opportunity and would be a logical and reasonable means of implementing rural job development. This bill should and can be an integral part of our growing commitment to deal with our Nation's urban and rural crisis.

The economic potential resulting from rural job development is tremendous. Recently a community in my congressional district of western Kansas revealed the projected impact of 100 new jobs. In Hays, Kans., according to the statistics 100 new jobs would mean: A population increase of 296 people, 112 more households, 174 total additional workers employed, 107 more registered passenger cars, four more retail establishments, $360,000 more in annual retail sales, $270,000 more in bank deposits, and $590,000 additional personal income in the community.

We must work together to find solutions to the dual crisis in rural and urban America. United, we can reverse the flow of rural people to metropolitan areas and initiate a reverse migration.

This, truly, is the turning point in our history. We must provide the tools to achieve a true population balance.

I am hopeful that the record of the 92d Congress will reveal that we operated with dispatch to meet this challenge and that we provided new opportunity and better living conditions for all Americans.

To further this most worthwhile goal, the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., has initiated a most worthwhile program, "Operation Build America" founded on the principle of rural job development. This program is discussed in some detail in a recent statement by the federation, the largest business organization in the United States:

RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT

Calling attention to the fact that the National Federation of Independent Business has developed a program, "Operation Build America" to support the principle of Rural Job Development, Congressman Keith G. Sebelius of Kansas, and 40 some co-sponsors have introduced legislation to achieve this objective.

The bill, heavily supported by 40 co-sponsoring members and companion legislation supported by 50 Members of the U.S. Senate, would provide limited, controlled tax incen-

tives for the creation of new employment-providing enterprises in rural and small town America.

Sponsors of the measure recognize that many of the problems which constitute the crisis of the cities can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry. Thus the rural development movement, which ultimately seeks to slow down the great rural-to-urban migration, if successful, will be of benefit not only to our rural communities but to our cities as well. We are coming to realize that rural development is not simply a desirable objective, but indeed, a national necessity.

Spearheading "Operation Build America", radio stations throughout the nation are airing special public messages from such well known performers as Ken Berry, star of the top-rated CBS show, "Mayberry RFD," from Lorne Greene of NBC's "Bonanza" and Michael Constantine from ABC's "Room 222." In addition Jerry Van Dyke, Lloyd Nolan, Richard Long, Denies Weaver, Clu Gullager and Shirley Jones are making appeals to the public to make rural America a better place to live, and a place where people can find employment.

The objective of the project "Operation Build America" is to make it possible for job producing enterprises to be launched in the economically under-developed areas of the country to provide jobs for the young people of these communities, to check the migration of job seekers to the already swollen population of the big metropolitan area which creates almost unsurmountable problems of welfare, transportation, pollution and crime.

THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 52d anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. This organization founded in Paris, France at the historic caucus of delegates from the First American Expeditionary Force, on March 15, 1919, was dedicated to God and country, and during its brief history it has honored that dedication.

This group of patriotic Americans has served admirably as a champion of veterans of our wars, and has served with only the best interests of our Nation in mind. It pioneered in obtaining deserved rehabilitation assistance for those who suffered physical disabilities in military service. It led the fight for deserved assistance to widows, orphans, and dependents of those who gave their lives in military service. It obtained increased educational and training opportunities for veterans with its sponsorship of the GI bill of rights and the Korean GI bill. And, of course, the American Legion played a prominent role in the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930. The American Legion last year spent $10 million alone for its child welfare program, and its youth training program is one of the Nation's largest, including junior baseball, sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, Boys State, and Boys National Government.

Mr. Speaker, no greater compliment can be paid, I think, than to state that the American Legion has lived up to the high standards it set for itself 52 years ago.

The largest veterans oragnization in the United States with about 3 million Legionnaires, the American Legion has enjoyed a consistent record of dedication to, and pursuit of, the American ideal. On this occasion of the 52d anniversary of the founding of this organization I join with all Americans to extend my most sincere congratulations to the members of the American Legion.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING IN MAINE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert in today's RECORD an article which appears in this month's edition of Down East: The Magazine of Maine. Written by Nancy Skoglund, it concerns the growth of public television in our State and the men and institutions who have been responsible for its successes. I commend both the article and the model of Maine's Public Broadcasting Service to my colleagues:

THIS IS THE MAINE PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE

(By Nancy Skoglund)

Alumni Hall on the Orono campus of the University of Maine used to house the women's gym. Today it is the home of Maine's Educational Broadcasting Network. In place of athletic equipment stand television cameras, videotape recorders and other mind-boggling machines which ETV uses to bring Maine viewers national and regional shows and—most meaningful to the ambitious young television crew—programs of impact to Maine.

Noncommercial television became a reality in Maine in 1961 when Colby, Bates and Bowdoin Colleges solicited $500,000 in private funds to put WCBB Channel 10 in Augusta on the air. Two years later a legislative act and a bond issue resulted in a public educational network, supported by legislative appropriation and licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to the University of Maine. Today about 90 percent of the state's viewers live within the beam of Maine ETV's three public stations—WMEB–TV Channel 12 in Orono, WMEM-TV Channel 10 in Presque Isle and WMED–TV Channel 13 in Calais—and privately owned WCBB Channel 10 in Augusta.

Roughly 70 percent of ETV's programs are supplied either by the Eastern Education Television Network, a regional association of public broadcasting stations and production centers in the Northeast, or by the Public Broadcasting Service. PBS' major function is to supply non-commercial stations with nationally available programs—*Forsyte Saga* and *Civilisation*, for example. The remaining 30 percent of Maine's ETV programming is produced by the personnel at Orono. College-owned WCBB has no production facilities, but by mutual agreement swaps use of its transmission building at Litchfield for the privilege of tapping in on the U. of M's 700-mile microwave network.

The original justification for state sponsorship of non-commercial television was the potential role of the medium in the public schools. Initially, therefore, ETV's thrust was, and to a great extent still is, instructional. Throughout much of the school day educational videotapes rented by the State Department of Education or produced by the network are broadcast primarily for student audiences. During this time period, ETV also airs children's shows such as *Misterogers' Neighborhood, Hodgepodge Lodge,* and the award-winning series *Sesame Street.*

In the late afternoon and early evening, ETV broadcasts adult education programs, giving instruction in such subjects as foreign languages, music and vocational training. Some are produced at Orono: for example, ETV signed up the University of Maine's only anthropology professor and, by putting him on the air, enabled students state-wide to "attend" his lectures and receive college credit through the U. of M.'s Continuing Education program.

Evening scheduling, with plays, concerts and especially public affairs programs, such as those on oil at Machiasport, mental health and drugs in Maine, is the area in which Maine's public broadcasting personnel are currently most active, for they produce roughly half of it. Although the listener may not always agree with what is aired after 7 p.m., he can hardly call it dull. It is on this kind of programming that general manager John Morison and his imaginative young producers have put their personal stamp.

Suave, self-assured John Morison had logged seventeen years in television, including three years in Boston as program director for the Eastern Educational Television Network, when in the spring of 1969 the University of Maine offered him the position as manager of the state broadcasting network. Although Orono seemed remote from the center of action in his trade, Maine ETV's potential for growth was so appealing that Morison accepted the offer. "In Boston I was at the end of the pipe," he says of his former job, in which he scheduled shows produced by others. But in Maine public broadcasting he has the chance to originate lively, engaging shows himself. In his eighteen months of directorship he has expanded the network from an extension of the classroom to a broadcasting force which is beginning to lure prime-time audiences away from commercial channels.

One of Morison's most impressive tours de force was production of Bowdoin professor Louis Coxe's *Birth of a State.* After four live performances by the Portland Players in Portland's First Parish Church, this play about Maine's separation from Massachusetts in 1820 was headed for oblivion. Morison procured funds from the Maine Sesquicentennial Commission, State Commission on the Arts and Humanities and Department of Education, and bussed the Players to Orono for a one-day "shooting." This television drama, the first produced in Maine, was shown several times last fall and then offered to the State Department of Education and commercial stations.

Other productions for limited audiences which have received state-wide viewing under Morison's management are a Millinocket high school play and a Smithsonian Puppet Theatre performance of *The Thousand and One Nights.* ETV's recent production of *A Downeast Smile-In*, the first Maine-produced show to receive national distribution, brought Marshall Dodge ("I" of "Bert and I") and his dry tales, delivered in Maine dialect and ending gently "with a poke instead of a punch," into living rooms all across the country. According to the Public Broadcasting Service, *Smile-In* is one of the nation's most popular shows.

Sharing the Orono limelight until his recent move to National Public Radio in Washington, D.C. was Charles G. Herbits. While Morison is diplomatic and reluctant to be critical, Chuck Herbits obviously delighted in

being the network gadfly. His outspokenness, often caustic and always witty, was occasionally apparent onstage during *Crosstalk*—a weekly interview show which last year provided a forum for diverse opinions, including those of war critics, abortion advocates, marijuana testers, deer hunting opponents and low income tenants unions, as well as those of the University chancellor and gubernatorial candidates. In addition to procuring federal funds for *A Time to Live*, a new series of entertainment and news for the elderly, one of Herbits' chief contributions to ETV was his assistance to U. of M. attorneys in their successful challenge of Section 5 of the network's enabling act, which in the past had prevented the station from broadcasting political programs. Removal of Section 5 permitted ETV to cover last November's campaigns in depth.

Taking over Herbits' post as director of program development—and replacing his pop art wall hanging with a French Impressionist print—is Calvin M. Thomas II, a distinguished, articulate young Bangor native who has been with the Maine network since 1968 as overseer of instructional programming. In expanding his scope from instructional to public television and radio, he assumes the responsibility of shaping program ideas into air-worthy shows and soliciting outside funds to help finance them.

Cal Thomas brings a background in the performing arts to his new job. In addition to his television duties, until last year he was manager of the Bangor Symphony Orchestra, and still serves on the boards of the Symphony and the Maine State Ballet Company. His family runs the Thomas School of Dance in Bangor and Portland, and Thomas himself taught there and helped to develop Husson College's dance department. While studying for an M.A. in speech at the U. of M., he became involved in public broadcasting and decided upon it as a career. Thomas' enthusiasm, characteristic of many people at ETV, appears in the glint which comes to his eyes when talking about a favorite project.

Education Perspectus, a former biweekly series on innovations in Maine education, reflected producer Thomas' interest in new ideas. On Christmas Eve ETV broadcast an hour-long "special," which he both produced and directed, featuring the Colby College Summer Music School String Quartet in a coaching session with a member of the world famous Hungarian String Quartet. Like *Birth of a State*, it will be used in instructional television as well as in evening programming. Other ideas which Thomas hopes to make into programs are shows depicting a New England Christmas, tracing a bill through the state legislature, focusing attention on Maine's Indians, and portraying how people in different parts of the state make their living. As second in command in the Orono studio, Thomas is acutely conscious of the responsibility imposed by involvement with powerful media such as television and radio, and senses that "more is expected of public broadcasting" than of commercial television because the public has a stake in it.

Whereas much of ETV's endeavors are directed at making viewers concerned about public issues, the efforts of Tobias LeBoutillier, whose special province is promotion, are aimed at keeping everyone happy. An intense, eager young man with a B.S. in physics from the U. of M., he gained experience for his present job through radio and television work in Bangor and Waterville. When he isn't on the phone with the press or editing *PG*—the network's fledgling program guide which last April took first prize in national competition—LeBoutillier can often be found in the production control room synchronizing camera shots and sound for on-the-air program promotion spots.

Director of television programming Kenneth Krall is in charge of scheduling local, regional and national programs for Maine viewing. A former promotion-publicity specialist with experience in Buffalo, New York, he teaches journalism part time at the U. of M. Assisted by the network's production staff, which falls under his directorship, Krall generates new ideas and techniques for television programming.

Recruited from Schenectady, New York to assume the duties as director of instructional television (ITV) is Erik Van DeBogart. In New York, where he earned an M.S. in education and did classroom teaching over closed circuit television, Van DeBogart was chairman of a committee which coordinated ITV selection, production and utilization for the state. At Orono he is responsible for developing and programming all ITV offerings for broadcast over the network and the closed circuit systems of the U. of M., and works in close coordination with the University's Continuing Education Division and the State Department of Education.

Last year a major innovation for Maine—public radio—was launched by the Maine Educational Broadcasting Network. Veteran broadcaster Lester Spencer, who was directing radio programming in Columbus, Ohio, was invited by the Maine network to develop its public radio station from scratch. Spencer cheerfully departed from the city and returned to his native Maine—he was born in Freindship—where he assembled several thousand stereo records and drew on the television division's public affairs facilities to create WMEH–FM, Bangor, WMEH–FM, with studios in Orono, is heard throughout a 100-mile radius and, since its first week of broadcasting last September, has been deluged with mail from listeners applauding the emphasis on classical music.

While ETV's affiliation with the University of Maine entails a measure of restraint and prohibits fund-raising on the air, it more often works to the station's advantage. Guest lecturers and special events on the Orono campus provide the network with a wealth of program material. Last year *Maine News and Comment*—a five-nights weekly show hosted by public affairs director Dan Everett—featured Senators Edmund Muskie and George McGovern speaking at Bates and Orono on Moratorium Day. CBS News bought copies of ETV's tapes of those events and flew them to New York for its 11 p.m. news. Former Catholic priest James Kavanaugh, speaking out on sex and birth control, was another guest whose television appearance resulted from his presence on campus. ETV officials admit that without University backing public broadcasting in Maine would never have got off the ground.

Staff members at the Orono studios—from students building new sets in the graphics room to the girls in the news department—all have opinions on what the network needs and what future priorities should be. Long on the want list has been a transmission tower in the Portland area including a transmitter for FM radio broadcasting. At present, ETV has transmitters at Eddington (Channel 12, Orono), Meddybemps (Channel 13, Calais) and Mars Hill (Channel 10, Presque Isle). Southern Maine viewers are supplied only by a distant signal from WCBB at Litchfield (Channel 10, Augusta) or from WENH–TV (Channel 11) in Durham, New Hampshire. The comments the Orono network receives complaining of poor reception in the Portland region indicate that at present ETV is not able to serve all the people whose tax dollars contribute to the network's $484,000 annual budget.

In addition to acquiring a fourth transmitter, ETV badly needs to update its studio equipment. Recently the network obtained a new videotape recorder which, for the first time, enables it to record color programs. Prior to this, the only ETV color shows which Maine viewers saw were those re-transmitted simultaneously with their original broadcast from regional or national networks. Statistics showing that 40 percent of all television sets in the nation and 25 percent of those in Maine are color sets make general manager Morison feel "pushed" into color. All new public broadcasting stations, he points out, are investing initially in color equipment. More important, most sources of outside funds are receptive only to ideas for color programs.

Last fall ETV's directors were successful in convincing University trustees that these needs warranted special funding. The result was a University request—presently before the legislature—for funds to enable ETV to extend adequate public television and radio broadcasting to all Maine citizens. If the legislature votes money to match the federal government's 75 percent, the network will build its transmitter in southern Maine and equip the Presque Isle facility with FM radio service to Aroostook County. In addition, new cameras and videotape recorders will replace the ten-year-old black and white instruments, which will be transferred to a van equipped as a much-needed mobile unit to make production possible anywhere in the state.

Nationally the trend in public broadcasting is expanding its role from strictly instructional television to public affairs and cultural programming. Motivated by a pronounced sense of professionalism, Maine's public broadcasting personnel appear to be keeping pace. As one observer suggested, ETV in Maine is no longer an "electronic bauble," but rather "TV that lingers in the mind after the set goes off."

TAXES RUIN BUSINESS—RAISE CONSUMER PRICES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, In 1969, Congress passed an antibusiness tax bill. Supposed to produce more taxes, it simply meant a heavier load on business and depressed the growth pattern.

A major target of this oppressive taxation was the oil business. History had proved the economic strength of oil depletion of 27½ percent. This incentive provided more oil, more gas, and more pipe lines to give lower energy costs to consumers.

Then, in 1969, the bureaucrats slashed depletion to 22 percent. This discouragement from our Nation's legislators meant that the oil drillers would have difficulties with their future explorations.

I have just read the latest figures on the depressed oil business. Rotary oil drilling last week reached the lowest level since the present reporting procedure was started in 1938. The oilwell drilling contractors release showed only 836 rotary drilling units engaged. This is 364 fewer than mid-December. The previous low was 847 units drilling back in May 1943.

Canada is not experiencing the same decline as we are having in the United States.

The power to tax is the power to destroy was a statement of Justice Mar-

shall about 150 years ago. When America is seeking more job opportunities, we question the logic of excessive taxation that limits business activity.

All the oil news is on the Middle East. Now these countries threaten us with increased prices. At the same time we have lower reserves to meet our domestic needs.

We need oil for energy and domestic expansion. Consumers do not want to be dependent on foreign oil and gas with rapidly escalated prices. Let us get back on the right track by strengthening domestic reserves, increasing production, and providing more jobs for Americans in the oil business. The biggest step forward will be to reestablish oil depletion at 27½ percent.

GOVERNMENT MUST CORRECT BASIC PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the Government must move now to correct the basic problems of rural America or those problems will erupt tenfold as urban problems in a very few years.

Young people, middle-aged people, and a growing number of older people are leaving rural areas in droves. And the only place for them to go is the city. But the cities are already overcrowded and there are few job opportunities for the unskilled.

It appears to me that we have two avenues of approach to these problems:

First, for those actually engaged in farming for a livelihood, we must find ways to help them derive their fair proportionate share of the income from their product. The current trend of vertical integration—downward from processor to producer and upward from processor to retailer—appears to point the way toward this goal.

Individual food producers can no longer bargain for the best price for their product on the open market because buying power is concentrating more and more into the hands of a few processors of each commodity. The farmer's best protection is to join with other producers of the same commodity to form one bargaining unit. They are then in a position to enter into contractual or joint venture agreements with major processors whereby both the processor and producer gain economic advantage. They share each other's risks and participate in each other's profits.

Government can assist the producers by providing long-term, low-interest loans to build the necessary central storage and primary processing facilities. The Government can also provide interim markets through the Small Business Administration's 8–A program.

By encouraging vertical integration between producers, processors and retailers, we will go far toward giving the farmer a "bigger slice of the action." Opportunity for growth and profit will thus be added to the farm production field and young people will find it more attractive and challenging.

Second, but with the continued mechanization and computerization of farm operations and the resultant trend toward larger and larger farm units and fewer farm operators, it does not appear that food production will be able to provide employment for all rural young people. Yet most youngsters raised in a rural atmosphere would prefer to live there if they were assured of an opportunity to earn a livelihood. To give them this opportunity, we must assist in rural economic development by encouraging industries to direct their expansion toward rural areas rather than urban centers.

This can be done through long-term, low-interest loans for those companies that move in this direction, preferential government buying policies, tax concessions and any number of other standard economic techniques. Further, the improvement of recreational, cultural, educational, medical, and housing facilities in rural areas will assist in reaching this goal.

With these two approaches: Helping the farmer obtain his fair share of income from his product and providing off-the-land job opportunities in rural areas, we will go far toward accomplishing our aims of solving our basic rural problems.

IRISH MOTHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate St. Patrick's Day Wednesday, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues another Irishman who by her deeds has set an example for all Americans to follow.

Mrs. James T. Kilbane has been chosen Cleveland's Irish Mother of the Year, an honor which includes leading the city's St. Patrick's Day parade. I am proud to have known Mrs. Kilbane as a friend.

An article citing her distinguished accomplishments appeared in the Plain Dealer of March 10 as follows:

MRS JAMES T. KILBANE: IRISH MOTHER OF THE YEAR NAMED HERE

Mrs. James T. Kilbane, wife of a retired policeman and mother of a former state legislator, has been named Irish Mother of the Year.

She will ride in a position of honor at the head of the St. Patrick's Day Parade here.

Mrs. Kilbane, active in Irish-American circles, was cited as "a woman whose life has reflected credit upon the Irish nationality, and whose example has been a source of inspiration to the community."

She is past president of the Yankee Division Ladies' Auxiliary, a trustee of World War I Pioneer Barrack 1 and a member of the St. Ignatius Parish Altar and Rosary Society.

Her husband is president of the Irish Civic Association. He is a native of Achill Beg in County Mayo, Ireland. They were married in 1921 and will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary April 19.

Mrs. Kilbane was born Anna E. Gannon in the old Angle on Cleveland's West Side and graduated from St. Malachi's Academy.

The Kilbanes live at 3303 West Boulevard S.W. They have two children—Mrs. R. G. Sutter, New York, and James P., a partner in the law firm of Kilbane, McDonnell and Sweeney and former state representative and senator. They have 10 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

The Mother of the Year was chosen by the United Irish Societies of Greater Cleveland which sponsors the St. Patrick's Day parade.

A BILL TO RAISE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND INCOME LIMITATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Congress will soon approve the long-delayed across-the-board social security benefit increase. I support the action whereby this basic benefit increase has been separated from the far more controversial problem of welfare reform.

The matter of increased benefits and automatic cost-of-living increases has already been the subject of long and unnecessary delay for almost a year. On May 21, 1970, the House passed legislation which provided for these increases. That legislation then became the target of Senate delaying tactics which stalled final passage until December 29. As finally passed by the Senate, the bill included over 100 differences from the House-passed version. Agreement between the two Houses was impossible in the short time remaining in the 91st Congress.

Nearly 27 million elderly Americans depend on social security benefits to meet living costs. To most of these people, the low fixed income they receive is not sufficient to assure them a decent standard of living.

As I am saying this, it is not clear what will be recommended by the conference committee now considering these social security amendments. It is fairly certain that the bill will include a 10-percent across-the-board benefits increase and possibly the automatic cost-of-living increase.

I will support these basic increases, and I hope that they will be made retroactive to the first of this year. At the same time, I do not believe that this is enough.

Today, I am introducing legislation which would provide a more comprehensive package to assist our older Americans and to help them help themselves. I do not mean for this bill to hold up immediate action on the benefits increase, but we should not pass this increase and feel we have done all that is necessary in this area.

My bill calls for the 10 percent across-the-board benefits increase, the automatic cost-of-living increase, an increase in the minimum monthly payment from $64 to $100, and an increase in the limitation on outside earnings from the present $1,680 to $3,600 annually. I would hope that all four of these provisions would be recommended by the confer-

ence committee this week. It is important that a consolidated package such as this is enacted to combat poverty among our elderly citizens who have contributed so much to our country.

The unrealistically low outside income limitation which now exists deprives our country from further contributions which our senior citizens can and want to make. Their skills, talents, and experience should be solicited rather than discouraged, as presently is the case. By raising this limitation to $3,600, we can encourage these people to more substantially earn their own way, something they want to do very much.

The total package I have introduced would provide a floor of $100 per month for each beneficiary plus the necessary escalator clause to automatically increase all benefit levels to keep pace with the rising cost of living. When we add to this the income limitation increase to enable beneficiaries to earn their way to better living standards if they so choose, we will have gone a long way toward alleviating the financial straits now faced by millions of senior citizens.

I urge prompt consideration of this coordinated attack on elderly poverty.

THE ROOTS OF LAWLESSNESS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual these days to have members from the intellectual community and especially great historians write on public questions.

Recently Prof. Henry Steele Commager, a noted historian and highly responsible citizen with a deep concern about the destiny of America, has written a very perceptive article entitled "The Roots of Lawlessness."

I commend this article to the reading of any who may have occasion to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ROOTS OF LAWLESSNESS

(By Henry Steele Commager)

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author. . . ."—ABRAHAM LINCOLN, SPRINGFIELD, 1838.

It was in 1838 that the young Abraham Lincoln—he was not yet twenty-nine—delivered an address at Springfield, Illinois, on "The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions." What he had to say is curiously relevant today. Like many of us, Lincoln was by no means sure that our institutions could be perpetuated; unlike some of us, he was convinced that they should be.

What, after all threatened American political institutions? There was no threat from outside, for "all the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a thousand years." No, the danger was from within. "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

This, Lincoln asserted, was not outside the realm of possibility; as he looked about him, he saw everywhere a lawlessness that, if persisted in, would surely destroy both law and Constitution and eventually the nation itself. In the end, *lawlessness* did do that—lawlessness in official guise that refused to abide by the Constitutional processes of election or by the will of the Constitutional majority. It was to be Lincoln's fate to be called upon to frustrate that lawless attack on the nation, and to be remembered as the savior of the Union. And it has been our fate to be so bemused by that particular threat to unity—the threat of sectional fragmentation—that we have failed to appreciate the danger that so deeply disturbed Lincoln at the threshold of his political career.

The explanation of our confusion is rooted in history. The United States invented, or developed, a new kind of nationalism, one that differed in important ways from the nationalism that flourished in the Old World. One difference was the enormous emphasis that Americans, from the beginning, put on territory and the extent to which American nationalism came to be bound up with the acquisition of all the territory west to the Pacific and with the notion of territorial integrity on a continental scale. The idea that a nation should "round out" its territory. or take over all unoccupied territory, was not prominent in the nationalism of the Old World. Territory there, after all, was pretty well pre-empted, and there was no compelling urge to acquire neighboring land for its own sake.

In the Old World, threats to unity had been, for the most part, dynastic or religious rather than territorial. As proximity did not dictate assimilation, distance did not require separation. But in America space and distance appeared to pose threats to the Union from the beginning. Some of the Founding Fathers, to be sure, continued to think of unity and disunion in Old World terms of interests and factions, rather than in terms of territory. This was perhaps because they had little choice in the matter or none that they could publicly acknowledge, for the United States was born the largest nation in the Western world, and the Framers had to put a good face on the matter. But Europeans generally, and some Americans, long familiar with Montesquieu's dictum that, while a republic could flourish in a small territory, a large territory required a despotism, assumed that the new United States, with boundaries so extensive, could not survive.

Jefferson and his associates were determined to prove Montesquieu mistaken. From the beginning, they formulated a counter-argument that size would strengthen rather than weaken the nation. Brushing aside the warnings of such men as Gouverneur Morris, they boldly added new states west of the Alleghenies. They made the Lousiana Purchase, seized West Florida, and looked with confidence to acquiring all the territory west to the Pacific; thus, the Lewis and Clark expedition into foreign territory, something we would not tolerate today in our territory. Territorial expansion and integrity became a prime test of the American experiment, and within a few years what had been a test became, no less, a providential command: Manifest Destiny. From this flowed naturally the principle that the proof of union was territorial, and the threat to union territorial.

A second American contribution to the ideology of nationalism was, in time, to become its most prominent characteristic: the notion that national unity required not merely territorial unity but social and cultural. In the Old World, the only cultural unity that had any meaning was religious: The principle *Cuius regio eius religio* was dictated by the fact that the ruler's religion determined the religion of the state. But class distinctions were taken for granted, as were profound differences in cultural and social habits in speech, for example, or in such simple things as food and drink and dress and games.

Americans changed this pattern around. They rejected the principle of religious unity—doubtless in large part because they had no alternative—and then substituted cultural for religious unity. Americans were not expected to pray alike, but they were expected to talk alike, dress alike, work alike, profess the same moral code, and subscribe to the same legal code. Eventually, as we know, they were expected to eat the same food, drink the same liquors, play the same games, read the same journals, watch the same television programs, and even have the same political ideas—expectations never seriously entertained by, say, German or Italian nationalists.

American nationalism thus became, at a very early stage, a self-conscious affair of imposing unity upon a vast territory, a heterogeneous population, and a miscellaneous culture. Because there was indeed land enough to absorb some forty million immigrants, because those immigrants were so heterogeneous that (with the exception of the Germans and, in modern times, the Negroes) they were unable to maintain a cultural identity counter to the prevailing American culture, and because, in provisions for naturalization and opportunities for active participation, the political system was the most hospitable of any in the world, an artificial unity became, in time, a real unity. Americans managed to achieve a single language with fewer deviations than were to be found in England, Germany, or Italy; to achieve a common education—not universal, to be sure, but more nearly universal than elsewhere in the nineteenth-century world; to create a common political system, each state like every other state; and, *mirabile dictu*, to conjure up a common history and a common past.

The threat to union, as Lincoln saw it in 1838, was not sectional or economic or social or even moral; it was quite simply the "spirit of lawlessness." As early as *Notes on Virginia* (1782), Thomas Jefferson had confessed that he trembled for his country when he reflected that "God is just and his justice cannot sleep forever," and throughout his life Jefferson saw slavery as a moral threat, but in this he was more farsighted than most. The threat to union posed by slavery was unprecedented; it was a product of that elementary fact by now so familiar that we take it for granted: that deep economic, social, and moral differences assumed a geographical pattern, and that the American Constitutional system, namely federalism, permitted them to take a political pattern as well. As it happened, the sectional pattern of slavery was in mortal conflict with a very different sectional pattern, and it was this conflict that proved in the end fatal to the thrust for Southern independence: the sectionalism created by the Mississippi River and its tributaries. That, as it turned out, was the decisive fact that preserved the Union; when, in the summer of 1863, Lincoln wrote that "the signs look better," what he noted first was that "the Father of Waters goes again unvexed to the sea."

Suppose slavery had rooted itself vertically in the Mississippi Valley rather than horizontally across the South from the Atlantic to Texas. That would have given sectionalism a more rational base than it had in the South—a base that in all likelihood would have been impregnable.

Here we have one of the assumptions about American history that gets in the way of an appreciation of our distinctive characteristics. Because thirteen American states, hugging the Atlantic seaboard, because a single nation spanning a continent, we either take American unity for granted or consider fragmentation only in terms of the experiment in Southern nationalism, which misfired. But there was nothing foreordained about the triumph of unity. Why did not the vast American territory between Canada and the

Gulf of Mexico go the way of Latin America, which, with a common religion, language, and territory, nevertheless fragmented into numerous independent states?

The spectacular nature of the American achievement has bemused almost all students of American nationalism and dictated most interpretations of the problem of American unity. The transcendent fact of slavery and of the Negro—so largely responsible for creating a sectionalism that did not yield to the ameliorating influences of economy, social mobility, cultural uniformity, and political compromise—has distracted our attention from other threats, if not to union then to unity. Because we had a civil war, precipitated by sectional fragmentation, we did not imagine that we could have a revolution based on social fragmentation.

We are tempted to say of Lincoln's Springfield address that it was shortsighted of him not to have seen that the threats to union were slavery and sectionalism—something he learned, in time. We should say rather that he was farsighted in imagining the possibility of a very different threat to union: an internal dissension and lawlessness that bespoke a breakdown in cultural and moral unity. This is what confronts us today: blacks against whites, old against young, skinheads against eggheads, militarists against doves, the cities against the suburbs and the countryside—hostilities that more and more frequently erupt into open violence.

Two considerations warrant attention. First, that what Lincoln described was in fact normal—we have always been a lawless and a violent people. Thus, our almost unbroken record of violence against the Indians and all others who got in our way—the Spaniards in the Floridas, the Mexicans in Texas; the violence of the vigilantes on a hundred frontiers; the pervasive violence of slavery (a "perpetual exercise," Jefferson called it, "of the most boisterous passions"); the lawlessness of the Ku Klux Klan during Reconstruction and after; and of scores of race riots from those of New Orleans in the 1860s to those of Chicago in 1919. Yet, all this violence, shocking as it doubtless was, no more threatened the fabric of our society or the integrity of the Union than did the lawlessness of Prohibition back in the Twenties.

The explanation for this is to be found in the embarrassing fact that most of it was official, quasi-official, or countenanced by public opinion: exterminating the Indian; flogging the slave; lynching the outlaw; exploiting women and children in textile mills and sweatshops; hiring Pinkertons to shoot down strikers; condemning immigrants to fetid ghettos; punishing Negroes who tried to exercise their civil or political rights. Most of this was socially acceptable—or at least not wholly unacceptable—just as so much of our current violence is socially acceptable: the 50,000 automobile deaths every year; the mortality rate for Negro babies twice that for white; the deaths from cancer induced by cigarettes or by air pollution; the sadism of our penal system and the horrors of our prisons; the violence of the police against what Theodore Parker called the "perishing and dangerous classes of society."

What we have now is the emergence of violence that is not acceptable either to the Establishment, which is frightened and alarmed, or to the victims of the Establishment, who are no longer submissive and who are numerous and powerful. This is the now familiar "crime in the streets," or it is the revolt of the young against the economy, the politics, and the wars of the established order, or it is the convulsive reaction of the blacks to a century of injustice. But now, too, official violence is no longer acceptable to its victims—or to their ever more numerous sympathizers: the violence of great corporations and of government itself against the natural resources of the nation; the long drawn-out violence of the white majority against Negroes and other minorities; the violence of the police and the National Guard against the young; the massive and never-ending violence of the military against the peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia. These acts can no longer be absorbed by large segments of our society. It is this new polarization that threatens the body public and the social fabric much as religious dissent threatened them in the Europe of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A second consideration is this: The center of gravity has shifted from "obedience" to "enforcement." This shift in vocabulary is doubtless unconscious but nonetheless revealing. Obedience is the vocabulary of democracy, for it recognizes that the responsibility for the commonwealth is in the people and appeals to the people to recognize and fulfill their responsibility. Enforcement is the language of authority prepared to impose its will on the people. Lincoln knew instinctively that a democracy flourishes when men obey and revere the law; he did not invoke the language of authority. We are no longer confident of the virtue or good will of the people; so it is natural that we fall back on force. The resort to lawless force—by the Weathermen, the Black Panthers, the Ku Klux Klan, the hardhats; by the police in Chicago; by the National Guard at Orangeburg, South Carolina, and Kent, Ohio; or by highway police at Jackson, Mississippi—is a confession that both the people and their government have lost faith in the law, and that the political and social fabric that has held our society together is unraveling: "By such examples," said Lincoln at Springfield, "the lawless in spirit are encouraged to become lawless in practice."

It has long been our boast—repeated by the President's Commission on Violence—that notwithstanding our lengthy history of violence we have never had a "revolution," and that our political system appears to be more stable than those of other nations. Our only real revolution took a sectional pattern and was not called revolution but rebellion; since it was rationalized by high-minded rhetoric, led by honorable men, and fought with gallantry, it speedily took on an aura of respectability, and to this day Southerners would be outraged by the display of the red flag of rebellion proudly wave the Stars and Bars of rebellion.

Thus, like most of our violence, violence against the Constitution and the Union, and by implication against the blacks who were to be kept in slavery, is socially approved. Where such violence has been dramatic (as in lynching or industrial warfare), it has not been widespread or prolonged; where it has been widespread and prolonged (as in slavery and the persistent humiliation of the Negro), it has not been dramatic. Where its victims were desperate, they were not numerous enough or strong enough to revolt; where they were numerous (never strong), they did not appear to be desperate, and it was easy to ignore their despair. Now this situation is changing. Lawlessness is more pervasive than ever; the sense of outrage against the malpractices of those in power is more widespread and articulate; and the divisions in society are both deeper and more diverse, and the repsonse to them more intractable.

One explanation of our current malaise is that it seems to belong to the Old World pattern rather than that of the New. Much of the rhetoric of the conflict between generations is that of class or religious wars—class war on the part of, let us say, Vice President Agnew; religious protest on the part of Professor Reich and those involved in what he calls "the greening of America." If this is so, it goes far toward explaining some of our current confusion and blundering: the almost convulsive efforts to distract attention from the genuine problems of environment, social injustice, and war, and to fasten it on such phony issues as campus unrest or social permissiveness or pornography. What this implies is ominous: Our society is not prepared, either by history or philosophy, for the kind of lawlessness and violence and alienation that now afflict us.

Why is this so ominous?

Traditionally, our federal system could and and did absorb regionalism and particularism, or channel these into political conduits. More accurately than in any other political system, our representatives represent geographical places—a specific Congressional district or a state—and our parties, too, are organized atop and through states. Our system is not designed to absorb or to dissipate such internal animosities as those of class against class, race against race, or generation against generation.

A people confident of progress, with a social philosophy that assumed that what counted most was children and that took for granted that each new generation would be bigger, stronger, brighter, and better educated than its predecessor, could afford to indulge the young. "Permissiveness" is not an invention of Dr. Spock but of the first settlers in America. Today, a people that has lost faith in progress and in the future, and that has lost confidence in the ameliorating influence of education, indulges instead in convulsive counter-attacks upon the young.

A nation with, in Jefferson's glowing words, "land enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation" could indulge itself in reckless exploitation of that land—the mining of natural, resources, the destruction of deer and bison and beavers, of the birds in the skies and the fish in the streams, and could even (this was a risky business from the beginning) afford to ignore its fiduciary obligations to coming generations without exciting dangerous resentment. But a nation of more than two hundred million, working through giant corporations and giant governments that ravage, pollute, and destroy on a scale heretofore unimagined, cannot afford such self-indulgence. Nor can it persist in its habit of violating its fiduciary obligations without outraging those who are its legal and moral legatees.

A nation that had more and better land available for its people than any other in history and that, for the first time, equated civilization with the pastoral life and exalted the farmer over the denizen of the city could take urban development in its stride, confident that the city would never get the upper hand, as it were. Modern America seems wholly unable to adapt its institutions, or its psychology to massive urbanization, but proceeds instead to the fateful policy of reducing its farm population to a fraction and, at the same time destroying its cities and turning them into ghettos that are breeding places for crime and violence.

A system that maintained and respected the principal of the superiority of the civil power over that of the military could afford to fight even such great conflicts as the Civil War, the First World War, and the Second World War without danger to its Constitution or its moral character. It cannot absorb the kind of war we are now fighting in Southeast Asia without irreparable damage to its moral values nor can it exercise power on a world scale without moving the military to the center of power.

No nation could afford slavery, certainly not one that thought itself dedicated to equality and justice. The issue of slavery tore the nation asunder and left wounds still unhealed. Here is our greatest failure: that we destroyed slavery but not racism, promised legal equality but retained a dual citizenship, did away with legal exploitation of a whole race but substituted for it an economic exploitation almost as cruel. And this

political and legal failure reflects a deeper psychological and moral failure.

Unlike some of our contemporary politicians, Lincoln was not content with decrying lawlessness. He inquired into its causes and less perspicaciously, into its cure. In this inquiry, he identified two explanations that illuminated the problem. These—translated into modern vocabulary—are the decline of the sense of fiduciary obigation and the evaporation of political resourcefulness and creativity. Both are still with us.

No one who immerses himself in the writings of the Revolutionary generation—a generation still in command when Lincoln was born—can doubt that the sense of obligation to posterity was pervasive and lively. Recall Tom Paine's plea for independence. " 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age; *Posterity* are virtually involved in the contest and will be . . . affected to the end of time." Or John Adams's moving letter to his beloved Abigail when he had signed the Declaration of Independence: "Through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. *Posterity* will triumph in this day's transaction." Or Dr. Benjamin Rush's confession, after his signing, that "I was animated constantly by a belief that I was acting for the benefit of the whole world and of future ages." So were they all.

The decline of the awareness of posterity and of the fiduciary principle is a complex phenomenon not unconnected with the hostility to the young that animates many older Americans today. It is to be explained, in part, by the concept of an equality that had to be vindicated by each individual; in part, by the fragmentation of the Old World concepts of family and community relationships, which was an almost inevitable consequence of the uprooting from the Old World and the transplanting to the New; in part, by the seeming infinity of resources and the seeming advantages of rapid exploitation and rapid aggrandizement; in part, by the weakness of governmental and institutional controls; in part, by the ostentatious potentialities of industry and technology, the advent of which coincided with the emergence of nationalism in the United States; and, in part, by the triumph of private enterprise over public.

However complex the explanation, the fact is simple enough: We have wasted our natural resources more recklessly than has any other people in modern history and are persisting in this waste and destruction even though we are fully aware that our children will pay for our folly and our greed.

Lincoln's second explanation—if it can be called that—was that we had suffered a decline of the creativity and resourcefulness that had been the special distinction of the Founding Fathers. "The field of glory is harvested," he said, "the crop is already appropriated." Other leaders would emerge, no doubt, and would "seek regions hitherto unexplored." At a time when Martin Van Buren was in the White House, to be succeeded by Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, and Buchanan, that expectation doubtless represented the triumph of hope over history. But the decline of political creativity and leadership was not confined to this somewhat dismal period of our history; it has persisted into our own day. We can no more afford it than could Lincoln's generation. At a time when the white population of English America was less than three million, it produced Franklin and Washington, Jefferson and Madison, John Adams and Hamilton, John Jay and James Wilson, George Wythe and John Marshall, and Tom Paine, who emerged, first, in America. We have not done that well since.

Even more arresting is the undeniable fact that this Revolutionary generation produced not only many of our major leaders but all of our major political institutions, among them federalism, the Constitutional convention, the Bill of Rights, the effective separation of powers, judicial review, the new colonial system, the political party. It is no exaggeration to say that we have been living on that political capital ever since.

Here again the explanation is obscure. There is the consoling consideration that the Founding Fathers did the job so well that it did not need to be done over; the depressing consideration that American talent has gone, for the past century or so, more into private than into public enterprise; and the sobering consideration that at a time when our chief preoccupation appears to be with extension of power rather than with wise application of resources, those "regions hitherto unexplored" appear to be in the global arena rather than the domestic. Whatever the explanation, lack of leadership is the most prominent feature on our political landscape, and lack of creativity the most striking characteristic of our political life.

It is still true that, "if destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author"—that the danger is not from without but from within. But . . . passions spin the plot. We are betrayed by what is false within.

For, paradoxically, the danger from within is rooted in and precipitated by foreign adventures that we seem unable either to understand or to control. We have not been attacked from Latin America or from Asia; we have attacked ourselves by our own ventures into these areas.

The problem Lincoln faced in 1838 is with us once again: the breakdown of the social fabric and its overt expression in the breakdown of the law. Lincoln's solution, if greatly oversimplified, is still valid: reverence for the law. A people will revere the law when it is just and is seen to be just. But no matter how many litanies we intone, we will not induce our people to obey laws that those in authority do not themselves obey. The most striking feature of lawlessness in America today is that it is encouraged by public examples. It is no use telling a Mississippi Negro to reverse the law that is palpably an instrument of injustice to him and his race. It is no use exhorting the young to obey the law when most of the major institutions of our society—the great corporations, the powerful trade unions, the very instruments of government—flout the law whenever it gets in their way. It is of little use to admonish a young man about to be drafted to revere the law when he knows that he is to be an instrument for the violation of international law on a massive scale by his own government. It is futile to celebrate the rule of law and the sanctity of life when our own armies engage in ghoulish "body counts," burn unoffending villages, and massacre civilians. While governments, corporations, and respectable elements in our society not only countenance lawlessness and violence but actively engage in it, violence will spread and lawlessness will flourish. We are betrayed by what is false within.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 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?

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) duPONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. DUPONT. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may be aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors a contest each year, in which high school students are invited to enter themes about democracy in this country.

In a recent letter from Cooper T. Halt, the executive director of the VFW in Delaware, I was informed that the winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest is Judi Grezlikowski.

Miss Grezlikowski, a student at the St. Elizabeth's High School in Wilmington, Del., won the contest with an entry entitled "Freedom—Our Heritage."

I think that the vigorous patriotic spirit she has shown in her essay is exemplary, I would like to have her remarks inserted in the RECORD:

"FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE"

(By Judi Grezlikowski)

The Boston Massacre, The Revolutionary War, The War Between The States, World Wars I and II, all of these produced one thing—our amazing heritage of freedom. Freedom was the word that forced the early Revolutionary soldiers on to victory. It was the fire that raged in their hearts and the word ever-uttered on their lips. Freedom was the cry of the Negro slave, "Free at last! Free at last! Thank God we're free at last!" Freedom was precious in the hearts of those who fought to preserve it—both young and old, rich and poor black and white, all alike. Freedom was the golden flame that kept men moving, fighting and dying. Today, freedom is the Statue of Liberty standing in New York Harbor waving that glorious torch—the gleam that symbolizes our freedom. And freedom is the "Star Spangled Banner"—"O say can you see by the dawn's early light"—and our flag "Old Glory", the "Stars and Stripes", that object that represents the land of the free and the home of the brave—that object that waves over the "purple mountains majesty from sea to shining sea'.

But, more than this freedom is our right to choose—to choose our own occupation, religion, and form of government. We were granted life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness many years ago by the Declaration of Independence. Even though all these freedoms are granted us, why then do I live in a society where some people go to bed hungry, where many are afraid to walk the streets at night and no one cares enough to get involved even on a local level? Probably the best motto a person can have today is taken from the Bible, the gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 23, Verses 39–40. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Over the years people have slowly drawn away from their neighbor. They do not realize that in order to have freedom they must also let their neighbor have freedom. They must also live with, work with, and help their neighbor in the fight to preserve freedom—the heritage we all share. The pioneers understood this need and came to each other's rescue in times of strife.

Today, I live in a prosperous and powerful nation. At present my country is involved on two great battlefields. The first is our involvement in the Vietnamese War. The United States is trying to preserve the freedom of a small backward nation against the mighty forces of Communistic power. From this turmoil results the second and more dis-

turbing problem—a problem at home, the college campus disorders. Many college students, kids just a few years older than myself are revolting against the measures the national government has taken to aid Vietnam. They are burning draft cards, evading draft laws, rioting, marching and even going so far as burning their own flag.

I am not trying to say that these college students are entirely wrong. There could be many logical reasons for their actions just as there could be many logical reasons for our Vietnamese involvement. However, on thing stands for certain. Emotion plays a big part in the disorders on the campuses and when you're fighting against nuclear weapons, your actions must be based on more than emotion.

In this the 20th Century our freedom is faced with many opponents. Chances are, however, that it will take a lot more war and hate and violence that this world has ever seen to destroy it.

This democracy we share as citizens of the United States has grown from a seed in the colonial days to a mighty oak in the 1970's. All men must die before this great creation falls. All men must die before the Statue of Liberty extinguishes her flame and all men must die before the "Star Spangled Banner" waves no more.

TRIBUTE TO WHITNEY M. YOUNG

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Whitney M. Young, executive director of the National Urban League, is a tragic loss for all who believe in the dignity and betterment of man, black or white. Whitney Young believed in the politics of persuasion and, in his words, "accommodation." Rejecting the militancy of black extremists, he preferred order to chaos and promoted calm in the midst of violent reaction.

During his 49 years, Whitney Young developed a toughness of character. He believed his moderate course of action was right and suffered verbal abuse from black militants who preferred the violent upheaval of society.

He objected to labeling people and causes. When asked if he were a moderate or militant, he replied:

> It isn't a question of moderate versus militant, but of responsibility versus irresponsibility, sanity versus insanity, effectiveness versus ineffectiveness.

He worked tirelessly and behind the scenes to provide jobs for blacks. Under his direction, the National Urban League secured funds for urban job training facilities across the country. He once considered the consequences of getting off a New York commuter train at 125th Street to "cuss whitey" or continuing downtown to "talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed blacks." It is not difficult to imagine his preference.

Whitney Young refused to curse the darkness all around him. He established goals early in life and his struggle to achieve these goals is a fitting epitaph indeed.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS CHIEF CONTROVERSY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star recently printed an article by Richard Wilson spotlighting the teapot tempest raging in Washington about the relative roles of the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, and the President's National Security Adviser, Dr. Kissinger.

For the information of my colleagues I am including the text as a part of my remarks at this point:

FULBRIGHT VS. NIXON, ROGERS AND KISSINGER

Sen. Symington's laughable statement that Secretary of State Rogers is the laughing stock of the Washington cocktail circuit affords an opportunity to express some convictions which have grown from two years of reasonably close observation of the Nixon-Rogers-Kissinger control of American foreign affairs.

In short, they have all learned a great deal. Rogers has hardened. The presidential national security adviser, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, has broken with accepted academic concepts. In his passion for definition, Nixon has redefined and hardened a doctrine which might have once been considered a measured withdrawal from responsibilities of world leadership.

Thus, they have all hardened under the pressure of a continuing and severe confrontation in a real world of unrelenting adversaries.

This is not an uncommon experience for those at the summit of power and authority, but one shared with other Presidents, other secretaries of state, and other presential advisers on national security.

It is not so much that Sens. Symington, Fulbright and others think that Kissinger has become an Over-Secretary of State, with Rogers trailing ineffectually along. The heart of the matter is that Rogers, Kissinger and Nixon have consolidated their attitudes, have learned from each other and the world at large, and have come to conclusions contrary to those prevailing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There is no dispute on policy between Nixon, Rogers and Kissinger.

This is especially galling where Rogers is concerned, because he was originally conceived to have a softening influence on Nixon. There were thought to be significant gradations between his attitudes and those of his predecessor, Dean Rusk, which would be more pleasing to the anti-war elements in the Foreign Relations Committee who could neither intimidate Rusk nor change him.

That has proved to be a miscalculation, and while Rogers may seem more agreeable and complaisant than the adamant Rusk, he is no less committed to Nixon's policies than was Rusk to those of President Johnson and presidential adviser Walt Rostow.

So, the disappointment is showing now in such ill-conceived statements as those of Symington, and in Fulbright's equally laughable pose that he does not know what is going on. Columnists are being told more than he, Fulbright complains, although he has had Kissinger at his home for secret and private sessions. Rogers is willing to fill him in at any time and everybody who disagrees with Nixon's policy comes running to him.

Fulbright knows all too well what is going on; it is just that he does not like it and wishes to get Kissinger and Rogers in the open before the Foreign Relations Committee so that he can try to do to them what he tried to do to Rusk—challenge and discredit the policy and the officials responsible for it.

Kissinger is the despair of the cocktail circuit. This witty fellow from Harvard is a traitor to his class. He should be slyly undermining Nixon's policy instead of wasting his time articulating it. Isn't that what all true intellectuals in the Nixon administration should do?

Instead, Kissinger has organized a large and effective staff advisory to the President and the National Security Council on the elements of international problems and decisions.

These analyses have preceded decisions opposed by the anti-war elements of the Foreign Relations Committee, such as the military operations in Laos and Cambodia. At the end of a long and complex process Kissinger has his hour with Nixon and is unquestionably in an influential position. So is Rogers.

Neither advised the Foreign Relations Committee formally or informally of the projected military operations in Laos or Cambodia. Both are thus accused of dissembling and in effect, misleading Congress.

But that is not really the problem, although it adds to the irritation. The problem is that they are in agreement on the military measures required in withdrawing from South Vietnam so that a government can be left behind equal ot the challenge from the North for the indefinite future as was the case in South Korea.

They not only are in agreement on this policy but they believe it is working. The Fulbright element in the Foreign Relations Committee does not agree and wishes to get Kissinger before the committee to harry and unhinge him as the sinister architect of a doomed policy which must be discontinued before it has a chance to succeed.

Thus the idea that Kissinger is leading everyone, including Rogers and Nixon, around by the nose, which is a senseless distortion of the consensus of three responsible officials on how to bring the Vietnam matter to a constructive end.

NATIONAL PRIVACY ACT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have been an original cosponsor of the National Privacy Act, which has just been reintroduced. I believe this to be an important piece of legislation that should attract the support of all those concerned with the preservation of individual liberties in the United States.

Much has been said recently, and widely reported in the media, about the alleged surveillance by the military of certain American citizens, some of them persons of prominence. It has been widely stated, and with good reason, that there is no place in a free society for the "big brother" syndrome.

In the last Congress the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, was instrumental in the passage of the legislation protecting Government employees from unwarranted invasions of privacy by Federal agencies. The Senate is presently con-

ducting hearings to determine the need for further legislation along these lines.

There have been instances of agencies selling data to companies that solicit business through the mails. Several years ago there was a proposal to consolidate all Federal records in one massive data bank, which without extremely stringent safeguards would have made readily accessible vast stores of information on any individual in the Nation. These are but a few examples of possible infringements of individual privacy by Government. But they are not the only ones.

It may be argued that there is little harm in any of this. That itself is a debatable point. But even if it is not a serious matter today, how can we be sure that such intrusions of Government into the lives of every American will not open the door to some future big brother?

The legislation I have cosponsored will limit invasions of individual privacy by Government agencies, both military and civilian. It will not curtail the effectiveness of either law enforcement agencies or those charged with the protection of our national security, for matters of concern to these agencies are specifically excluded. But it will insure that no American need fear the accumulation of information relating to his life by any potential "big brother" data bank in Washington. Few individuals are aware that many agencies of the Federal Government maintain extensive dossiers on private citizens. The citizen has a right to know such data exists and he should be able to check it for veracity, and exercise some control over its dissemination. This bill will guarantee him those rights without jeopardizing the necessary functions of the agency involved, or the vital necessity of maintaining domestic order and international security.

BRINGING US TOGETHER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Des Moines Register of March 2, 1971, indicates the President may be bringing us together. The article follows:

BRINGING US TOGETHER

Well, he did it. He finally did it. For one brief moment Monday, Richard (The President) Nixon brought us together again.

Peaceniks, hard hats, farmers, Golden Agers; they were all together on the Statehouse lawn—united by their opposition to the President and his ways. (That may not be exactly what Mr. Nixon had in mind during the 1968 campaign, but it's better than he's done on a lot of his promises.)

The scene at the Statehouse was wild, really wild. You'd see a construction worker carrying a sign, "Nixon Unfair to Hard Hats," next to a shaggy-haired kid with a "Stop the War" placard, next to a man in a cowboy hat with a "Parity, Not Charity" poster.

It was like a central casting office at a Rent-A-Demonstrator agency.

The high point of the Togetherness was reached when the Presiednt's caravan arrived at the Statehouse. The crowd was gathered in front of the building, under the impression that the cars were going to sweep right by them, so that they could shake their signs and yell and otherwise be disrespectful, in a nice way.

They were encouraged in this expectation by a man with a bullhorn who seemed to be in contact with the Secret Service.

The caravan came down Locust headed straight for the Capitol, and the crowd got ready to let the President know what it thought of him.

However, the caravan turned off a block short of the Statehouse, and sped to Grand Avenue; indicating that the President already knew what the crowd thought of him.

"He double-crossed us," the man with a bullhorn said. "Tricky Dick does it again," a hard hat yelled.

The crowd made a wild surge toward Grand, hoping to intercept the caravan, but the line of presidential cars whipped by at about 40 miles an hour. The President, with his characteristic sense of the appropriate, could be seen in the back seat of his limousine, smiling and waving at the howling mob.

At that moment, he couldn't have gotten five votes out of that bunch if he were running against Genghis Khan.

The student-worker-farmer solidarity went to pieces after that, though. They can agree on Mr. Nixon, but not on much else.

During the time when Mr. Nixon was deliving his speech in the Capitol, the crowd was pretty much standing around outside, milling.

One student type was moving through the hard hats passing out radical literature and receiving less than a warm reception.

"Are you fellows going to march to the Fort Des Moines for the demonstration there?" he asked one one of them.

"No," the hard hat said. "I don't think you'll find many labor guys doing that. That's just for people who want to tear down this country."

"We're not trying to tear down the country: we're trying to get it together. The government would like nothing better than to see working people and students at each other's throats."

"I'd like to see that myself," said the hard hat, "and I'm not even with the government. That's the only way to straighten you guys out."

"But working people all over the world have to stick together."

"That's what I say. Why don't you get yourself a job, boy? Then I won't have to work so hard to pay for your food stamps."

Still, it's hard to argue that an event like Monday's demonstration doesn't narrow the Class Gap.

Earlier, a group of Simpson College students had staged some heavily symbolic political theater on the steps of the Statehouse. The workers looking on displayed less than unalloyed enthusiasm for the proceedings until the company, which included a number of comely young maidens, broke into a hip-swinging dance.

"Right on!" yelled one of the construction workers.

That's not a complete meeting of minds, perhaps, but it's a start.

DONALD KAUL.

EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR OVERSEAS MILITARY DEPENDENTS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill which would authorize an educational travel allowance for dependents of military personnel serving outside of the United States. This bill would also authorize payment for room and board expenses at Department of Defense dormitory schools and one round trip a year for Department of Defense dependents to go to the United States to obtain an undergraduate college education.

It is my feeling that payment of dormitory costs, as well as transportation costs should be provided for by a specific law so that authorizations and appropriations for such costs can be dealt with in a routine fashion on a permanent basis.

Travel allowances are necessary when there is no suitable school where parents are stationed overseas and dependents must attend the nearest Department of Defense dormitory school. Payment of dormitory costs is necessary. The fortuitous circumstances of the location of a military man's assignment should not deny his children access to a free public education which is available to other military and civilian Government employee dependents stationed abroad. Travel allowances for one trip stateside to attend an undergraduate college is necessary. It is not fair to make access to a college education more difficult for dependents of military stationed overseas than it is for civilian Government personnel also stationed abroad.

Certainly it must be recognized that we are not now dealing fairly with the hundreds of military dependents who are attending the same schools as civilian Government employee dependents. Travel allowances are available to the civilian dependents while military must pay for the transportation of their dependents to and from school.

This bill would remedy an inequity by extending the benefits now available to civilian Government employees to those who are serving their country in the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this legislation will be given early and favorable consideration during the 92d Congress. The text of this bill is as follows:

H.R. 13284

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is inserted after section 427:

"§ 428. Education, travel, and transportation allowances: dependents at permanent station outside United States

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, which shall be, as far as practicable, uniform for all of the uniformed services, a member of a uniformed service who is on duty outside of the United States at a permanent station and when such benefits are not made available in kind by the Government, is entitled to an education allowance and a travel and transportation allowance, to assist in providing adequate education for his dependents who

are authorized to accompany the member, as follows:

"(1) An allowance for elementary and secondary education not to exceed the cost of obtaining such elementary and secondary educational services as are ordinarily provided without charge by the public schools in the United States, plus, in those cases where the Secretary concerned has designated the duty station of the member as having inadequate educational facilities, board and room, and periodic transportation between that station and the nearest locality (including where applicable the United States), designated by the Secretaries concerned as having adequate educational facilities; but the amount of the allowance granted shall be determined on the basis of the educational facility used.

"(2) A travel and transportation allowance is authorized to meet the travel expenses of the dependents of a member to and from a school in the United States to obtain an undergraduate college education, not to exceed one round trip each school year for each dependent for the purpose of obtaining such type of education. All or any portion of the travel for which a transportation allowance is authorized by this section will be performed wherever possible by the Military Airlift Command or the Military Sea Transportation Service on a space required basis. Notwithstanding the area limitations in this section, a travel and transportation allowance for the purpose of obtaining undergraduate college education may be authorized under this clause for dependents of members stationed in the Canal Zone.

"(3) The term 'United States' shall, for the purpose of this section, mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone.

"(4) The words 'permanent station' shall, for the purpose of this section, include the home yard or home port of a vessel to which a member of a uniformed service may be assigned.

"(5) Notwithstanding section 401 of this title, 'dependent' in this section may include an unmarried child over twenty-one years of age who is in fact dependent and is obtaining undergraduate college education."

(2) The analysis is amended by inserting the following item:

"482. Education, travel and transportation allowances: dependents at permanent station outside United States."

SEC. 2. Section 912 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 912) (relating to exemption from taxation for certain allowances) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"(4) EDUCATION ALLOWANCE.—In the case of member of a uniformed service, amounts received under section 428 of title 37, United States Code."

NEGLECT OF PUBLIC WORKS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues from Illinois, Congressmen DERWINSKI and COLLIER, are cosponsoring a bill to help railroads replace dangerous street level crossings in metropolitan areas. The Citizen in La Grange, Ill., recently published an editorial which makes some interesting points about the bill, and I would like to include the editorial, as follows:

SPEND "LARGESSE" ON RAILROADS

Every time the war in Vietnam seems to be coming to a conclusion, there arise all manner of schemes for using the funds which are now being spent for military purposes.

The proposals, all involving such impeccable goals as education, housing, environmental control, medical research, health care and the abolishment of poverty, are nearly as abundant as the number of volunteers offering their services, for a substantial remuneration, as the administrators of the largesse.

The construction of public works seems to have little support. Providing opportunities for employment while adding to the capital assets of the nation does not offer much scope of paternalism.

Yet bills recently introduced in congress with the support of Congressmen Edward Derwinski and Harold Collier deserve higher priority than they are getting.

The bills would make federal funds available for grade separation of major rail lines in metropolitan areas.

Such grants should require some contribution by the carriers.

The use of public money can be justified when it is considered that the greater benefit would accrue to the people. The automotive industry has been aided by using federal money to assist in the construction of trunk highways; the airlines have been assisted through government grants for airports.

Abolishment of street level crossings in much of Chicago as well as in Oak Park, Evanston and Winnetka, has many times proved its advantages if only in producing an uninterrupted flow of vehicular traffic.

A greater advantage lies in safety. In the past 50 years, there has averaged, on the section of the Burlington Northern railroad between the county line and Harlem avenue, one fatality every year. Except in two or those cases where it appeared that the victim sought self destruction, none of these would have occurred.

The terrain of the area is such that track depression would not seem practical. Elevation, the only answer, would raise the old objection to a "community split by a Chinese wall".

Evanston and Oak Park neighborhoods seem not to have been sundered because a railroad embankment runs the length of both communities and it is doubtful if the residents, were the opportunity offered, would advocate a return to the original grade level.

Elevation need not produce a "Chinese" wall. A sloping embankment, carefully planted and maintained, would improve rather than detract from, the appearance of the area.

Depots, with their waiting rooms and ticket offices, should be placed below the tracks and thus free space for landscaping, for commuter parking and for widening adjoining streets.

Commuter lines are essential to any mass transit program. No transit system can provide the swift and frequent service the future will demand if it is to compete with, or interrupt, surface traffic.

The futility of unlimited superhighway construction has been demonstrated.

The time has come to create the supercarriers of the rails.

OVERLOOKED SPACE PROGRAM BENEFITS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the most recent issue of McGraw-Hill's publication, Aviation Week, which I received this morning, there was an editorial which brings sharply into focus the enormous benefits the national space program has brought to this Nation. The editorial contains remarks recently made by Mr. J. F. Clayton, general manager of the Bendix Aerospace Systems Division, in, which he drew dramatic comparisons between what this country is spending in many areas of Government activity and what we are spending to explore space. I urge every Member to read and reflect upon that editorial which I now include for the RECORD and that all of us should carry the message back to our constituents that they really have gotten more than their money's worth out of the national space program.

The article follows:

OVERLOOKED SPACE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Apollo 14's three astronauts passed by a hotel housing welfare families during their tickertape parade welcome to New York last week. Waiting there on the sidewalk were 20 or so demonstrators with signs like one that read: "White astronauts fly to the moon while black children die in welfare hotels."

On the steps of City Hall, where Mayor John V. Lindsay greeted the three crewmen—Alan B. Shepard, Jr., Edgar D. Mitchell, Jr., and Stuart A. Roosa—there were other demonstrators. While the mayor spoke, the chanted, "Crumbs for the children, millions for the moon."

A National Aeronautics and Space Administration spokesman with the astronauts said that the welfare demonstration was not directed at the astronauts. His impression was that they took advantage of the TV and news coverage they knew would follow the parade, whose route had been published, to focus attention on an issue that has been controversial in New York. Similarly, the City Hall demonstration had been planned earlier in the wake of a proposed mass layoff of New York substitute teachers, he said, and the demonstrators adapted their message to the occasion.

This may well be the case. Mayor Lindsay in the past has himself taken the line that space or defense funds ought to be diverted to the cities. On this occasion, however, he talked more in terms that funding for space and for urban programs were not mutually exclusive.

Nevertheless, the incidents—even if the demonstrators were few—brought home again that the U.S. space effort cannot exist on a bed of platitudes. A good example of how to meet a grassroots audience with facts was a recent appearance by J. F. Clayton, general manager at Bendix Aerospace Systems Div., at a Rotary Club meeting in Ann Arbor, Mich. He said in part:

"What are the benefits of the space program? You have all heard of sharper X-ray pictures, the longer lasting paint, the faster dentist drills, small TV cameras, new medical instruments and far better ice cream freezers. These are comparatively trivial and insignificant outputs of the program and certainly not in themselves ways to justify the expense and energy we have undertaken.

"I believe there are [other] overriding benefits that have already been realized and will continue to have a profound effect on not only this country but the rest of the world.

"The first benefit has to do with finding solutions to overwhelmingly complex problems. The national space program represents a successful management approach to accomplish the almost impossible. The task of going to the moon required a government, industry, and university team which, at its peak, involved organizing 400,000 people, hundreds of universities and 20,000 separate industrial companies to a common goal. This

project was done in public and full view of the world. It was done without a military objective and it was done within the cost and schedule set for it 10 years earlier. These management techniques are available to the country if we ever decide to again use them on what we now consider almost impossible tasks.

"The second benefit is the exploration itself. We obviously cannot forecast what our descendants centuries from now will say about our beginning the exploration of space. But as we look back to earlier centuries it is obvious how tremendous an impact the exploration of our ancestors had on our life today. We can think of Columbus and Marco Polo and Charles Darwin and the voyage of the Beagle and many others. One of the unique aspects of the voyage of the Beagle was that it was the first time that science had ever been involved in exploration.

"Darwin's 'ridiculous' collection of rocks, plants and animals life took ten years to study after he returned. But now we know that the results of this obscure exploration simply revolutionized our understanding of our world and everything in it.

"A third benefit of the national space program is the leadership that it has given us in science and technology.

"At this time someone usually interrupts me, perhaps if they are polite Rotarians they do not jump up and shout, but they say 'how can we justify spending billions exploring the moon when there are so many pressing problems here on earth?' Well then let us look at a comparison of where the taxpayers' money has gone.

"Since 1961, when it started, through last year the space program has cost $38 billion. Of this, $24 billion has been involved directly or indirectly on the Apollo program. During the same period the country has spent $624 billion for military purposes. This, too, is a well known number. But here is a number people have not been made aware of: during the same period we have spent $340 billion on health and welfare. Do we feel that health and welfare social programs are getting a fair share of the federal budget?

"The ratio of expenditures on the social programs is growing. In 1971, this fiscal year, the country will spend $77.2 billion on social programs, slightly greater than the defense budget of $73.5 billion compared to the space expenditure of $3.265 billion. That is a ratio of 23 to 1 in favor of social programs. We could close down the NASA establishment, let facilities at Cape Kennedy go back to jungle. We could terminate the employment of all aerospace engineers and scientists. We could close the university laboratories. Save the $3 billion and spend perhaps $80 billion next year on social programs. Does anyone seriously think that the country's interest would be served. Please do not misunderstand. I do not oppose social welfare programs. But the figures do show that these programs are currently being funded at substantial levels when one looks at the total budget.

"There has been clearly one event in our national life that has caused real frustration and perhaps is responsible for this senseless lashing out against good science and technology. I am referring, of course, to the Vietnam War. Through last year the expenditures for this war during the previous six years have been $107 billion. During the last three years the war has cost as much per year as the total cost of the lunar exploration program. In 1969 the war cost $25 billion, 1968—$28 billion, 1967—$26 billion. We spend as a nation $160 million per day for the Vietnam War. The space program has cost you 5 cents per day since 1961.

"I was impressed with something that Mr. [Daniel P.] Moynihan recently said in his farewell address to the Administration. The American people are particularly able to skip their attention from one major problem to another very quickly and in the process lose sight of long-term priorities. Just yesterday space exploration was a major concern but today is out of vogue.

"The suggestion of an either/or choice between technological and social advances ignores the fact that without a technology base we will not have the capability to address ourselves effectively to any national problem."

MISUSE OF TERM "SOCIAL JUSTICE"

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable A. R. Stout of Waxahachie, Tex., a recently retired district judge, wrote an article on "Social Justice" which appeared in the January 22 edition of the Texas Bar Journal, I include Judge Stout's article in the RECORD:

MISUSE OF THE TERM "SOCIAL JUSTICE"

(By A. R. Stout of Waxahachie)

FOR THE AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP COMMITTEE

The much used term "Social Justice" that we hear so much about today is a socialistic term which originated in Europe, which means a division of money and property and which means Socialism itself.

Most of our so-called liberal officeholders of national repute repeatedly espouse and advocate "Social Justice." If these politicians were to say they are Socialists or for Socialism, they could not hold office for long nor be elected to any position of public trust. The question arises: To whom are these officials appealing? It is logical to believe that, first, they are seeking the votes of all who admit they are for Socialism as well as all who want to enjoy governmental support and the fruits of other men's labor and frugality; second, they are making a veiled and subtle appeal to the cupidity and prejudice of every one who wants something for nothing or fancies that he has some grievance that should be redressed at the expense of his fellowman; and, third, they are hoping that the rest of the voters will misinterpret the term "Social Justice" to mean that such politicians are advocating "law and order," whereas, "Social Justice" and "law and order" have entirely different meanings.

Congress and legislatures can pass laws but they cannot make a man rich or happy, nor can they even give him a social status that he does not deserve and earn for himself. It could be possible, if our government were completely changed by a new Constitution, that every man start off with the same amount of property, but this would not last very long. There would still have to be those who stand ready to fight for our country and who are willing to work to support it. The man with genius and industry, no matter how great the division or levelling process may be, would forge ahead, and the laggard, the malcontent and the no-account would fall behind. This is as it should be and as Nature and God intended it to be.

The government can and should give every man the choice of being free, as it has done for "Lo, these many years." It should protect him in his liberty, possessions and property, and not enslave, despoil or destroy him. It should insofar as is possible, without injuring other men, endeavor to create a climate for opportunity. But neither our government nor our law can for long make men equal in worldly goods or give them gold at the rainbow's end. This Utopian dream has never been achieved on this earth and, men being what they are, it likely never will be. "Social Justice" is contrary to every rule of reason and commonsense as well as every American heritage, tradition and virtue. It must be labeled for what it is—a misleading term and political perversion to make a trap for the unwary.

As has been suggested, many "liberal" politicians of national stature endorse and advocate the term "Social Justice." Few seem willing to say that they are against it, and not any of them seem willing to say he is for, or proposes, what the term really means, to-wit: "National Socialism." We should postpone and prevent the evil day when Socialism reigns supreme and man is reduced to the status of an ant in a hill—not hasten it by surrender or subterfuge. To that end, we hope that the great majority of our fellow Bar members will be vigilant and active.

VALUE OF UNITED NATIONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the value of the United Nations, that magnificent monument to an international something or other which graces the skyline of New York City. I expect the number of spoken and printed words are exceeded only by the amount of U.S. dollars, nearly $4 billion since 1946, spent by American taxpayers to finance its existence.

There has been much speculation about what the U.N., conceived and dedicated to the proposition of keeping peace throughout the world, has been doing while Americans die in combat in Southeast Asia and while the Middle East broils under the threat of a new war.

However, Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial appearing in the Daily News, published in the city of McKeesport, Pa., may have supplied the answer. I am inserting the article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the American taxpayer. I am certain they will find it most interesting and informative:

THE UN RAISES

One of the more fascinating questions among the diplomats has to do with whether any assignment in their world of treaties and alliances can beat one to the United Nations.

First of all, pay is good—far better, in fact, than most diplomats might receive from their own countries. And life in New York City is swinging and especially when it can be engaged in on an expense account as a part of the traditional round of diplomatic entertainment.

What's more, the U.S., that patsy for everybody, continues to pay 31.5 per cent of the UN budget while the other 126 members divide up the balance. So there isn't much chance of a UN functionary having to stand criticism at home. His high life rests lightly on his taxpaying constituents—that is, if he isn't an American.

But now the UN post has become even more rewarding. Eight per cent pay boosts have been awarded the upper echelon people. Those down the line have gotten six per cent raises. Together, these hikes will cost the U.S. taxpayers a total of $1.5 million in addition to the $53 million they already are contributing to the UN annually.

The UN's budget for this year—before the raises, amounted to $168.2 million, or quite a sum for an organization whose value is questionable and whose services appear most-

ly of the make-work variety. This year's total reflects a raise of $11.4 million from last year. As with most public organizations, costs keep mounting with each new budget.

It is interesting, perhaps for the U.S. taxpayer to note that his own country abstained in the final General Assembly vote on the new salary increases. However, 57 nations voted aye, or more than enough to approve them. Many of those which voted in favor, as the Richmond News Leader found in a check-up, are arrears in their own UN dues even though they amount to only small fractions of the total. In fact, $190 million is past due on the UN books.

So the UN adventure goes on while the Middle East, which it has failed to quiet, sputters with new dangers and Americans continue to die in Indochina. And as we remember, this thing was supposed to keep the peace and not an army of world diplomats and their aides in high-salaried comfort.

ANIMAL EXPERIMENT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized animal smoke inhalation study by Drs. E. Cuyler Hammond and Oscar Auerbach has now been published as a two-part article in the December 1970, issue of "Archives of Environmental Health." Its appearance in the medical literature lagged 10 months behind its debut at a press conference in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. The findings of this animal experiment have been heavily relied upon in both the English Royal College of Physicians' 1971 report and the U.S. Surgeon General's 1971 report, which has just recently been presented to Congress.

However, I noted that the authors of the Royal College of Physicians' report apparently relied upon and cited a February 1970, news article reporting on the animal study rather than the long delayed published report. Thus the results recited in the Royal College report are different from those finally reported by Drs. Auerbach and Hammond in the medical literature.

In a thoughtful response to an earlier inquiry I had made about this animal study, Dr. Victor Buhler, one of America's most distinguished pathologists, and a former president of the College of American Pathology, provided a keen analysis of what was known about it based on prepublication reports. Since the study has now been published, I have again solicited his comments and am pleased to present his views regarding this controversial animal experiment to my colleagues in Congress:

ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL,
Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1971.

Hon. TIM LEE CARTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. CARTER: Thank you for your recent inquiry requesting my additional comments on the cigarette smoke inhalation experiment by Drs. Auerbach and Hammond et al. now that their work has finally been published.

I have made a comparison of the text of their two-part article appearing in the December 1970 issue of Archives of Environmental Health with the original text presented to the press at an American Cancer Society meeting in February 1970. In my evaluation, I have also considered presentations by Drs. Auerbach and Hammond to the Section on Diseases of the Chest at the June 1970 A.M.A. Convention, which I attended.

The changes which have been made, both in wording and in substance, are quite remarkable. For example, the original text presented to the press in February 1970 by the American Cancer Society stated that one of the primary purposes of the experiment was "to ascertain whether smoking cigarettes for two years or longer will produce lung cancer in dogs." This purpose has been deleted in the *Archives* text.

Another example of the numerous changes wrought is the tacit acknowledgment that the entire experiment had no controls. Eight nonsmoking dogs, originally designated as controls, have now become simply "group N." They were not subjected to the same stresses and strains as the smoking dogs and obviously should never have been called controls. The authors' explanation that they did not have eight dogs "smoke" unlighted cigarettes because "nonsmoking human beings do not 'smoke' unlighted cigarettes", and "because of having a limited number of technicians", is hardly plausible. The first explanation completely evades the question of possible traumatic effect. And the failure to provide technical help to have eight dogs "sham" smoke—in an experiment which is claimed to be so vital to the public interest—is beyond comprehension.

Perhaps the most startling change is the dramatic reduction in the number of dogs with "cancer" from twelve, as originally reported, to but *two* in the published version. The first reports of the experiment presented in February 1970 referred to *twelve* dogs with cancer. In the final version appearing in the *Archives*, the authors refer only to *two* dogs with cancer. The photomicrographs in the published material are inconclusive as to the existence of any cancer.

These changes leave me with a feeling that if the purpose, interpretations and conclusions attending this study can be so radically altered within a span of several months, based on the same experimental data, then the entire study is suspect.

In addition to the fact that the results published in *Archives* do not support the claims originally made, the article itself contains many fundamental deficiencies. Briefly stated, these include:

1. Dr. Auerbach accepts Liebow's criteria for bronchiolo-alveolar tumors in humans. Yet his discussion of the tumors in the experimental dogs shows that virtually none of these criteria were fulfilled.

2. The photomicrographs published with the article would not permit most pathologists to reach the conclusions stated by the authors. Specifically, the photomicrographs of "emphysema", "invasive" tumors and "early squamous cell carcinoma" are inconclusive.

3. The reported incidence of tumors in 25 percent of the nonsmoking dogs is from 40 to 125 times greater than has been reported by other investigators. This finding, which Dr. Auerbach said "surprised" him, calls into question (1) the use of beagle dogs as experimental animals, (2) the interpretation of the data which led the authors to diagnose tumors and (3) the entire experimental design.

4. It is overtly obvious, since 12 of the 24 dogs in Group H compelled to smoke died of disease states as cor pulmonale, pulmonary infarction, aspiration of food, bronchopneumonia and of "uncertain causes", that the stated conclusions that "male beagle dogs are suitable experimental animals and that our procedures are satisfactory for testing the relative potency of cigarettes . . ." are not justified.

5. None of the tumors, including the bronchiolo-alveolar tumors, are reported to have metastasized, yet in humans the rate of metastasis from such tumors is 50% according to Liebow's criteria.

Many of the now apparent deficiencies in this animal experiment were mentioned in my letter to you dated February 21, 1970. Most significant perhaps, was the method used to get the animals to "smoke." This involved the direct delivery of cigarette smoke to the lower trachea, the bronchi and the lungs, thus bypassing the oral cavity, the pharynx, the larynx and the upper portion of the trachea. A tracheostomy is a most unusual and unnatural way for an animal to breathe and introduces a great possibility of infection, both bacterial and viral. There is now ample evidence that all of the dogs were subjected to abnormal respiratory infections and diseases. The authors report that among the dogs that died during the course of the experiment, autopsy revealed that all had microscopic evidence of pneumonia.

A tracheostomy not only bypasses all the protective mechanisms of the animal's upper respiratory tract, but, additionally, does not permit the mixture of air and smoke which occurs under normal smoking conditions. The traumatic method used to force the dogs to "smoke" has been criticized in the scientific literature. For example, an article by Bair et al. entitled, "Apparatus for Direct Inhalation of Cigarette Smoke by Dogs", Journal of Applied Physiology, June 1969, pp. 847–850, pointed out that experiments exposing animals to cigarette smoke through a tracheostomy aperture "lack similarity to human smoking habits." The authors warned that the "validity of extrapolating results from such experiments to possible effects in man is therefore highly questionable." It is of interest to note that Bair et al., using controlled muzzle masks, caused their dogs to smoke up to 20 cigarettes per day. In their two-year experience the dogs were reported to "tolerate smoking well" and there was an "absence of subjective signs of discomfort or clinical symptoms of adverse reactions . . ." Such results are far different from those reported by Drs. Auerbach and Hammond.

My previous concern about this study has been confirmed by the finally published article, which so completely fails to bear out the claims announced at the American Cancer Society's press conference last February. The mischief of such premature statements is illustrated by your reference to certain claims in the 1971 Report of the English Royal College of Physicians which were not supported by the dog study as finally published. This does, indeed, show the danger of relying on pre-publication results. There is obviously a grave risk that the public, and even the medical profession, may be misinformed and misled by such reliance. Science can well do without the hanky-panky which results from such unwarranted publicity.

Respectfully,

VICTOR B. BUHLER, M.D.,
Pathologist.

NOT WITHOUT THE AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to insert an editorial that recently appeared in the Indianapolis Star. Mr. Keyes Beech, who for 20 years has been

an outstanding U.S. foreign correspondent in Asia, has written a new book, "Not Without the Americans," and is the subject of the following editorial:

U.S. GOOD IN VIETNAM

Keyes Beech is known as "the dean of United States foreign correspondents in Asia." He has been "up front" in the Orient for more than 20 years. He learned his craft "at the feet of the old Far Eastern hands," as he puts it.

"I believed in our Vietnam commitment and, at the risk of being blackjacked in a dark alley by some of my liberal friends, I still do. I just wish we had not handled it so badly," Beech writes in a preface to his new book, "Not Without the Americans," which deals, as the title suggests, with the U.S. role in the Orient.

"I also happen to believe, at the risk of being called a mindless optimist, that in the long run our decision to intervene will be proved right. I also believe that we will win. Perhaps this is because I prefer to win wars rather than lose them. And despite the cliche that nobody wins a war, I can assure you that it is far better to win than to lose . . ." Beech continues.

"Mainly because of Vietnam, America seems ready to turn its back on Asia. That is a pity, because we got into the mess in Vietnam precisely because of our appalling ignorance of that part of the world.

"We have been accused of many crimes, among them arrogance, when our real crime was an excess of humility or half-baked imperialism. We had the name but not the game. I do not share the hair-shirt complex nor, I hope, the arrogance of so many of America's liberal intellectuals . . .

"If we had been truly arrogant we would not have vacillated between whole and half-measures. In Vietnam, as elsewhere, we have been the victims of our own anti-colonial legacy. We were damned for supporting corrupt military dictatorships. But when we attempted to reform them we were damned for meddling in the affairs of sovereign nations. Often our sin was that we did not meddle enough.

"A British critic has made the eminently sensible observation that, 'With all due deference to Senator Fulbright, it is possible to argue that the false starts of American policy in Asia and elsewhere have been at least as much due to the illusions of liberalism as the arrogance of power.

"There were two fundamental flaws in liberal thinking on Asian policy. One was to underestimate, if not wholly ignore, the utter hostility and implacability of Asian Communism, often to the point of idiotically assuming a community of interests. The other was to assign to our enemies a measure of good will that never existed.

" 'In a sense,' " as Beech quotes Coral Bell, of the London School of Economics, as saying " 'it is only after you have paid your adversary the compliment of understanding how serious and formidable is his determination to cut your throat—and how reasonable, from his own point of view—that you can settle to the reality of a long-continuing struggle, on which battlefields must be carefully chosen and strategies carefully judged. The best guide to this situation is not, unfortunately, Senator Fulbright. It is Mao Tse-tung's "On Protracted War." '

"We have been accused of relying too much on military force when our real crime was not using that force selectively and effectively. 'Weeding with a bulldozer,' is the way a New Zealand friend described our Vietnam tactics.

"We have been accused to laying waste to the land. But wherever we went we built far more than we destroyed. And how many people are aware of the 'green revolution' that is sweeping Asia?

"It, like our guns and airplanes, is a product of American technology. And its meaning is that millions of half-starved Asians should, for the first time in their history, no longer go hungry.

"Finally, I find it ironic that my generation should be accused of not caring. We cared too much. That is why we fought in World War II, why we went into Korea, why we went into Vietnam . . ."

When experience speaks, the wise listen.

THE MICHIGAN ENVIRONMENTAL TEACH-IN 1 YEAR LATER

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a year ago today the University of Michigan completed the first university teach-in on the environment. Some 15,000 students worked together for 4 days to express their deep concern about man's relationship to his environment and to urge that greater attention be given to the environmental effects of man's technological and economic advances.

This highly successful event was followed a month later by environmental teach-ins in numerous universities throughout the Nation. The environmental youth movement was culminated in a national day of concern which involved nearly every American—Earth Day.

As we look back on these first strong efforts on behalf of the environment by America's youth a year ago, it is important to point out that they were more than just a series of rallies and speeches and demonstrations. They were serious discussions that have led to serious and positive results. In Ann Arbor, where the movement started, the young people have established the Ecology Center, Inc., a nonprofit institution which serves as an environmental education center for all of southeastern Michigan. The parent organization of the Ecology Center is ENACT, a student organization at the University of Michigan, which has led an active fight to clean up the environment both near their home base of Ann Arbor and around the Nation. Two notable efforts have been undertaken which are the establishment of a recycling center in Ann Arbor and the coordination of a Huron River cleanup.

On a national level, the environmental movement led by the youth of the Nation has made great strides during the last year. The creation of the Council on Environmental Quality in the White House and the establishment of the Environmental Protection Administration are symptomatic of the increased concern by government officials for preservation of the environment and correction of damage already done. Without the great outpouring of public support engendered by the activities of our young people, I am convinced that those steps forward would have been longer in coming.

Mr. Speaker, I think the significance of the participation and enthusiasm of our youth in this important subject cannot be overrated. Despite years of rhetoric on the part of politicians, it took the enthusiasm and dedication of the youth of the Nation to get results. Despite many discouraging predictions about this generation its efforts in this field may result in improving life for all of society. The system can and does respond to the youth of America when they speak loudly, in unison and with research, reasoning, and dedication on their side.

On this first anniversary, it is also appropriate for us to rededicate ourselves to the fight for the environment. There is still much to be done—we have barely started the necessary work on cleaning up our environment. We need stronger Federal regulation of pollution sources and we need improved enforcement procedures. We need more funds both on a governmental and a private level to finance the needed antipollution devices. We need even more public attention and participation in cleanup drives, in cooperation with recycling campaigns, in patronizing those products which are least guilty of pollution. We need immediate action on the preservation of many wilderness areas throughout the Nation and the creation of additional national parks, so that our national resources of beauty and tranquility will not be destroyed for future generations.

Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis and a noted environmentalist described the success of the Michigan teach-in and the problems which remain in his article in the Saturday Review last April. I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BEYOND THE TEACH-IN

(By Barry Commoner)

The sudden public concern with the environment has taken many people by surprise. After all, garbage, foul air, putrid water, and mindless noise are nothing new; the sights, smells, and sounds of pollution have become an accustomed burden of life. To be sure, the mess has worsened and spread in the last decade, but not at a rate to match the dramatic, nearly universal reaction to it that has hit the country in the past year.

Although the growing demand for action against environmental pollution is very clear, it is not so clear how the movement came about and where it is going. This is a particularly crucial time to find out. For the environmental teach-ins that are being planned on thousands of campuses this month are both the chief evidence of the origins of the movement and the main force that will determine its future.

Several environmental teach-ins have already taken place, the largest of them being that of March 11–14 at the University of Michigan, where the roster of speakers and participants was dramatic evidence that the environmental movement has become a meeting place for major and divergent elements of American society.

The kick-off rally for the teach-in, attended by 15,000 enthusiastic students, was addressed by Michigan's Governor Milliken, and a number of other municipal, state, and federal officials were present—testimony to the importance government figures attach to voter interest in the environment.

Among the teach-in speakers were a variety of scientists with a professional interest in the environment: biologists, ecologists, engineers, sociologists, urban analysts, and

public health experts. This reflects one of the earliest origins of the environmental movements—the work of those of us in the scientific community who, some years ago, began to detect in our own studies evidence that pollution is not only a nuisance but a threat to the health, even the survival, of mankind.

The well-known performers Arthur Godfrey and Eddie Albert—both ardent conservationists and anti-pollutionists—were teach-in participants, lending the prestige of the world of entertainment. Ralph Nader, another teach-in participant, spoke for the consumer and dealt with the failure of our technological society to meet the real needs of those who live in it.

Industry was represented by officers of the Detroit Edison Company, Ford Motor Company, Dow Chemical Company, and others—all industries that bear a large responsibility for serious pollution problems. The interest of these companies in public concern with the environment has become a matter of direct corporate necessity.

Labor was represented by Walter Reuther, whose union—the United Automobile Workers—opposed the construction about five years ago of Detroit Edison's Fermi reactor, located about five miles outside Detroit. Through an educational program, the UAW has developed a broad interest in environmental quality, and that consideration is now included among UAW contract demands.

That the president of the Dow Chemical Company was invited to speak at Michigan reveals another important element in the environmental movement. Dow has been, of course a prime target of the antiwar movement; its campus recruiting program has triggered many demonstrations by student activists, who cite the hold of the military-industrial complex on U.S. policy as a reason why our social system must be radically changed. And the activists had *their* representatives on the roster of teach-in speakers—one being Murray Boochin, an environmental analyst who takes a socio-revolutionary approach to this and other social ills. Finally, the speech that closed the teach-in was given by Richard Hatcher, mayor of Gary, Indiana, a city that suffers the specially intense environmental problems of a largely black population.

The Michigan teach-in epitomized the remarkable convergence around the environmental issue of a number of earlier, separate concerns: conservation, scientists' responsibility for the social consequences of science and technology, the consumer movement, the young generation's feeling for a more humane life-style, the businessman's worries over the impact of all of these on industrial profits, the problem of the ghetto and urban decay, the antiwar movement, and student activism against the nation's social and economic system. Somehow, the issue of environmental quality touches all these separate facets of the crisis of American society.

I can report from my own experience that there is a close link between the problem of war and the problem of the environment. My concern with the environment does not stem from my professional training; I was trained as a cellular biologist, not as an ecologist. But I also learned that science is part of society and that every scientist owes it to himself, and to the society that supports him, to be concerned with the impact of science on social problems. And it was the problem of war that first introduced me to the environmental crisis. In the 1950s, when nuclear tests first showered the world with fallout, and the Atomic Energy Commission showered the nation with assurances that radiation was "harmless," I studied, along with many other scientists, the path that fallout takes in the environment from the bomb to man. And I was shocked to learn that nuclear radiation is never harmless, to the ecosystem or to man. That is when I began to appreciate the importance of the environment to man. It was the AEC that turned me into an ecologist.

There are specific links between the environmental crises, the evils of war in general, and the war in Vietnam in particular. One link can be seen in the economics of war and of pollution. That our industrial system is heavily sustained by the military diversion of human and natural resources from human needs has been demonstrated cogently by numerous observers; the military-industrial complex was not a myth to President Eisenhower, nor is it to the stockholders in major American industries. What is less known, but can be equally well documented is that the profitability of most American industry and agriculture has been related significantly to their avoidance of a large cost of doing business—environmental deterioration. For example, the power industry, a major cause of urban air pollution sells electricity to its consumers for a certain amount of money, but those same consumers pay an added cost for the environmental consequences of the power they buy—in laundry bills caused by soot, and in doctor bills (and some reduction in their life expectancy) caused by sulfur dioxide and organic air pollutants from power plants. The dollar value alone of these "social costs" of air pollution that we now know of—and many remain unknown—adds about 25 per cent to the city dweller's electric bill.

Some economists assert that the economic system could readily adjust itself to this situation by undertaking the cost of preventing pollution and adding that cost to the real price of its products. Such a readjustment would affect the cost to the consumer, not only of power but of all manufactured goods (nearly every factory pollutes the air and water), of transportation (cars, trucks, and airplanes are major polluters of air), and of food (U.S. agriculture through its use of intensive fertilization and feedlots for fattening cattle to high-priced grades, bears a major responsibility for water pollution; organic wastes from U.S. feedlots exceed those produced by the total U.S. urban population). *It may be that the economic system can get along without the crutch provided by the diversion of environmental costs to the people, and that it can get along without the crutch of military production. But thus far it hasn't, and one can at least suspect that in both cases the crutch has become a support essential to the system's stability.*

Another close link between the problems of war and environment is that both represent the inability of our technology to foresee its own inherently fatal environmental flaws. Like detergents—which, much to their developers' surprise, failed to be accommodated by natural water systems and bloomed into unsightly mounds of foam on our rivers—or the unanticipated backlash of DDT, the nation's war program can be viewed as a vast technological blunder. When, in the 1950s, the Pentagon and its scientific advisers decided to hang the nation's defense on nuclear weapons, they did not know what the scientific community has since told them: It will not work; no nation can survive a nuclear war. Remember that in 1956 Eisenhower campaigned for continued nuclear tests in part because "by the most sober and responsible scientific judgment they do not imperil the health of man." Eight years later, Johnson praised the nuclear test ban treaty, because it "halted the steady, menacing increase of radioactive fallout." The Pentagon also told scientists that it would not use herbicides in Vietnam if it believed that these agents would have "long-term ecological effects" on that tortured land. Now we know from scientific evidence that mangrove areas of Vietnam will not recover from herbicide attacks for at least twenty years. Indeed, because of herbicide attacks not only on forest areas but on food crops, together with the massive assaults by more conventional weapons, the way in Vietnam represents, in my opinion, the first ecological warfare conducted by the United States since the attacks on American Indians. The technological failure of biological warfare as a suitable means of defense (for there is no way to test artificial infectious agents, much less use them, without incurring serious risks to ourselves) was recently acknowledged when the government ordered the abandonment of its entire biological warfare program.

If there is little reason to regard the environmental movement as a diversion from the antiwar movement, its relation to the racial issue is less clear. Some approaches to the environmental problem seem to run counter to the interests of the blacks. This was dramatized recently at San Jose State College, where, as a symbol of environmental rebellion, a student program was climaxed by the burial of a brand new car. The event was picketed by black students who believed the $2,500 paid for the car could have been better spent in the ghetto.

The San Jose burial reflects a personalized attack on the environmental crisis, an approach that is now fairly common among some student groups. They reason that pollution in the United States is caused by the excessive consumption of goods and resources, a favorite statistic being that the U.S. contains about 6 per cent of the world's population but consumes half of the planet's total goods and resources. Since the wastes generated by this intense consumption pollute our environment, the eco-activist is advised to "consume less." In the absence of the added statistic that in the United States the per capita consumption by blacks is much lower than that of whites, such observations are not likely to arouse the enthusiasm of blacks.

Disaffiliation of blacks from the environmental movement would be particularly unfortunate, because in many ways blacks are the special victims of pollution and have much to teach whites about survival. A white suburbanite can escape from the city's dirt, smog, carbon monoxide, lead, and noise when he goes home; the ghetto dweller not only works in a polluted environment, he lives in it. And in the ghetto he confronts added environmental problems: rats and other vermin and the danger of his children's suffering lead poisoning when they eat bits of ancient, peeling paint. To middle-class Americans, survival is not a familiar issue. They have not yet learned how to face such a soul-shaking threat, as demonstrated by the continued failure to appreciate that the existence of ready-armed nuclear weapons may bring doomsday as close as tomorrow. For blacks, the issue of survival is 200 years old. If they have not yet mastered it, they at least have had a good deal of experience that may be enormously valuable to a society that now, as a whole, must face the threat of extinction. Blacks need the environmental movement, and the movement needs the blacks.

Confusion between certain aspects of the environmental movement and other social issues is also generated by the view that the former is closely connected to the population crisis. In one sense, this belief is valid, for clearly the world population cannot continue to grow at its present rapid rate (largely in underdeveloped countries) without eventually outrunning the capacity of the planetary ecosystem to produce sufficient food to sustain it. But some environmentalists hold that in an advanced country like the United States "the pollution problem is a consequence of population." This view leads to the idea that the environmental crisis in the U.S., which clearly calls for drastic action, can be solved only if we take strong action to stop the growth of the U.S. population.

A good deal of the confusion surrounding priorities can be cleared up by some facts.

Nearly all of the stresses that have caused the environmental breakdown here—smog, detergents, insecticides, heavy use of fertilizers, radiation—began about 20 to 25 years ago. That period saw a sharp rise in the *per capita* production of pollutants. For example, between 1946 and 1966 total utilization of fertilizer increased about 700 per cent, electric power nearly 400 per cent, and pesticides more than 500 per cent. In that period the U.S. population increased by only 43 per cent. This means that the major factor responsible for increasing pollution in the U.S. since 1946 is not the increased number of people, but the intensified effects of ecologically faulty technology on the environment.

So the environmental movement—and the teach-ins that signal its emergence as a major political force—has become a meeting place for the major issues that trouble American society. This is its strength, and this is the importance of its future course.

Demands for *action* dominate the environmental movement, and wide-ranging programs of action are being organized. Some are direct, personal efforts to clear up the environment, such as community-wide campaigns to remove the junk from a stream bed. Some are politically oriented demonstrations, such as the delivery of a mass of beer cans to the lawn of a can manufacturer's home. Petition campaigns directed at remedial legislation abound, and legislators have been busy trying to reflect in law the new desire of their constituents for a clean environment. There are strong indications that on most campuses the current teach-ins will lead to environmental action's becoming a major, continuing feature of campus life.

Of course, there are those who regard the environmental movement as only the latest in a series of ephemeral fads for political action, doomed like its predecessors—civil rights, the anti-war movement, and student power—to rise to an enthusiastic peak and fade away before the hard, intransigent realities of political life. I disagree.

That danger does exist, for there are no easy solutions to the *fundamental* problems of the environmental crisis. Some of the superficial symptoms can be attacked directly: Creeks can be cleared of junk and beer cans can be collected. But no band of activists can return a river to an unpolluted state when the polluting agent is fertilizer draining from the surrounding farmland. And if farmers were abruptly required to halt their intensive use of fertilizer, often crucial to the solvency of their operation, they would simply go out of business.

Once we look beyond its immediate accessible symptoms, the environmental crisis confronts us with very hard, inescapable choices. If we really want to cure the evil of water pollution, we will have to make drastic revisions in present waste-treatment methods, for these overfertilize the algae in the water, which soon die, reimposing on rivers and lakes the very burden of organic waste that the treatment was supposed to remove. The natural ecological system that can accommodate organic waste is not in the water, but in the soil, and no lasting solution to the deterioration of both surface waters and the soil can be achieved until organic waste is returned to the soil. For the same reason, no scheme of handling garbage that fails to meet this fundamental requirement of nature can, in the long run, succeed. And since these and similar violations of the demands of the ecosystem have become embedded in our ways of productivity, any effort to change them will encounter the massive economic, social, and political forces that sustain that system. Our major technologies—power production, transport, the metal and chemical industries, and agriculture—are a threat to the ecosystems that support them and to our very lives. Because we reckon the value of a technology by the value of its marketable products, we have neglected their cost to society—which is, potentially, extinction.

President Nixon has spoken of the need for "the total mobilization of the nation's resources" in order to pay our "debt to nature." But the resources needed to roll back pollution remain immobilized by the cost of the Vietnam war and the huge military budget, by the talent-and-money-gulping space program, by the disastrous cuts in the federal budget for research support, by the reduction in funds for the cities and for education. The environmental crisis, together with all of the other evils that blight the nation—racial inequality, hunger, poverty, and war—cries out for a profound revision of our national priorities. No national problem can be solved until this is accomplished.

Confronted by the depth of this multiple crisis, it is easy to respond with a spate of studies, reports, and projections for future action. But, however essential they may be, more than plans are needed. For the grinding oppression of environmental deterioration—the blighted streets and uncollected garbage, the rats and the cockroaches, the decaying beaches and foul rivers, the choking, polluted air—degrades the hope of our citizens for the future and their will to secure it. To unwind this spiral of despair, we must take immediate steps against the symptoms as well as the fundamental disorder. Community efforts to clean up rivers and beaches, to build parks, to insist on enforcement of anti-pollution ordinances and to improve them can give tangible meaning to the spirit of environmental revival.

All of our problems seem to have a common root. Something is wrong with the way this nation uses its human and natural resources. And I believe that it is always healthy to reexamine, to test, the basic mechanism we have created to run our affairs. Those who are already convinced that our social system is in need of radical revision will welcome this opportunity to discuss the prospect. Those who are convinced that the system is fundamentally sound and can be adjusted to the new stresses should welcome this opportunity to demonstrate their conviction. Here, then, is good reason to bring the social revolutionary and the industrialist onto the same platform. Both need to face the same question: How should our society be organized to resolve the crisis of survival?

It is fitting that these issues are being called to our attention by the nation's youth—in the teach-ins and in the student movement that will surely follow them. For young people, our future generations, are the real victims of the impending environmental catastrophe. They are the first generation in human history to carry strontium 90 in their bones and DDT in their fat; their bodies will record, in time, the effects on human health of the new environmental insults. It is they who face the frightful task of seeking humane knowledge in a world that has, with cunning perversity, transformed the power knowledge generates into an instrument of catastrophe. And during the coming months, I think, our young people will demonstrate that they are, in fact, equal to this task, as their environmental teach-ins and ecological actions begin to mobilize the knowledge of our schools and universities and the civic zeal of our communities for a real attack on the environmental predicament.

We have long known that ours is a technological society, a society in which the knowledge generated by science is a chief source of wealth and power. But what the environmental crisis tells us is that the future of our society now depends on new, profoundly fundamental judgments of how this knowledge, and the power that it endows, is to be used. If power is to be derived from the will of the people, as it should be in our democracy, then the people need to have the new knowledge—about strontium 90, DDT, herbicides, smog, and all the other elements of the environmental crisis—that must be the source of the grave new judgments and sweeping programs this nation must undertake. Here, then, is an urgent task that must follow the teachings. Let us take our knowledge about the environmental plight to the people; let us help them learn what they need to know to decide the future course of our society.

The obligation that our technological society forces upon all of us is to discover how humanity can survive the new power engendered by science. Every major advance in man's technological competence has enforced new obligations on human society. The present age is no exception to this rule of history. We already know the enormous benefits technology can bestow, and we have begun to perceive its frightful threats.

The environmental peril now upon us is a grim challenge. It also represents a great opportunity. From it we may yet learn that the proper use of science is not to conquer nature but to live in it. We may yet learn that to save ourselves we must save the world, which is our habitat. We may yet discover how to devote the wisdom of science and the power of technology to the welfare and survival of man.

THE UNTIMELY DEATH OF WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I join with men of good will throughout the world in mourning the untimely death of Whitney M. Young, Jr.

The cause of human rights and dignity has lost an eloquent champion and the civil rights movement in America has lost an effective spokesman. A brilliant, energetic, and dedicated man, Whitney Young made the National Urban Coalition an effective tool in advancing the progress of blacks throughout the United States.

The inhabitants of our deeply troubled cities—regardless of their race or ethnic heritage—have lost a good and understanding friend. In paying tribute to this great civil rights leader we should rededicate ourselves to those goals and principles for which he worked and fought. As a memorial to Whitney Young we should continue to strive to right those wrongs which he opposed, to assist all of our citizens to achieve equal and full opportunity and true equality and to aid those in need.

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to Whitney Young I insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the last article which he wrote and which appeared in last Saturday's New York Times:

THE GHETTO INVESTMENT

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

The statements of concern and the rhetoric of "involvement in the community" that emanated from so many public relations departments of major corporations a few years ago seem to have given way, if not to a retreat, then to an orderly withdrawal, from the problems of society.

In many quarters, the "great involvement" in the social arena is beginning to look like the "great copout." In fact, our business leaders sometimes act like restless college kids, flirting first with civil rights action, then speaking up against the war, and now, clutching the new-found environment issue to their collective bosoms.

That sound, hard-headed businessmen are reflecting the same qualities they find no reprehensible in others—lack of staying power and dilettantism—is a rough charge, but a very deserving one for some inhabitants of executive suites.

The period of corporate activism in social concerns coincided with two phenomena of great importance—a booming economy and the spread of urban rioting. On the one hand, companies were rolling in record-high profits; on the other, they perceived civil disorders as harming the good climate for business and as demanding responsible civic action from the corporate citizen.

Corporations that had never put their toes in the muddy waters of urban problems plunged in, not nearly as deep as they should have, but at least enough to get their feet wet. Now, crying that the water is too hot, many are clambering back to shore. The result of this unseemly dash to the beach is that the motives of many corporations are called into question, and their pullback has endangered worthwhile programs, increasing the frustrations of the ghetto.

A good case in point is what happened in the New York Urban League's Street Academy Program. This program, which has taken high school dropouts and, through intensive innovative educational techniques, has placed many in the best colleges in the country, is having its troubles. Some of these are related to administrative and other causes, but the root cause of the problems is fiscal—not enough dollars. Some of the academies have had to close their doors because corporate sponsors dropped out, refusing to fund them for more than the initial year or two.

One company blamed its pullout on the recession. "When the red ink shows," said an executive, "anything that is not of a direct business nature is the first to go." Another corporate official showed the complacency that drives so many critics of business up the walls: "We've done our share," he said. "We've put in $100,000."

The same businessman will pour many millions into research and development of new products. He'll only expect a 5 per cent return, even though he's dealing with known chemical and physical properties.

But when he's trying to help solve social problems 400 years in the making, created by the racialist attitudes of companies and unions like his own, he suddenly expects fast returns and instant successes.

It is beginning to look like business, in its attempt to become part of the solution, is once again becoming part of the problem.

HELP SOVIET JEWS EMIGRATE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the plight of the Soviet Jews has been particularly in the news. I have sent the following letter to the Soviet Government in the hope that this expression of concern along with many others that have been voiced will persuade the Soviet Government to change its present inhumane policies:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. March 1, 1971.

ALEXEI KOSYGIN,
Council of Ministers, The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

MY DEAR PREMIER: I am taking the liberty, as a United States Congressman of writing you directly to plead with you to use your great influence to bring relief to those Soviet Jews who wish to return to their homeland in Israel.

Today, your country is in a unique position to demonstrate to a troubled world, a genuine humanitarian concern for the rights of those Jewish people who wish to join their countrymen and live in accordance with their rich and ancient traditions.

Such a policy of free emigration would not only be consistent with basic humanitarian concepts, but it would also be consistent with Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights signed by the U.S.S.R. in March of 1968, and the International convention on all forms of racial discrimination signed by the Soviet Union in March 1966.

Allowing Jews to emigrate to Israel would be consistent with your own stated policy first announced in 1966 of permitting reunification of families in Israel.

Many of my Congressional colleagues believe you are insensitive to a problem that deeply concerns men of all faiths and from all countries. I cannot accept the view that a man who has achieved one of the most powerful positions in the modern world is callous and indifferent to the cries of a few thousand helpless Jews who wish nothing more than to enjoy their cultural heritage.

The world community craves for new humanitarian initiatives for those people living in second class citizenship and at the same time demands that all nations live up to their international commitments. I earnestly believe that your personal commitment to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel would represent the statesman-like leadership so desperately needed to produce peace and understanding among all nations. I genuinely hope that this will be your mark on the history of modern world leaders.

Respectfully yours,

PETER A. PEYSER,
Member of Congress.

WHITNEY YOUNG

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death last week of Whitney Young was a great loss for all Americans. Mr. Young distinguished himself as a man of patience, moderation and pride.

While others believed that in order to change they must first destroy, Mr. Young continually labored to bring the conflicting elements together.

When two sides each demanded their own solutions to problems, Mr. Young struggled to find a compromise solution.

As groups on both sides of an agreement sought to inflame the situation, Mr. Young was always one of the first to calm the fires.

While working at great personal cost to bring an end to racial discrimination and poverty, Mr. Young carried the message of pride and respect for his country and all peoples wherever he went. I am deeply saddened at his passing and send my deepest condolences to his wife and two daughters.

THE $10 BILLION MISUNDERSTANDING

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, few things remain sacrosanct today. Unfortunately, our defense budget appears to be one of them. However, last November, Dr. Kaysen, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, suggested that the defense budget could be cut by $10 billion in the next year without endangering our security or defense posture.

His testimony as presented in Roland Paul's column, "The $10 Billion Misunderstanding" is a convincing argument for a substantial budget cut without forcing us back to a policy of "massive retaliation."

I hope my colleagues will give careful consideration to the ideas it espouses:

THE $10 BILLION MISUNDERSTANDING

(By Rowland A. Paul)

WASHINGTON.—Last November Dr. Carl Kaysen, the director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and a former deputy special assistant to President Kennedy for national security affairs, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad. There was no press coverage for Dr. Kaysen's testimony because public attention was absorbed at that time by the dramatic raid on the North Vietnamese P.O.W. camp at Sontay. Nevertheless, Dr. Kaysen had a very important message to deliver—the defense budget for nonnuclear forces, in his opinion, could in the next year or so be reduced by $10 billion.

I would like to explain how this savings of $10 billion can be achieved, based upon Dr. Kaysen's testimony and the work done by the Brookings Institution, which Dr. Kaysen referred to in his testimony.

The 1971 defense budget of about $73 billion is composed of $18 billion for strategic (nuclear) forces, $11 billion as the incremental costs of the Vietnam war this year and $44 billion for the base line general purpose forces, i.e., the pre-Vietnam Army divisions, Air Force wings and Navy task forces at 1971 prices. It is out of this $44 billion which Dr. Kaysen and Dr. William Kaufmann, who did the basic work for Brookings, believe that $10 billion can be saved.

Let me first show the savings that could be achieved among the Army and Marine Corps divisions, and then indicate the parallel savings within the Navy and Air Force. The nineteen and two-thirds Army and Marine Corps divisions which we have today (we had nineteen and one-third in 1964) are roughly allocable: eight to Europe, eight to Asia, one to other regions and two and one-third to a strategic reserve.

Some of these, though allocable to a contingency beyond our borders, are, of course, stationed within the United States. Until the recently announced doctrine of the Administration that the United States will henceforth stand ready to engage in one and one-

half major contingencies, namely, one in Europe or one in Asia and a minor contingency elsewhere, it becomes clear that we do not need to have the same number of active divisions for an Asian contingency as for a European contingency.

Instead, Dr. Kaysen and Dr. Kaufmann recommend reducing the eight active divisions allocable to Asia by six, leaving two active divisions in being as an immediate force available for an Asian contingency. Since each division deactivated represents an annual savings of $800 million, such a reduction in itself would represent an annual savings of $4.8 billion.

Similarly under the one and one-half wars doctrine, three wings of tactical aircraft and six naval carrier task forces could be cut. The elimination of the three air wings would mean a savings of more than $1 billion annually and the elimination of the six task forces would constitute an annual savings of $3 billion. Additional savings among the antisubmarine warfare carriers and airlift and sealift forces would make the total savings about $10 billion.

Such savings would still leave the United States with forces actually in the Pacific of one, and possibly two, carrier task forces (with one or two backup task forces), four Air Force wings, two ground divisions and, if those divisions were Marine Corps divisions, two additional air wings (since Marine air is integral to the Marine Corps divisions).

Some of these forces recommended for reduction are now in Vietnam. Five of the eight base line divisions mentioned above as allocable to Asia are there. What is recommended then, is that as Vietnamization occurs and the United States withdraws from a combat role in Southeast Asia, we should demobilize not only those units which represent the special augmentation for that conflict but also units that would have been in existence had there been no such war.

The recent announcement by the Secretary of Defense that he expects an increase in the defense budget suggests that he does not contemplate making all the reductions which I have outlined above, especially since further savings should be possible in Vietnam as we reduce our $11 billion commitment there.

It is not absolutely necessary that the total savings come solely from forces allocated to an Asian contingency. They could also be taken from the eight Army divisions allocable to Europe, the one allocable to other regions, or the two and one-third allocable to the strategic reserve. We also have sixteen Air Force air wings allocable to Europe, which could bear part of the Air Force reduction.

A current myth about such reductions in American manpower should be laid to rest. This myth is that such reductions are tantamount to a return to the doctrine of massive retaliation. This is not so. These reductions are being proposed because American interests abroad can be adequately protected with a smaller American force in being in light of the reduced risk of overt aggression against those interests today, both in Europe and in Asia. The flexible response policy would continue, but with greater peacetime efficiency.

FORCE PLANNING UNDER THE NEW STRATEGY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is important that every American fully understand the new strategy of realistic deterrence which emerges from the defense report submitted last week to the Congress by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird. This strategy leaves no doubt as to our Nation's desire for peace by maintaining adequate strength and by remaining willing to negotiate differences.

Through the Laird report, we have for the first time a clear-cut defense budget and manpower goals established under a 5-year program that envisions a modern and efficient military force. I believe the 5-year program deserves our careful study and request that a section of the defense report related to this program be printed in the RECORD.

I include the following material:

FORCE PLANNING UNDER THE NEW STRATEGY

The traditional discussion of both the threat and our own force planning in specific mission categories has certain limitations. While it is convenient for budgetary purposes and superificially clearer to analyze threats and forces in neat categories, such categorization can be both misleading and hazardous for force planning. The military strategist necessarily deals with the complete spectrum of conflict, just as the national security strategist must take account of both military and non-military resources.

In planning forces for the complete spectrum of conflict, we must recognize all the capabilities that can be provided by our existing forces. Many of these forces are versatile enough to perform more than one mission or function and to serve purposes different from the one for which they have been specifically designed and procured. Many examples are available: the B–52, although designed as a strategic bomber, has played a large role in tactical operations in the conflict in Southeast Asia; most tactical aircraft and tactical missile systems have both conventional and nuclear delivery capabilities and several aircraft have multimission roles, such as interdiction, close support, and air superiority; some tactical fighters can be used as interceptors for strategic air defense of the Continental U.S.; and aircraft carriers, depending on aircraft complement, are capable of being used in defending the fleet, attacking hostile ships or submarines, providing close air support or interdiction overland, or other missions.

Thus, the use to which any system can be put derives more from inherent capability and the nature of the conflict than from primary mission design. At the same time, it should be recognized that any given force element cannot always be used in a time-critical environment for more than one mission, a major reason for prudent levels of force redundancy.

A. THE FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM

Last year, when presenting the FY 1971 Defense Budget and Program I advised you that we had broken the cycle of five-year planning, and that the FY 1971 Budget was transitional. This year, as I promised, we are presenting the first Five-Year Defense Program of this Administration. The summary forces, shown in classified tables provided to the Committee, represent the basic minimum capabilities which we deem necessary and appropriate to provide for the immediate years ahead. In effect, we have completed our transition to baseline planning, and are now building for the future. Table 9 includes a summary of the active forces we plan to maintain through FY 1972.

In the following sections, I will discuss many of the specific programs which we are recommending in the FY 1972 Budget to preserve baseline capabilities and to provide for readiness, modernization and improvement in existing forces, while at the same time creating additional options for new forces should future events require them. Before turning to a more detailed discussion, however, I believe it is important to note certain trends.

As you know, major reductions have occurred over the past two years in the size of our armed forces—in numbers of Army divisions, in the number of aircraft in the total tactical and strategic aircraft inventory, in active naval ships, and, of course, in the manpower associated with these forces. In FY 1972, continuing reductions in certain areas are planned, although of a much smaller scope than in the immediate past.

An examination of Table I reveals a change in emphasis in the FY 1972 Defense Budget, in that both research and development and procurement reflect considerable increases from FY 1971. The procurement increases will provide us with some badly needed modernization of existing forces, while the R&D increases represent a needed investment for the future.

Several other points are worthy of note. First, the FY 1972 Defense Budget, in terms of constant dollars, is about equal to what might be termed the last peacetime budget, that of FY 1964.

Second, the cost of manpower required to maintain our active forces is increasing. As we proceed towards an all-volunteer force, we can except manpower costs to continue increasing substantially as we seek to make military service more attractive and more rewarding. It will not be easy to strike a balance between our equipment needs and our manpower needs.

In addition, you will note that there is no appreciable change in our strategic force funding compared with last year. We continue to believe that hard decisions may have to be made in this area in the coming months, and I will not hesitate to recommend additional effort should the threat or developments in SALT warrant. But pending favorable development in SALT, we continue to believe that an orderly phased program, to preserve essential capabilities, maintain available options and create new ones as appropriate, is both prudent and necessary.

Let me turn now to a discussion of major forces and modernization programs we are proposing for FY 1972. Of course, many of the details associated with these programs will be amplified by other Department of Defense witnesses when they appear before the Committee.

B. STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES FOR DETERRENCE

"Our strategic forces are the cornerstone of the Free World's deterrent against nuclear attack and must always be sufficient for this crucial role. We seek a negotiated limit or reduction of strategic nuclear forces in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). But in the absence of an agreement, we must proceed with planned improvements to assure the effectiveness of our strategic forces in the face of a formidable Soviet threat."—President's Message to Congress on FY 1972 Budget, January 29, 1971.

Since the Soviet Union was approaching the strategic strength of the United States in the past two years, re-examination of the basis for strategic force planning was required. As a result of the re-examination, the Nixon Administration established sufficiency criteria insofar as a nuclear attack upon the United States is concerned, which are more comprehensive than the retaliatory, or "assured destruction" objective followed in the past.

These criteria for strategic sufficiency are not rigid and unchanging, but rather are developed as broad guidance for planning. They are kept under review in the light of changing technology and other factors, such as intelligence estimates of Soviet and Chinese Communist capabilities in strategic weaponry

Furthermore, as the President noted in his Foreign Policy Report, the concept of sufficiency in what I like to call the broader con-

text of total force planning includes more than just military considerations. In the President's words:

"In its broader political sense, sufficiency means the maintenance of forces adequate to prevent us and our allies from being coerced. Thus the relationship between our strategic forces and those of the Soviet Union must be such that our ability and resolve to protect our vital security interests will not be underestimated. I must not be—and my successors must not be—limited to the indiscriminate mass destruction of enemy civilians as the sole possible response to challenges. This is especially so when that response involves the likelihood of triggering nuclear attacks on our own population. It would be inconsistent with the political meaning of sufficiency to base our force planning solely on some finite—and theoretical—capacity to inflict casualties presumed to be unacceptable to the other side."

We are continually examining ways to diversify our strategic systems to reduce the possibility that an unforeseen technological development or early deployment of projected threats could neutralize a substantial part of our strategic capability.

In planning strategic forces to meet the military criteria for deterrence, our principal objectives, derived from the sufficiency criteria, currently include:

Maintaining an adequate second-strike capability to deter an all-out surprise attack on our strategic forces.

Providing no incentive for the Soviet Union to strike the United States first in a crisis.

Preventing the Soviet Union from gaining the ability to cause considerably greater urban/industrial destruction than the United States could inflict on the Soviets in a nuclear war.

Defending against damage from small attacks or accidental launches.

While these general planning objectives provide overall guidance, there are a number of more specific issues which must be considered when planning our strategic forces.

Among them is the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Because we cannot predict their outcome we must insure the maintenance of our present capabilities, while at the same time preserving or creating options to adjust those capabilities upward or downward if that is required at some time in the future. In the absence of an appropriate SALT agreement that provides for mutual security, an approach that preserves needed capabilities while we continue to seek an effective agreement is, in my view, essential.

To fulfill our objectives in strategic force planning, we strive to maintain a reliable retaliatory force, placing primary emphasis on measures that both reduce vulnerability to attack and assure defense penetration. In addition, we seek to provide reliable reconnaissance and early warning capabilities to minimize the likelihood and consequences of surprise, appropriate defensive forces to protect both air and ballistic missile attack, and effective and reliable command and control of these forces.

At the same time, recognizing the uncertainty inherent in strategic force planning, it is essential to pursue a vigorous research and development program to preserve our options to augment or modify both our offensive and defensive capabilities.

Both the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist strategic nuclear threats, as presently projected through the mid-1970's, have important implications for our strategic force planning.

Even if the Soviet Union levels off at roughly the present number of ICBMs operational and under construction, it could have more than 1,900 reentry vehicles in its ICBM force by the mid-1970's. This force, alone, would be more than enough to destroy all U.S. cities of any substantial size. Practically all of the U.S. population also lies within range of the growing Soviet SLBM force. We must also continue to take into account the Soviet bomber force, which is expected to decline only gradually in the near term.

We continue to believe that an effective defense of our population against a major Soviet attack is not now feasible. Thus, we must continue to rely on our strategic offensive forces to deter a Soviet nuclear attack on our cities.

Since we rely on these forces for deterrence, we must insure that they are adequate to convince all potential aggressors that acts which could lead to nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail pose unacceptable risks to them.

Recent analyses of strategic force effectiveness indicate that planned strategic forces should continue to provide an adequate deterrent for the near term. We do have reliable and survivable strategic retaliatory forces, and their capabilities for retaliation today cannot be denied by nuclear attack.

1. The planned fiscal year 1972 strategic forces

For FY 1972, in the absence of a SALT agreement, the major numerical change that will take place in these forces is the inactivation of three B–52 squadrons. We currently plan to keep the aircraft from one of these inactivated squadrons, plus those of the two B52–D squadrons in Southeast Asia, as rotational aircraft to support our mission requirements in that area.

Our strategic offensive forces at the end of FY 1972 will consist of 1,000 Minuteman missiles, 54 Titan missiles, 450 B–52 aircraft (26 squadrons), 71 FB–111 aircraft (four squadrons), and 656 Polaris and Poseidon missiles carried in 41 nuclear submarines.

Our strategic defensive forces at the end of FY 1972 will include about 600 manned interceptors and about 900 surface-to-air missiles on site, together with the required warning and command and control systems.

With planned modernization, and with a phased Safeguard deployment as appropriate, these strategic force strengths represent our baseline planning forces for the future.

2. Modernization of U.S. strategic forces in fiscal year 1972

The major programs for improvement and modernization discussed in the following sections are designed to preserve the sufficiency of these forces to fulfill the basic planning objectives I noted earlier, while at the same time preserving our flexibility. A summary of these programs, and the comparable FY 1971 effort, is shown:

SELECTED STRATEGIC FORCES PROGRAMS

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1971 actual funding	Fiscal year 1972 proposed funding
Reliable, survivable retaliatory forces:		
Development and continued procurement of short-range attack missile (SRAM) and modification of aircraft	266	359
Continued development of subsonic cruise Armed decoy (SCAD)		10
Continued procurement of minuteman III and minuteman force modernization	589	839
Conversion of SSBN's to Poseidon configuration, continued procurement of Poseidon missiles, and associated effort	1,022	803
Development of new undersea long-range missile system (ULMS)	45	110
Continued development of new strategic bomber, B-1	75	370
Development of advanced ballistic reentry systems and technology	100	87
Reconnaissance, early warning, and air defense:		
Continued development of airborne warning and control system (AWACS), and over the horizon radar (OTH)	92	149
Continued deployment of new satellite strategic surveillance system and development of follow-on systems	213	187
Ballistic missile defense:		
Continued deployment of safeguard	1,331	1,278
Identification and development of advanced ballistic missile defense technology by the Army's Ballistic Missile Defense Agency	105	100
Prototype development of hard-site defense	25	65
Civil defense	73	78

a. A Reliable and Survivable Retaliatory Force

In the strategic offensive forces area, we are concerned both about the potential vulnerability and the penetration capability of our bombers and missiles as we approach the mid-1970's.

As I noted last year, to enhance the prelaunch survivability of our strategic bomber force against the Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missile threat, alert aircraft are being dispersed over a greater number of bases, generally further inland than in the past. Fourteen satellite bases, each with minimum facilities to support aircraft, will be in operation by the end of FY 1972. We are currently examining options for more extensive interior basing of this force, and other means to further improve prelaunch survivability against a broad range of potential submarine-launched ballistic missile threats. For example, one specific initiative undertaken by the Air Force is the provision of a rapid start capability for the B–52's and associated tankers assigned to the Strategic Air Command to reduce engine start time.

We will also need to provide improved penetration capability for the B–52 force as well as the FB–111 bomber force which will be operational through the mid-to-late 1970's. For this purpose, we are requesting $359 million in FY 1972 to: (1) complete development of the Short Range Attack Missile (SRAM), (2) procure a quantity of missiles, and (3) modify B–52 and FB–111 aircraft to carry SRAMs. In addition, we are requesting $10 million to continue development of the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD) to counter possible Soviet air defenses of the late 1970's.

The SRAM will carry a nuclear warhead and travel at supersonic speed. It will give the attacking plane a capability to "stand off" from a target and avoid anti-aircraft defenses. Based on favorable static and flight test results of the SRAM motor, the Air Force has recently ordered the start of full production of the missile.

We are continuing the program to deploy MIRVs in our MINUTEMAN and POSEIDON missiles. We consider this program essential to preserve the credibility of U.S. deterrent forces when faced with the growing Soviet strategic threat. The MIRV program will provide a number of small, independently-targetable warheads on a single missile. Should part of our missile force be unexpectedly and severely degraded by Soviet preemptive actions, the increased number of warheads provided by the remaining MIRV missiles will insure that we have enough warheads to attack the essential soft urban/industrial targets in the Soviet Union. At the same time, the MIRV program gives us increased confidence in our ability to penetrate Soviet ABM defenses, even if part of our missile force were destroyed.

Including MIRV, several major programs for the improvement and modernization of our land-based missile force are now underway, with a total funding requested of $839 million. The budget includes $591 million to procure Minuteman IIIs toward a total planning objective of 550 missiles. The force mod-

ernization program includes upgrading Minuteman silos against nuclear blast and radiation effects, in order to reduce their vulnerability. This program will be coordinated with the replacement of Minuteman I by Minuteman III missiles to complete both the silo upgrading and Minuteman III deployment programs efficiently. The Budget also includes funds to continue the program of reducing the vulnerability of the Minuteman II missiles to nuclear radiation effects while in flight. The Minuteman III missiles currently being produced are already designed to withstand these effects. In addition, we will continue the Command Data Buffer Program, which will permit more rapid and remote retargeting of Minuteman III missiles.

In addition, we are planning steps to preserve this portion of our strategic offensive forces through the deployment of active ballistic missile defense. I will discuss this program and its relation to our overall planning in a later section.

We are continuing to convert Polaris submarines to carry the Poseidon MIRV missile. The Poseidon development test program was completed in June 1970 with 14 successes in 20 firings. In addition, through February 1971, there have been eight production missiles fired from submerged submarines. The first Poseidon-equipped submarine will deploy this spring. The budget includes $803 million to convert more submarines, procure more missiles and provide long lead items for conversions planned next year. Funding for the Poseidon submarine conversion program should be completed in FY 1974.

In addition to these programs now in progress, we must also make preparations to carry out long-range modernization programs to provide adequate strategic offensive forces in the 1980's. We believe that the best near-term approach is to do design studies and preliminary engineering development of a number of systems without committing ourselves to produce any of them. In this way, we will preserve the flexibility to capitalize on opportunities as they appear, counter threats which may emerge in the future, and respond to changes emerging from SALT.

The two most significant of our on-going long-range developments are the Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) and the B–1 intercontinental bomber. The ULMS program now underway will provide the option to augment or eventually modernize the sea-based portion of our missile forces. Work is proceeding deliberately so as to preserve options on performance characteristics and to shorten the leadtime for deployment should this become necessary in the future. Although our continuing investigations have resulted in no immediate concern about the survivability of our Polaris and Poseidon submarines at sea, we are continuing our active program for SSBN defense. Of course, no system can be guaranteed to remain invulnerable indefinitely and we are aware that the Soviets are working on new ASW techniques. However, our investigations have also persuaded us that the expanded operating area permitted by the long range of an ULMS missile could offset possible anti-submarine threats which might develop during the late 1970's or beyond. Since continued development work on ULMS preserves our flexibility to respond to a possible future degradation in the effectiveness of any of our strategic systems, it is an important factor in our future strategic force planning. The Budget contains $110 million, primarily for continued technical trade-off studies, preliminary submarine and facilities design, and design work on the power plant and navigation, guidance, fire control, and launcher systems.

The Budget also includes $370 million to continue engineering development of the B–1 intercontinental bomber. This aircraft is designed to modernize the aging B–52 fleet. The B–1 is being designed to enhance survivability in all modes of operation through faster reaction, increased resistance to overpressure, faster fly-out times, higher speeds and lower altitudes during penetration, reduced IR and radar cross sections and greatly increased ECM capabilities; it is being designed for increased conventional capabilities as well. The B–1 is being developed in such a manner as to minimize the concurrence of development and production. This will permit a B–1 operational capability by the early 1980's if we choose at a later date to proceed into production.

The B–1 engineering development contract with North American Rockwell is a "Cost Plus Incentive Fee" contract with no provision for a buy option. I want to emphasize that we will not commit the B–1 to production before development is completed. The program provides for seven basic milestones. At the present time, the only fixed date is a September 1974 first flight time, but a contract change proposal is being prepared to move the first flight time ahead to April 1974 and to eliminate two test aircraft. The Preliminary Design Review and the System and Engine Design Validations are scheduled for FY 1972.

We plan to continue our investigations of Advanced Ballistic Re-entry systems (AB RES) and technology, and are requesting $87 million in FY 1972 for this effort.

b. Air Defense

During FY 1972, we will make certain additional reductions in the current air defense forces, primarily with reductions in surface-to-air missiles, but we will maintain our aircraft early warning capability and will continue research and development to provide effective bomber defenses. The major change planned for these forces is FY 1972 is a reduction in the number of NIKE-HERCULES missile batteries.

Even if we successfully conclude a strategic arms limitation agreement, we may need to modernize our air defenses in the late 1970's. Therefore, the Budget includes research and development funds for two key systems: $3.6 million for the CONUS Over-the-Horizon radar (OTH–B) and $145 million for the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS).

The CONUS OTH–B radar system will provide distant, all-altitude detection of approaching aircraft. Tests now being conducted should provide by mid-1972 performance data needed to decide whether to construct an operational system.

AWACS will provide the capability to detect and track low- or high-flying aircraft against the surface clutter over land or sea. It is now in engineering development, and two prototype radars are being prepared for flight testing in military versions of the Boeing 707 commercial jet aircraft. We expect the tests to be completed in late 1972. We can then select the better system, and decide in light of circumstances at that time whether to proceed with the final stages of system development.

A future air defense system will require an improved interceptor that possesses a "look-down/shoot-down" capability, greater time on station at AWACS operating ranges, and improved fire power. Both the Navy F–14 and Air Force F–15 now under development are capable of being adapted to fulfill the mission of a new air defense manned interceptor, and we expect to examine closely the feasibility of using one of them for this mission. The Army surface-to-air missile system (SAM–D) currently under development could also play a significant role in CONUS air defense.

c. Missile Warning and Space Systems

Early warning of ICBM attack will continue to be provided by the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) radars and the "forward scatter" OTH radar system. The seven radars of the 474N system will give limited early warning of SLBM attack. Development of the satellite early warning system is continuing. The FY 1972 Budget includes $187 million to deploy this new advanced system, which will complement our radars in providing early warning of ICBM, SLBM and Fractional Orbit Bombardment System (FOBS) launches, and continue development work on follow-on systems. The system will greatly improve the overall capability of our warning network, especially against both ICBM and SLBM launchers.

We will continue to maintain an active anti-satellite defense capability. Satellite tracking and identification will continue to be provided by the existing USAF Spacetrack system and the Navy's SPASUR system; both tied into the North American Air Defense Command and supported by the Space Defense Center for continuous space cataloguing.

d. Ballistic Missile Defense

The Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense System has been and continues to be designed to achieve several objectives against a combination of Soviet and Chinese threats. They include:

"Protection of our land-based retaliatory forces against a direct attack by the Soviet Union.

"Defense of the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within the decade.

"Protection against the possibility of accidental attacks from any source."

Last year I told the Congress that ". . . without the Safeguard increment provided by this [FY 1971] budget, we would be faced now with the hard decisions about adding immediately to our offensive systems rather than being able to await hoped for progress in SALT." I further noted in discussing Safeguard several other important points:

That the impact of technological surprise—for example, Sputnik—can lead to expensive crash responses unless we face and make important national security decisions in a timely manner.

That Safeguard may not be sufficient to cope with all possible threats, but that it can serve as a core for growth options to defend Minuteman as well as providing the basic four-site coverage.

That we were pursuing other concepts, including Mobile Minuteman (on land or afloat), further hardening of Minuteman silos, and shelter based Minuteman, through FY 1971 R&D programs to provide other approaches to the Minuteman survivability problem.

And that if the threat development warranted, I would not hesitate to recommend accelerated development of ULMS.

Before turning to a discussion of this year's proposed Safeguard program, let me note that we have moved forward in this budget on both the ULMS and the B–1 development programs, and we are continuing to examine other options as well. With regard to deployment options, we are requesting funds to exercise only one in FY 1972, to start the increased hardness program for Minuteman silos. Our philosophy has not changed: we are pursuing moderate programs, preserving our flexibility with regard to both SALT and the threat, and keeping our options open for the future.

This year a complete and comprehensive review was conducted in accordance with the President's commitment of March 14, 1969. The review of Safeguard included:

Technical Progress. The technical and deployment progress of Safeguard has been satisfactory. The Spartan and Sprint missiles under control of the Missile Site Radar deployed at Meck Island have successfully intercepted ICBM targets. Of ten systems tests to date, eight have been successful, one partially successful, and one unsuccessful.

Threat. The threat is discussed in detail in Chapter III and the Tables. In summary:

(a) There has been an unexplained slowdown in deployment of current Soviet ICBM models, but tests of modifications of the SS–9, SS–11, and SS–13 have continued. Even at current ICBM levels, qualitative force improvements, to include MIRV's, could pose a threat to the survivability of U.S. land-based ICBM's unless defensive measures are taken;

(b) The continued deployment of Soviet Y-class submarines, and a new long-range Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM) which is being tested, could threaten the survivability of our strategic bomber force; and

(c) The Chinese have continued to make progress toward the development of an ICBM system. Estimated earliest possible initial ICBM capability is 1973 with the more likely time being the mid-1970's.

Diplomatic Context. The President has discussed developments in SALT in his Foreign Policy Report to Congress on February 25th. Although there has been progress in SALT, we have not obtained the necessary results from the negotiations to allow us confidently to change our basic plans for Safeguard.

As the President said two years ago, the deployment of Safeguard depends on the evolution of the Soviet and Chinese threats, and the outcome of SALT. As we found in the review, the threat developments indicate that we should continue to move ahead toward the full Safeguard deployment; however, we cannot predict the outcome of SALT.

The President has decided to request authorization to implement the following Safeguard program through FY 72:

Continue construction at the sites at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota and Malmstrom AFB, Montana.

In 1971, strat construction at the site at Whiteman AFB, Missouri, authorized in the FY 71 Budget.

Take steps toward deployment of a fourth site at either Warren AFB *or* in the Washington, D.C. area.

This decision reflects the following considerations:

To be responsive to the threat, orderly progress on the presently authorized Minuteman defense and those research and development activities for improving future Minuteman survivability should continue. A fourth Safeguard site at Warren would allow timely deployment of additional Minuteman defense and light defense of some inland strategic bomber bases and command and control centers at Omaha and Colorado Springs. However, an acceptable arms control agreement could affect the planned Safeguard defense of Minuteman.

The National Command Authorities are vulnerable to attack by Soviet ICBMs and SLBMs and the defense of our NCA would add to the credibility of our deterrent. At the same time, NCA defense is part of one option of a U.S. SALT proposal and is of interest to the Soviet negotiators.

The initiation of a full light area defense deployment of the entire U.S. continues to be a desirable objective because of the continuing efforts of the Chinese to produce an ICBM. Therefore, we should retain the option for proceeding with full Safeguard area defense deployment.

In summary, the Soviet and Chinese threats to the U.S. call for moving ahead toward the full Safeguard deployment. However, we wish to exercise those restraints which we believe may enhance the chances for reaching an acceptable agreement. In short:

The President's program will continue progress toward satisfying our strategic objectives. It continues progress toward defense of Minuteman pending a satisfactory agreement in SALT. It maintains an option to provide for defense of the NCA as outlined as part of one option in a U.S. SALT proposal, and it maintains the option for the deployment of area defense against small attacks at a later time.

The President's program will continue progress in SALT. The proposed program does not request authorization for additional area defense sites beyond those which also protect Minuteman and the NCA. The U.S. has indicated a willingness to modify the long-range plans for full Safeguard area defense of CONUS if an acceptable arms control agreement with the Soviet Union can be reached.

Our FY 1972 request for funds and authorization includes both Warren AFB and Washington, D.C. We believe that the Congress should authorize work on both sites this year, to provide the President maximum flexibility both with regard to SALT developments and the threat. I would emphasize that under this request, the FY 1972 deployment program would be limited to only one of the two locations.

The Safeguard program is designed to achieve several strategic objectives. In addition, the present program provides flexibility for several SALT contingencies and possible outcomes. It does not prejudge either the decisions to be made in SALT or the possible results of SALT. Until it becomes clear that an agreement adequately constraining the Soviet threat to our retaliatory forces is attainable, the program will proceed in an orderly and timely manner. To do more could reduce the chances for success in SALT: to do less could erode our security and reduce Soviet incentives to negotiate seriously in SALT.

In summary Mr. Chairman, the proposed FY 1972 Safeguard program and other related actions which we are recommending reflect the basic philosophy which President Nixon announced in making his first decision on Safeguard—a measured, orderly, and sufficient pace, subject to review and modifications as developments dictate. While we proceed at a measured pace with Safeguard, we intend to keep our other options open. We are continuing to examine those which I mentioned last year, and are examining other concepts as well: for providing light area defense against small or accidental attacks through other means than the current full Safeguard to enhance our ability to counter the Chinese threat even if a desirable SALT agreement precludes full deployment of the current Safeguard program; through prototype development of a hard site defense to augment the Safeguard defense of Minuteman if necessary; and other potential programs that may become available in the decade ahead in both offensive and defensive areas. Our objective is to ensure that under any foreseeable circumstances we can continue to provide for the safety and security of the American people.

A summary of the deployment schedule through FY 1972 for the proposed SAFEGUARD program is shown below. The $1,278 million we are requesting for FY 1972 will accommodate the funding level required for either site, excluding personnel and operation and maintenance costs. The details of the SAFEGUARD program and related ballistic missile defense activities will be discussed in detail by Department of Defense witnesses.

DEPLOYMENT SCHEDULE (EQUIPMENT READINESS DATE)

October 1974	May 1975	Early 1976	Mid 1977	Late 1977
Grand Forks	Malmstrom	Whiteman	Warren	Initial Washington capability.[1]

[1] The initial defense of Washington is the same as would be provided in the full Safeguard deployment and includes a single missile site radar (MSR).

e. Civil Defense

A complete review of the U.S. Civil defense Program has been conducted by the Office of Emergency Preparedness at the direction of the National Security Council (NSC). Pending consideration of the review by the NSC we do not propose any major changes in the civil defense funding for FY 1972. The Budget includes $78 million for this program. We will maintain current programs to identify shelters, equipment and train civil defense volunteers. Deployment of the prototype low frequency warning transmitter will continue in FY 1972. As in previous years a large portion of the civil defense funds will be used to assist state and local civil defense activities and finance federal emergency operations.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just passed a constitutional amendment that would grant 18-year-olds the right to vote in any election. The need for this legislation is plain. The Supreme Court, as you know, has upheld the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act provision extending the franchise to 18-year-olds. The Court, however, ruled that this law is binding only for Federal elections. America's young people, as a result, are left with this irony: they can take part in elections for the highest Federal offices, but not in elections for offices in their own communities.

The constitutional amendment passed by the Senate last week—an amendment that explicitly spells out any 18-year-old's right to vote in any election—would clear away this inequity.

Like most of my colleagues here, I hope this legislation is promptly enacted into law.

It is clear—indeed, conspicuous—that today's 18-year-olds are far better educated and far more sophisticated than those of even a generation ago. It can be argued convincingly, in fact, that contemporary youth is more keenly aware of the problems confronting American society and more ardently committed to solving those problems than many of their elders. At the age of 18, young men and women have completed their secondary education. They are entering college, joining the Armed Forces, taking jobs. They are more intellectually mature and more politically responsible than any generation in the country's history. It was nearly two centuries ago—in a small, rural, agrarian society—that most States set the voting age at 21. It made sense then. It no longer makes sense today.

The overwhelming majority of American youth want to work within what is

called "the system," seeking their political goals through the traditional institutions of our democracy. They are frustrated, however, merely because they are denied the right to vote. American young people are a powerful force for good in our society. Granted, a minority so small that it can be accurately termed "trivial" has embraced radicalism and revolution. But—I cannot emphasize this point strongly enough—most young people border on exemplary citizens. They are bright. They are responsible. They are conscientious. They deserve the right to vote.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR BILL TO BAN UNSOLICITED CIGARETTE SAMPLES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1971, I introduced a bill to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited cigarette samples. Since then I have received numerous complaints from all over the country from people who have received cigarette samples in the mail. The Federal Trade Commission has been receiving complaints as well.

Due to the widespread interest in this legislation and the many inquiries I have received from my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I am reintroducing this bill today with 21 additional cosponsors.

It is my hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will give this bill its prompt and favorable consideration. At this point, I would like to insert the text of this legislation in the RECORD:

H.R. 3559

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745 and 746; Public Law 91–375) and amended by the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1974; Public Law 91–662), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting immediately below subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f)(1) Any sample of any cigarette mailed without the prior express written consent or request of the addressee is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs. The Postal Service may permit the transmission in the mails, under regulations prescribed by the Postal Service, of any such unsolicited sample addressed to a physician, chemist, or medical technician engaged in medical research or to a hospital, clinic, laboratory, medical school, or other agency, institution, or organization, whether government or private, engaged in medical research or having medical research facilities. Such regulations shall provide that the envelope, package, or other cover under which such unsolicited sample is mailed shall bear on its face in conspicuous type a notice, in words prescribed by the Postal Service, to the effect that such envelope, package, or other cover contains a sample of one or more cigarettes unsolicited by the addressee but which may be of interest or assistance to the addressee for purposes of medical research.

"(2) As used in this subsection, 'cigarette' has the meaning provided by section 1332 (1) (A) and (B) of title 15."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the third calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act or on such earlier date, published in the Federal Register by the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, as the Board may prescribe.

THE PLIGHT OF THE "UNPEOPLES" OF THE RED EMPIRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most informed scholars of the Soviet Empire is Dr. Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly of New York City. In an article in the spring 1971 edition of that publication, Dr. Dushnyck pens a precise and objective article on conditions within the U.S.S.R. The article follows:

THE PLIGHT OF THE "UNPEOPLES" OF THE RED EMPIRE

"There were Ukrainian nationalists and therefore had a pathological hatred of the Soviet regime. . . . During the second half of the war he (Bandera) fought against both us and the Germans. Later, after the war, we lost thousands of men in a bitter struggle between the Ukrainian Nationalists and the forces of the Soviet Powers." (Cf. *Khrushchev Remembers,* pp. 140–141)

Once again, the world's attention has been drawn to the plight of the captive peoples of the Soviet Russian empire, this time by a series of incidents which, unhappily for them, could not be suppressed by the Communist rulers behind the Iron Curtain.

The December 1970 riots in the Baltic ports of Poland, the infamous case of extradition of the Lithuanian seaman Simas Kudirka to Soviet guards by the U.S. Coast Guard officials off Boston, and the global repercussions of the Leningrad trial of the Soviet Jewish would-be plane high-jackers—all again confirm the great tragedy suffered by the captive "Unpeoples" in the Russian communist empire.

The term "Unpeople" is an exceedingly appropriate one. It captures the relentless drive of the Kremlin rulers to destroy physically if need be, all non-Russian ethnic entities in their empire and to "Sovietize," that is, Russify, all heterogeneous peoples.[1]

Owing to the special nature of their society and government, the Russian rulers have always been successful in eliminating unpalatable facts from their history books, whether they pertain to persons or to whole nations. It has now became commonplace in Soviet historiography to try to hide actual happenings and facts from Western eyes and knowledge. Several prominent Soviet figures in recent times, once they were "liquidated" for real or imaginary conspiracy, have become "Unpersons," and no longer receive mention in Soviet history books or Soviet encyclopedias. One case in point is Lavrenti Beria, once Stalin's chief of secret police, who was "unpersoned" in 1953. Nikita S. Khrushchev is now treading this path of official obliteration. Although he escaped physical liquidation by the present tenants in the Kremlin, his name eventually will be removed from the annals of Soviet history; he will not even have lived.

The Russians specialize in wholesale inhumanity and cruelty. They seek to wipe out no less than whole ethnic communities and peoples, all to the end of making the hapless people inhabiting the slave empire of the USSR comprise a "Soviet" (read Russian) nation.

UPROOTING OF WHOLE NATIONS

This genocidal policy of the Soviet government has been known for decades to the Western world, especially to various governments and to the academic and journalistic communities. Such horrible features of Soviet rule as the man-made famine in Ukraine in 1932–33, the massacre of 10,000 Ukrainian men, women and children in 1937–38 in the City of Vynnytsia, the murder of 10,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest by the NKVD during World War II, the war-time deportation of the entire Chechen-Ingush nation, the Volga Germans and the Crimean Tartars, and the thoroughgoing destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine in 1945–46—all are irrevocably on record.

None other than oblivion-slated Khruschchev, the alleged author of *Khrushchev Remembers* revealed in his "secret speech" to the 20th Party Congress in 1956 that Stalin officially ordered the mass physical liquidation of the small non-Russian peoples under the pretext that they had "collaborated" with the Germans during World War II. In the case of the Ukrainians, Krushchev reports, Stalin wanted to deport all of them, but "the Ukrainians were too numerous, and there was no place to which to deport them . . ."

One and a half million Chechen-Ingush, Volga Germans and Crimean Tartars, including women and children, however, were brutally uprooted. The casualties of this genocidal operation ran into the hundred of thousands. Of this nothing is mentioned in the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia:* the Russians help along their demonic philosophy of history wherein communism's triumph is inevitable not only by falsifying it but also by taking a macabre hand in its making—even if it has meant the death of millions of "enemies of the people."

It is ironic to note that this policy of extermination did not always apply to the peoples of the Caucasus. Early in the course of the Soviet regime, one of the Caucasian leaders and freedom fighters, Shamil, who had led a rebellion against the Russian Czar in the XIXth century, was considered a progressive force by the Soviet historians of that time. But because he was a devoted Muslim and a defender of the social and national customs of the Chechens, he was subsequently labeled a "reactionary nationalist." His modern descendants were deported *en masse.* Although the majority of these "established permanent roots in their new territories," a goodly number of them died or were killed outright during the heinous "resettlement."

Other imperialisms, of course, were by their nature inhumane. But the crimes of Western imperialism were exposed, criticized and denounced by *Western* historians. Furthermore, these colonial peoples suffered chiefly from an indifference to their lot; they comprised an economic market to exploit. But Russian imperialism has gone incomparably further; its colonial peoples have had to give up their very souls or die.

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC GENOCIDE

The Russians are satisfied with nothing less than the eradication of the culture, language and traditions of a people. They assiduously aim at the very extirpation of an entire nation wherein what propaganda cannot achieve

Footnotes at end of article.

bloodletting assuredly does. One must identify with the Russians or perish.[2]

But the Ukrainians in Ukraine and in other parts of the USSR, as Khrushchev writes, proved to have been too many. There are today about 47,000,000 of them, according to the recent Soviet population census. All are implicitly or explicitly accused of *nationalism*, that consciousness of identity that plagues the Russian totalitarians. One Ukranian intellectual imprisoned in a Mordovian labor camp, Mykhailo Masyutko, in his appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukranian SSR, dated February, 1967, wrote:

"Entering into the second part of the case against Ukranian citizens—*nationalist* propaganda (or activity). By what code of law does one explain an indictment for nationalistic propaganda (or activity)? There are no such laws. On the contrary, there is the Constitution of the USSR, which guarantees the right of nations to self-determinations; there is the Leninist nationality policy, which fully guarantees the right of nations to self-determination without limit, and which assures the complete withdrawal of the troops of the annexing country, of propaganda for separation, of the resolving of national problems by way of the referendum of a whole nation . . . Sukarno's book, *Indonesia Accuses*, which is officially published in the Soviet Union—which means that its ideas are accepted by Communist ideology—quotes Dr. Sun Yat-sen: "Without nationalism there is no progress; without nationalism there is no nation. Nationalism is that treasure which gives a state the strength to strive for progress, gives the nation in question the strength to defend its existence . . ."[3]

This fear of Ukrainian nationalism—the most numerous people in the Soviet Union after the Russian—is strikingly evident in Khrushchev's book. In discussing Stalin's obsession with Ukrainian nationalism, he recalls how in 1943 Stalin assailed Alexander P. Dovzhenko, noted Ukrainian film director, for his scenario, called "Ukraine in Flames." The deposed Soviet head writes:

"During one of my trips to Moscow, Stalin asked me if I'd read it. I said, yes, I had. Actually, I hadn't really sat down and read it, but Dovzhenko himself had read it to me during the German offensive in July, 1942 . . . I explained this to Stalin. He said I was trying to weasel out of my responsibility for what had happened, and he started a blistering denunciation of Dovzhenko, criticizing him up and down, accusing him of Ukrainian nationalism and all kinds of other sins. At that time it was fashionable to accuse Ukrainians of nationalism, regardless of whether there was any evidence for doing so. This practice had started during Kaganovich's term in Ukraine. He was fond of saying that every Ukrainian is potentially a nationalist—which is, of course, nonsense."[4]

This from a man who earned in Ukraine the epithet, "Hangman of Ukraine," for trying to stamp out Ukrainian national consciousness in the Thirties.

During World War II an astonishingly well-organized force—the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—sprang up to combat for Ukraine's freedom not only the Russians but the Nazis as well, as Khrushchev himself acknowledges.

Thus Masyutko, in his petition discussing the unbridled lawlessness of the Soviet security organs, brings forth the fate of another Ukrainian political prisoner, Myroslav Yovchuk:

". . . He had written 268 complaints altogether. Yovchuk writes that the investigating organs soon realized from the proceedings of the inquest that he was not guilty of anything, but they approached the case according to the theory of probability: Yovchuk is a Ukrainian, and since in the view of the State Security organs, all Ukrainians, if they have not committed any crimes against the Soviet government, are bound to commit them, therefore Yovchuk has to be convicted . . ."[5]

To this day the resistance of Ukrainians against the Russification policy is classified as "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," or, synonymously, "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," and dealt with accordingly.

For instance, at the 1970 meeting of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, impassioned speeches were made in defense of the Ukrainian language and against its restriction and its debasement with Russicisms and, above all, against its relegation to a second place in Ukraine. One young writer, Butin, demanded: "Where are the grammars, dictionaries, phonograph records and other materials with which to learn Ukrainian?" Another young writer, Korotych, protested that foreign literature and many other subjects are taught at Ukrainian universities solely through the medium of the Russian language.

A London-based Polish review has summed up ably the intellectual resistance and the general opposition against Russian rule in Ukraine as follows:

"The Ukrainian intellectuals have been in a state of ferment for some time, but their ranks were decimated by Stalin's purges. The pressure of Russification was much stronger in Ukraine than elsewhere in the Soviet Union. . . Consequently, Ukraine was the scene of the most frequent trials and persecution on the pretext of "nationalist deviation," as well as of the influx of Russians on a large scale . . .

"But the years of persecution in great and small matters have had the reverse effect, that of stiffening the resistance and obstinacy of the Ukrainian people. The young generation, as a result, is even more anti-Russian than its fathers and grandfathers. Many young Ukrainians have been put on trial recently for demonstrating publicly their desire for independence from Moscow. It may thus be assumed that the national consciousness is growing stronger and that resistance to Russification is not only stiffening but extending to the masses. The populous Ukrainian nation is approaching the point at which it will again feel strong enough to give proof of its independence and cultural identity. One sign of the new spirit of independence is that the Union (of Writers of Ukraine—Ed) refused to expel from its ranks Ivan Dzyuba, the courageous author of a book with the provocative title: *Internationalism of Russification?* This work has only appeared abroad, but it is undoubtedly of great significance as regards the attitude of Ukrainians in their own language area. It is of little importance that the Russians forbid its publication in Ukraine, when the truths expressed in it can be brought to the Ukrainian people by means of broadcasting. And the main truth it reveals is that the multi-national Soviet State is a Muscovite empire with the dominant nation—the Russian; and to this the Ukrainians are determined not to submit . . ."[6]

Perhaps one of the most telling documents on the oppression of Ukraine by Communist Russia is the book, *Two Years in Soviet Ukraine*. It was written by John Kolasky, a former Canadian Marxist of Ukrainian descent, who was sent a few years ago to Ukraine to a party training school, only to become disenchanted swiftly with Marxist-Leninist ideology. In this book, written in 1970 (and in his *Education in Soviet Ukraine*, written two years earlier), he has described in detail the unbridled rule of Moscow over 47,000,000 Ukrainians and the overall Russian attempt to eradicate the Ukrainian nation by cultural and linguistic techniques, supplemented by persecution and oppression. In a word, by genocide.

LACK OF WESTERN RESPONSE TO ENSLAVEMENT OF "UNPEOPLES"

It is almost unbelievable that the Western world, which prides itself on upholding the general principles of freedom and emancipation, should continue to be so oblivious to the plight and suffering of the "unpeoples" of the Russian empire.

In the past, both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations adhered to the principle of containing the spread of communism. In subsequent years, however, this policy has gradually become watered down into one of "bridge building" to Eastern Europe. Today President Nixon essays a dubious policy of "negotiation rather than confrontation."

This erosion of our belief in universal freedom was not a bit affected by the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the challenging "Brezhnev Doctrine," which had serious, adverse effects upon Yugoslavia and West Germany, not to mention the captive nations in the Soviet Russian empire. Accompanying this deteriorating Western policy with respect to the USSR were the non-proliferation treaty in 1969, the SALT talks, and the Soviet-German Agreement of 1970. The Kremlin sees no reason why it cannot call a European Security Conference which would eventually secure a much-wanted *status quo* and thus assure the permanent division of Europe.

The basic "unprinciples" (to coin a word) of U.S. foreign policy were aired by President Nixon in his report to Congress on February 18, 1970.[7] The fundamental outline of this "strategy" seems to grope for some kind of liberalization in the communist bloc, with an eventual convergence or symbiosis of the two world systems. This despite the swift political demise of Alexander Dubcek in Czechoslovakia, who made the mistake of thinking a more "humane" communism was at hand. At best, this policy relies on a pious hope that the Western system will simply outlast Communism.

An editorial in an English review characterizes scathingly the Western stance:

"The West's foreign policy is still one of futile optimism geared to reconciliation and trusting men such as Brezhnnev and Kosygin who have a record of incorrigible treachery. It is based on a totally false assessment of Soviet intentions and ruthlessness both at home (in the field of repression) and abroad (in the area of subversive imperialism) . . . Both the British and American governments are basically disinterested in the fate of the captive nations. Their members turn a blind eye to reports of re-Stalinization, repression, slave labor camps and putting dissident intellectuals into lunatic asylums. . .

"Western leaders want to enjoy the friendship of both the rulers of communist states at the same time of the peoples who endure living under such totalitarian regimes. They pursue the fatuous illusion of being all things to all men. They solemnly maintain the contemptible theory that tyranny and freedom are reconcilable and that people denied liberty will happily continue to agree to being denied the freedom that Western politicians themselves enjoy. . . ."[8]

This dangerously unrealistic policy is mirrored by the *Ostpolitik* of Willie Brandt, which, some claim is a "second capitulation of Germany." The Bonn government has agreed to recognize *two* German States, although one of them is an outright Russian colony; it has renounced all claims to the annexed German territories without any *fluid pro quo*. The Russians, in turn, have promised nothing, not even to tear down the infamous "Wall of Shame" in Berlin. This new policy of Bonn cannot fail to dishearten not only the German people of East Germany but all the captive nations as well.

To be expected now is a gradual Soviet penetration of Germany and a pressuring pol-

Footnotes at end of article.

icy against all those in the West who do not accept the *status quo* in Europe, that is, on Russian terms.

And in all this, no help is to be expected from the NATO organization which has long been reduced to an ineffectual club of 15 nations, without any power of retaliation against Soviet invasions implementing the "Brezhnev Doctrine."

The overall picture is grim, indeed. Not because the Kremlin, morally or physically, is superior. Far from it. The USSR is beset by seething opposition in Ukraine, the Baltic states, the Caucasus and elsewhere. The tragedy for the "unpeoples" in the Soviet empire lies in the West's ineptitude to comprehend its vested interest in freedom.

But there are those in the West who have its security at heart. Former U.S. Undersecretary of State George Ball, for example, has sharply criticized the new Brandt policy. Others must marshal their moral and material resources to support the captive nations in their unequal but vital struggle for freedom, self-determination and justice.

The people of the free world are endlessly fed half-truths in the communications media to the end of accepting the Soviet viewpoint on "peaceful coexistence" and the abandonment of the captive nations, those "unpeoples" of the Russian communist empire. It is high time, however, that our spokesmen realize that incantations to the power of freedom are mere rhetoric, ineffectual, self-debasing and eventually suicidal, unless accompanied by a realistic confrontation with the self-avowed enemy.

Otherwise—although to be an "unpeople" is un-American—this may be our fate, too.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Unpeoples," *The Nation Killers*: The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities, Robert Conquest, *The Times Literary Supplement*, September 4, 1970, London.

[2] Cf. "A Chronicle of Resistance in Ukraine," by Valentyn Moroz, appearing elsewhere in this issue of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*.

[3] Cf. "Masyutko Condemns Russian Repressions in Ukraine," *ABN-Correspondence*, November-December 1970, p. 7, Munich.

[4] *Khrushchev Remembers*: With An Introduction, Commentary and Notes by Edward Crankshaw, Little, Brown & Co., 1970, New York, p. 172.

[5] Cf. Masyutko, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[6] *Polish Affairs and Problems of Central and Eastern Europe*, No. 84, July, 1970, London, pp. 42–43 Cf. "Ukrainians Fight Russification."

[7] *A New Strategy for Peace*: United States Foreign Policy for the 1970's. President Richard M. Nixon. A Report to Congress. February 18, 1970, Washington, D.C.

[8] "The Need to Breach the Conspiracy of Silence," Editorial, *East West Digest*, October, 1970, Vol. VI, No. pp. 293–294, London.

REMOVE BARRIERS TO IRISH IMMIGRATION

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day recalls the many contributions of Irish and other immigrants who helped build this country.

Today I have joined 56 of my colleagues in introducing a bill that will remove the last major barrier to Irish immigration. This bill will double the number of visas for Irish immigrants, as well as other European countries which have traditionally been sources of valuable immigrants.

The bill introduced by my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), would place a floor under immigration from every Nation. Each country would be guaranteed a minimum number of visas equal to 75 percent of its immigration between 1956 and 1965. No more than 10,000 visas could be issued to any one country. Unused visas would carry over to the next year.

For Ireland this would mean an increase from 1,150 visas in 1970 to more than 4,000 next year.

The Ryan bill would permit young men and women who do not qualify for a skilled labor certificate to enter the country without a job. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 required skilled professionals to have a firm job offer before they could enter the country.

The 1965 act severally limited Irish immigration. This restriction was not intended, but it has never been corrected.

Our history books are filled with the names of famous immigrants who came to this country with few skills and rose to the top of their professions. I feel it is in our Nation's best interest to give these new immigrants a chance to see what they can do.

GOOD CHOICE FOR NASA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle, Houston, Tex., who has been over the years a supporter of our space program, editorialized the selection of Dr. James C. Fletcher as the new head of NASA. I include the editorial which appeared on March 8, 1971, in the RECORD:

GOOD CHOICE FOR NASA

The man President Nixon has nominated to be the new administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has an impressive record of achievement.

Dr. James C. Fletcher, 51, a physicist who is president of the University of Utah, has worked as a scientist, a government advisor, a company president and an educator. He has an unusually broad background which combines his scientific knowhow and his organizing ability. He has been deeply involved in the government's space program.

A native of New Jersey, Dr. Fletcher is the son of a scientist, Dr. Harvey Fletcher, who was research director at the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

He was the organizer and president of a space electronics corporation and before that was organizer of another space company which was a subsidiary of Aerojet-General Corp. He served as associate director for the guided missile laboratory at Ramo-Woolridge Corp. and as a consultant for the secretary of defense, to the President's Science Advisory Committee, and to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

His associates at the University of Utah have described him as "uncommonly able."

He earned his bachelor's degree in science at Columbia University and his Ph.D. in physics and mathematics at the California Institute of Technology. He has taught both at Harvard and Princeton.

Dr. Fletcher has the necessary qualifications for his important new responsibility. We'll have to wait to see how he chooses to direct the space program, of course. He was quoted in the New York Times the other day as saying he intends to do some fresh thinking about the logic of the space program. He favors a greater emphasis on unmanned space ventures, particularly such projects as the "grand tour" of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune that is planned for the late '70s but has had little support thus far.

From the standpoint of the Manned Spacecraft Center here in Houston, that sounds somewhat disturbing. Yet he shouldn't be prejudged. He will be assuming a big job at a critical moment in the space program. We wish him well.

SUPERSONIC EXAGGERATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pointing out that backers of the SST are "really pulling out all the stops" in their campaign for continued Federal subsidy, a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal today comments:

In the process, though, some of them are sounding a little odd.

What the Journal picks out from all the sideline noise is the remark by presidential science adviser Edward E. David, Jr., that refusal to proceed would reflect "timidity and lack of courage" on the part of Congress and the country.

After debunking that one, the editorial acknowledges environmental uncertainties about the SST, then adds:

On a purely practical level, however, there's still the question of whether the supersonic transport will be commercially viable any time soon.

That brings to mind an SST overstatement in the President's 1972 budget. Referring to the two prototypes scheduled to be completed and flight tested during 1973, the budget asserts:

Federal funds will not be required after the flight testing since the experience from this program should enable the aviation industry to proceed to production of an economically efficient aircraft that will not create adverse environmental effects.

Yet, Richard L. Garwin, a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, has declared that:

First. Boeing and General Electric originally were to submit plans by June 30, 1968, for financing certification and production costs, but have been allowed to hold back their proposals. The deadline now has been postponed until 1972.

Second. The FAA's original contract with Boeing would have required the prototypes to have the same aerodynamic configuration as a safe and economically profitable production model, but under contract changes the prototypes need only show that a successful SST program—financed either publicly or privately—could emerge from their performance.

Given the lack of detailed financing plans and contract guarantees, we can

tell what is likely to happen by looking at the Anglo-French Concorde—the subsidized and unsold aircraft whose existence is so often cited as "proof" that the age of supersonic airliners has arrived.

The Concorde test and development program requires seven aircraft, not two. These are prototypes 001 and 002—now flying—preproduction aircraft 01—scheduled to fly late this year—and 02—now delayed until mid-1972—and three production aircraft.

Aviation Week & Space Technology, the McGraw-Hill publication, declares that the Concorde's performance "will be completely certified with the No. 2 production aircraft"; in other words, the sixth in the series.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Wall Street Journal editorial of March 4 follows:

SUPERSONIC COURAGE

A decisive vote on further federal subsidy for the supersonic transport will be coming soon in Congress, and the plane's backers are really pulling out all the stops. In the process, though, some of them are sounding a little odd.

The other day, for example, Presidential science adviser Edward E. David, Jr., said that refusal to go ahead with the supersonic subsidy would reflect "timidity and lack of courage" on the part of Congress and the country. The only way the nation can determine whether the SST will damage the environment, he said, is to build a couple of them and then see what happens.

"Make no mistake," Dr. David went on. "A limitation on experimentation in whatever cause is the beginning of wider suppression. When we fail to experiment, we fail. In failing, we bring the best part of American society, as we know it today, to a halt."

Let's back off from that one for a minute. The particular experiment we're talking about here is the creation of a special machine for the commercial transportation industry. That would be an interesting and possibly even a useful development, but it's hardly to be equated with general scientific advance, such as the search for a cure for cancer.

It's true that a great many Americans are concerned about sonic booms and other potentially damaging side effects of an SST. On a purely practical level, however, there's still the question of whether the supersonic transport will be commercially viable any time soon.

In recent months the airlines have been having a hard time financing, not to mention filling, the planes already available. If a wide demand for supersonic flight actually existed, there probably would be less need to lean so hard on federal subsidy.

For our part we remain unconvinced that more research can't answer those environmental questions. By that time perhaps the market would have changed so much that this private transportation project could be taken over by private enterprise.

FARM REAL ESTATE TAXES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article indicated that farm real estate taxes showed the biggest 1-year increase on record in the year 1969, rising by 11.1 percent. This marks the 27th consecutive year in which farm real estate taxes increased and I call this to the attention of my colleagues:

FARM REAL ESTATE TAXES IN U.S. ROSE 11 PERCENT IN 1969

WASHINGTON, March 10—The tightening money pinch, felt by local and state governments has produced a sharp new drain on farm income through rising real estate taxes, an Agriculture Department report indicates.

The report said that state and local taxes on farm real estate rose 11.1 per cent in 1969, the biggest one-year increase on record. The increase, the 27th consecutive one, brought total real estate taxes on American farms to nearly $2.3-billion.

Agriculture Department economists said that the reports covered taxes levied in 1969 and mostly payable last year. Data on taxes levied in 1970 and payable this year will show another increase, though the amount has not been determined, experts said.

THE PLIGHT OF THE RAILROADS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent series of articles on the financial plight of the country's railroad systems.

Christian Science Monitor Reporter Merelice K. England has put together a series of interviews with a wide range of those interested in the railroad systems—from train crew members to officials of the Department of Transportation.

This study of the problems of railroads today deserves the attention of all of us.

The material follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 4, 1971]

RAILROAD FINANCIAL CLOUD MAY HAVE SILVER LINING—PART I

(By Merelice K. England)

CHICAGO.—They stand dismally in big cities across the United States, former elegance now faded to cavernous dinginess—railroad passenger stations, symbols of decline.

In seeming contrast, tracks sing, cars bump, and cranes swing at many a freight yard as railroad freight tonnage—41 percent of all freight moved in the nation—keeps climbing. Yet railroads say they don't make enough profit on freight to finance new equipment or running repairs.

With continuing labor-union unrest which regularly raises the threat of nationwide strikes (though at this writing a strike this year seems unlikely), it all adds up to crisis—yet it is a crisis in which glimmers of hope are beginning to appear.

RAILPAX FORMED

Both Congress in Washington and railroad management itself have begun to act. Congress last year passed legislation setting up the semipublic National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Railpax), which goes into effect May 1. Railpax, which would take over a minimum network of routes, is seen by many experts as a workable solution to the passenger crisis, which has sent traveled passenger miles from 21 billion down to 12 billion per year during the 1960's. Air, road, and water transport has taken over.

Passenger lines are down from 11,000 in 1946 to less than 400 today.

Railroad management for its part, has come up with a report by its own American's Sound Transportation Review Organization (ASTRO).

FEDERAL AID SOUGHT

ASTRO's plans are to attract government aid that would keep American railroads in private hands, with renewed financial health. "Creative federal involvement" is the railroad term. The plans oppose the other alternative now the subject of widespread debate among management, the Nixon administration, unions, and passenger groups alike—government take-over by nationalization.

In an interview in Washington, James M. Beggs, Undersecretary of Transportation, says one encouraging sign in the overall crisis is that Congress—spurred on by the gigantic bankruptcy of the Penn Central Railroad—now is well aware that a crisis does exist. The awareness has not always existed, sources say.

MANY MILES OF TRACK

Despite constant complaints about having to maintain unneeded lines, the railroads have managed to lop off only 10,000 miles of physical track in the last decade and to prune a mere 40,000 miles since a peak of 249,433 miles of track 40 years ago.

There now are some 75 class I railroads—a figure that cannot accurately be compared with earlier figures since it represents many consolidations of carriers that, in merged form, still exist. Class I railroads have annual gross revenue of at least $5 million.

BANKRUPTCIES OCCUR

According to the Association of American Railroads (AAR), they operate 95 percent of the nation's railway mileage, employ almost 93 percent of its railroad workers, and handle more than 99 percent of railway freight and passenger traffic.

Three of them last year, besides Penn Central, have tumbled into bankruptcy, says Dr. Burton N. Behling, vice-president of economics and finance of the AAR which speaks for railroad management.

They include the Boston and Maine, Lehigh Valley, and Central of New Jersey: all Eastern roads. There is still concern that the ailing Pennsy could financially derail connecting roads.

When 1970's totals are tabulated, Dr. Behling estimates that "about 20 railroads will have deficits." Most of the roads not losing money still find they are spending it at a faster rate than they are making it.

Railroads, in a remarkable show of unanimity, started this decade determined to let people know a "countdown" for railroad survival had started.

PITCH TO PUBLIC

More than 2,000 railroad employees are making radio and TV speeches, addressing local meetings of civic clubs, and distributing explanatory brochures.

The AAR has had former astronaut Walter M. Schirra Jr. step onto TV screens with the down-to-earth message that everyone needs the railroads.

Gradually the railroads are also picking up the public's aroused concern about pollution on the highways and in the air.

The debate on nationalization grows, aided by the fact that except for a few lines in Canada, the United States has the only privately run railroad system in the world.

Notes Dr. John A. Bailey, director of the transportation center at Northwestern University: "Wherever the railroads are nationalized, they're in trouble. But if changed policies don't occur here [to improve the railroad,] we'll go ahead and nationalize anyway."

"LAST RESORT" SPECIFIED

Across the board, no one actually urges nationalization. It is always proposed only as a last resort." But Dr. Bailey is not alone in concluding that if no alternative solutions are successfully urged and proved effective,

there's a real possibility nationalization would win by default.

Railroad opinion. What individual railroad presidents say is summed up by the AAR:

Nationalization would be costly—an estimated "$60 billion merely to acquire privately owned railroad facilities." Simple takeover still would not have solved the problems. The government would then be responsible for making expensive improvements. (When the government took over the railroads in World War I, it lost about $2 million a day.)

The national railroads of Western Europe and Japan operate at an average 20 percent deficit—even though they often get interest-free financing and pay no taxes.

GOVERNMENT OPPOSED

Government outlook.

Undersecretary Beggs says of nationalization, "I dont like it."

His reasons: It's a multibillion dollar proposition, he says. The market value of the railroads today is $15-billion-to-$20 billion; the railroads claim $60 billion.

There is a tendency in nationalized service to improve what is visible—that is, the passenger service—and offer "lousy freight service," Mr. Beggs goes on. And, he says, other nationalized systems elsewhere are extremely overstaffed—in some cases admittedly "sopping up unemployment." Featherbedding makes for deficits, he adds.

Labor view.

Resistance here is less pronounced. The Congress of Railway Unions says only recently have some prominent brotherhood chiefs, when faced with critical negotiating problems, said it's the only way.

The labor congress consists of 75-to-80 percent of all railroad employees. Another labor group, the Railway Labor Executives' Association, wants a study done.

HOW PASSENGERS FEEL

Passenger opinion.

Anthony Haswell, chairman of the National Association of Railroad Passengers, agrees that nationalization needs to be studied. He calls the railroad's own estimate of their worth—$60 billion—"outrageous propaganda."

Though Mr. Haswell says he would choose nationalization over the "present state of affairs," he stresses that "the government does not have a particularly exciting record in running a business." He hopes Railpax will provide the answer for passengers.

Another area of some agreement: complaints about the role of the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) as the government's regulatory agency. There is even increasing evidence government itself agrees that railroads no longer should be restricted to turn-of-the-century rules, imposed at a time when the roads were abusing their power as a monopoly.

NEW AGENCY URGED

The ASTRO report seeks equal opportunity as follows: The railroads want the freedom to make changes in rates and services without delays pending ICC decision. They ask that a new agency be created "to regulate all modes with equality."

The railroads also want exemption from property taxes since highways and airports are public property. They ask help maintaining rights-of-way, government loans to buy and improve equipment, and a 10-year research-and-development program with the federal government sharing some of the research largess it has bestowed on airlines.

After railroads concede the need for self-improvement, they gingerly suggest in euphemistic language that unions eliminate featherbedding.

FEATHERBEDDING

Chief negotiator representing railroad management John P. Hiltz Jr., chairman of the National Railway Labor Conference, says 15 years ago, eliminating featherbedding in its entirety could have saved half a billion dollars a year. Since then, he says, the figure could have climbed to $1 billion a year.

Donald S. Beattie, executive secretary of the labor congress, defends, "Every so-called work rule on the books today was the product of collective bargaining."

One labor leader privately admits, "There's no question some work rules could and need to be modified. They are as old as the industry. And they will be modified, given the right attitude [of management]. But the trenches have been dug deep.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 6, 1971]

RAIL FREIGHT HIGHBALLS ON TROUBLED TRACKS—PART II

(By Merelice K. England)

ABOARD THE "SUPER C" BETWEEN CHICAGO AND LOS ANGELES.—Barreling down a long straight stretch of track, the high-speed train slices through the stillness of remote, flat, expansive Missouri farmland.

A huge flock of geese lifts and flutters as the engineer blows his whistle at them. The "whooo-whooo" of whistle signals float out to each tiny crossing—little-used, rutted dirt roads—then melt like mist into the morning air.

The day started bright and cold in the yards in Chicago; snow flurries set in briefly as the train rumbles on, now beside a frozen Mississippi River, now through a tiny township.

This is the views from the cab of the "Super C," the pride of the Santa Fe—the fastest freight train in the world. Speed is this train's major service.

Chicago to Los Angeles (2,213 track miles) is covered in less than 40 hours. Over 95 percent of runs are on-time, or early. For maximum speed (up to 80 miles an hour), no more than 15 to 20 cars are hauled—premium-rated, container and piggy-back freight. A large bulk of it is U.S. mail.

INDUSTRY MIXES GLOOM AND ELATION

Individual U.S. railroads, like the Sante Fe, can show ways they are improving freight services. But in the railroad freight industry as a whole, there exists a puzzling combination of elation and gloom.

Freight service is where the United States really depends on the railroads. Even though the railroads' share of freight transport has diminished in deference to pipelines, barges, trucks, and airlines, the actual amount of railroad freight is increasing.

Without railroad delivery, grocery stores run out of canned and frozen foods. Half our meat and dairy products come by train.

Without the coal that fires generating plants, lights and other electrical devices black out. Without its purification chemicals, drinking water stays untreated.

Intercity freight volume gained 33 percent (in ton miles) in the last decade. By 1980 railroads will be moving freight to an extraordinary one trillion ton-miles annually about 46 percent more than they do now—according to a projection by America's Sound Transportation Review Organization (ASTRO).

RAIL SHIPPING VITAL

Industries and their jobs depend on railroads—and would be hard-pressed to find alternative means of shipping if railroads ground to a long-term halt. For example, railroads have 71 percent of the household appliance shipping business, 76 percent of automobiles and automobile parts, 40 percent of furniture, 78 percent of lumber and wood, 73 percent of the cotton crop going to textile mills.

And yet the gloomy side: Like a young couple that finds the home of its dreams and doesn't have a down payment, railroads are frustrated by financial limitations.

With the industry in a generally depressed financial condition, capital for needed improvements is harder and harder to come by. Purchases and repairs are stalled. Result: chronic freight-car shortages, defective or excess tracks, and poor service—all of which turn shippers to other methods of transportation.

Defective tracks often mean derailments. In the two years between year-end 1967 and year-end 1969, the number of derailments went up 1,000 from 4,960 to 5,960. This was during a period in which the number of train-miles traveled dropped from 895 million to 864 million.

The bankrupt Penn Central would like to dispose of about 40 percent of its 20,000 miles of track. Long before the New Haven & Hartford Railroad went bankrupt, it had said it needed to abandon 1,200 miles.

TOO MUCH TRACKAGE

Even "successful" railroads are trying to shed excess trackages still requiring costly care. The Sante Fe currently has 830 miles scheduled for abandonment.

Most railroads grumble about long delays and refusals by the Interstate Commerce Commission when railroads want permission to drop both unprofitable service and little-used track mileage.

Yet many people—including James M. Beggs, Undersecretary of Transportation—suggest that railroads have not been as aggressive as they should have in pursuing such permission.

"Consequently we have 200,000 miles of right-of-way," notes Mr. Beggs. "Some experts are saying that's 100,000 miles too much. We agree with about 50,000 to 60,000."

HARVEST PEAKS A PROBLEM

Failings in the industry—though they might be limited to certain railroads—affect the whole system. As a Santa Fe spokesman points out, "We can run the wheels off a train to give a shipper fast service from Los Angeles to Kansas City. But if another railroad can't provide the same service and a car is idle for a few days somewhere, the shipper is unhappy with both of us."

Another industrywide problem which plagues even those with a good supply of rolling stock is that of freight-car shortages.

At peak harvest time, Western railroads often have to send out a call to Eastern roalroads asking for the return of their boxcars to haul grain. Financially bereft Eastern railroads sometimes hold on to such cars, finding it cheaper to pay per diem rental fees than to replenish their own rolling stock.

Undersecretary Beggs insists, "We must find a way to rationalize the car-shortage problem." He says it might require a government-backed loan program for purchase of a reserve fleet.

Mr. Beggs attributes the box-car shortage to the railroads' "$1 billion per year capital deficit during the last decade."

Beyond the shortage itself, however, Mr. Beggs also assails the inefficient use of cars already in stock. Cars are so underutilized, he notes, "the result is that the average box-car moves about six miles an hour, or is used the equivalent of two houre a day."

On the Santa Fe "Super C," crews change every two to three hours—18 different crews in all—because the train laps up 100 miles that often.

A day's work, by union rules, is 100 miles or eight hours—whichever is less. Railroad management call it "featherbedding" and lash out at such frequent and expensive crew changes. Unions call it "incentive" and say that by it, trains are moved faster.

TWO OR THREE RIDE CAB

When this correspondent recently rode in the diesel of the Super C (the first woman to do so), each crew consisted of at least the engineer, a brakeman up front (to pull the

emergency brake in case of need), and two brakemen in the caboose. Occasionally a "firemen" joined the diesel crew even though there no longer are any fires to feed and tend.

For the first stretch, to Chillicothe, Ill., the locomotive engineer was Charles A. Villanova, in jaunty kelly-green beret that matches his union pin. "I don't like to work—this just happens to be the best work I don't like to do," he quips.

The second stretch, to Fort Madison, Iowa (the train crew pronounced it eye-oh-way) brought the train through Galesburg, Ill., with its dozens of railroad crossings—one for every street marking every block.

At such a place, the engineer holds on to the whistle and brings the train down to a crawl. Even so, some motorists showed little respect for the train's length, tonnage, speed, and inability to stop quickly as they played "dodge 'em," trying to beat the overpowering diesel across the tracks.

Engineers can do without that, they say. Each year, a large proportion of railroad deaths and injuries are attributed to careless or undiscerning motorists at railroad crossings.

FREIGHT YARD VISITED

The train whistled on to Los Angeles, but this correspondent got off at Kansas City where another example of quick freight service is located—Santa Fe's Argentine freight yard.

Here, a switch engine pushed a line of cars, classified on arrival, up an incline. Once identified, a car is pushed over the "hump" and uncoupled by hand (the only job the railroad doesn't yet know how to automate).

The rumbling car slide down the humping track and over a weight-measuring rail (determining whether the car is full or empty).

Radar measures the car's acceleration and "retarders" compress against the squealing wheels, holding the car to four miles per hour. It is then automatically shunted to the right track as rail switches guide it along tracks spread out in a wide fan below the humping track—all under the benevolent eye of a computer.

As cars are "humped" and trains are "blocked" (put together) an inventory is kept, so that at any time the Santa Fe knows the location of rolling stock on its tracks. The system is meant to become part of a nationwide freight-car tracking system being developed in the industry.

SANTE FE—A MONEYMAKER

The Santa Fe Railroad is a moneymaker. Its freight business is good enough to more than offset passenger losses of $42 million last year. So the Santa Fe can afford to be innovative, not only at its yard operations but also in its equipment and services. It is in the forefront of developing such new cars as jumbo closed hoppers, autoveyors, flatcars, gondolas, and special-purpose boxcars.

Part of this correspondent's ride here from Chicago was on smooth, welded strips of rail several miles long which not only eliminate the constant clickety-click of rail joints but keeps bounciness at a minimum.

In Chicago, where the Super C originates, Santa Fe's piggyback operation is streamlined. While large trailer trucks are single-filed, parallel to railroad flatcars, a high-boxy crane scoots along. In five minutes, the crane clasps, lifts, and sweeps two trailers onto a flatcar.

And yet it will take even more efficient operations like the ones at Santa Fe's Argentine Yard to remedy such deficiencies as not knowing whether a freight car is empty or loaded, where it came from, where it is going next, or how it can be blocked to save steps at the next switching site.

FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE CRITICAL

The Association of American Railroads warns that freight operations are in trouble unless funds are pumped into needed areas—specifically, between now and 1980, $18.6 billion for freight cars, $6 billion for new locomotives, and $11.9 billion for rail and tie replacements.

Donald S. Beattie, executive secretary of the Congress of Railway Unions, considers the freight-car shortage and the inefficient use of cars the most important problem now facing the industry.

Mr. Beattie solicits shipper support and insists, "Shippers are willing to pay more money for reliable efficient service." He notes there will be at least three freight-car bills introduced in Congress this year, and he elaborates briefly on the approach of the bill being drawn up by his labor group, which would:

Set up a semi-public corporation patterned after the new legislated National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

Provide for government investment—"not a great deal"—with guaranteed loans and tax-exempt bonds. Income from corporation cars would then revolve to buy more cars.

Centralize computer control of the cars so that railroads would always have access to all cars.

"We can get 20 percent more utilization of freight cars if the industry runs as a nationwide system rather than as regional railroads," says Mr. Beattie. "Translated into dollars, that means huge savings just in using the equipment on hand."

Any bill to improve and modernize railroad freight service needs public support—certainly as much as that needed to set up a passenger corporation last year.

Sometimes nostalgia stands in the way. Some traditionlists find it hard to see railroading, so crucial to the nation's pioneering expansion and development, as a computerized industry in the space age—with hefty freight cars guided not by hundreds of rugged individuals in a freight yard but by a computer in a tower.

Yet this is the direction the railroad industry must take throughout the nation if it is to have any hope of keeping up with demands for service.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 8, 1971]

DEFICITS RIDE THE RAILS—PART III

(By Merelice K. England)

ABOARD THE CAPITOL LIMITED.—Promptly at 3:50 p.m., the mustard-yellow Capitol Limited gently eases its way out of its Chicago berth, its once proud name wearing an air of genteel poverty, symbol of an era fast fading.

For a single night this correspondent, in Car 66, Roomette 4, is one of a dwindling breed—the United States railroad passenger.

Empty cars, once full of passengers who now prefer faster and more glamorous plane travel . . . the nearly deserted railroad station, once bustling with people hurrying to catch their trains . . . nearby tracks, now unused and overgrown with weeds, and silent railway crossings where bells once warned of approaching trains. . . . All are symbols of the Capitol Limited's past glory.

The train picks up speed through Chicago's suburbs. It will touch base at Akron and Youngstown (both in northern Ohio) before cutting south to Pittsburgh and Cumberland, Md., then on down to Washington, D.C.

Less than 2 percent of America's intercity passengers now travel by train. Cars and planes have taken over the rest.

Railroads say they lose an estimated $200 million a year on passenger service. The National Association of Railroad Passengers admits the railroads could save more than $150 million a year if they dropped all remaining passenger service. But the association insists that it would be wrong to drop passengers—instead, service should be modernized and expanded, it says.

A few railroads—notably the Santa Fe, Southern, and Seaboard (East) Coast Line (complete with a fashion show on board)—still consider it good business to maintain attractive long-distance passenger service. They can still afford to.

Some 20,000 passenger trains ran in the United States in 1929. By 1946, the number had dropped to 11,000. In 1970, less than 400 remained, and more than 100 of these were seeking permission from the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue.

The heyday of passenger trains is gone, the days—before airplane travel—when all the trimmings that went with the journey made riding a train a memorable experience: elegant dining cars, luxurious comfort, swift service.

Aboard the Capitol Limited, train workers talk wistfully about the good old days. Once this train was known for its excellent cuisine. One conductor especially recalls its roquefort salad dressing. He adds: "Now, the dining-car fare is about average."

The train is moving along well. Passengers get ready for the evening meal. Once those in roomettes were served a free dinner in the dining car. Now they have to pay extra for it.

The answer, both for passengers and the railroads losing money on them, may be the new National Railroad Passenger Corporation, dubbed Railpax—the biggest thing to happen to railroad passengers since the invention of the Pullman car.

The quasi-public corporation was set up by the 1970 Congress to operate a nationwide rail-passenger service beginning May 1.

Twenty-one major U.S. cities have been designated as end points by John A. Volpe, Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Routes will be developed between these cities.

When Secretary Volpe announced this preliminary nucleus of a nationwide passenger network, he stressed: "I believe that Americans will ride the railroads in increasing numbers if they are given good, fast, clean, safe, and efficient service between metropolitan centers.

"I also believe that we need rail-passenger service," he continued, "or else the congestion on our highways and in our airways will become intolerable."

A mere 28 passengers ride the Capitol Limited—six first-class riders in double bedrooms or single roomettes. The rest are in the coach section with reclining seats for the overnight haul.

This correspondent has a private roomette which has its own bathroom facilities and passenger seat, the back of which pulls down for a bed. Roomette doors can be slid shut or left open.

For its 28 passengers, the diesel hauls two coach cars (one empty), a lounge car which provides reading material and snacks, a first-class sleeper car, and a dining car.

The basic fare is $42, just $6 less than coach air fare from Chicago to Washington. Yet a roomette costs an additional $40, for a total of $82. It's expensive.

But still the railroads lose money on passenger tickets. Railpax—the hope for the future—evolved when the railroads, burdened by the compulsory money-losing passenger runs, asked for help—and got more than they had bargained for.

Initially, the railroads sought federal legislation to be reimbursed for costly passenger runs whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission prohibited them from being dropped. Under that proposal, the railroads would not have made money. Yet the plan still would have meant more money

in their budgets, since continuing high losses would have been avoided.

But the railroads' plan—which would have kept them in charge of passenger service and schedules—was scuttled in favor of Railpax.

The board of Railpax will have 15 directors—eight appointed, with Senate approval, by the President and seven chosen by stockholders. Railpax will contract with relevant railroads to provide needed employees and track passages for the passenger routes it develops.

Whatever routes are designated now at the start of the system's operation must be kept running at least until July 1, 1973. If at that time, Railpax decides a train is no longer needed by the public or that it impairs the corporation's overall services, the train can be discontinued. But if a state or other local agency then offers to reimburse Railpax for at least two-thirds of the losses attributed to such services, the train cannot be dropped.

In either case, such a decision no longer falls into the bailiwick of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Railpax is on its own.

Railroads don't have to join Railpax. But it is expected that most will, since those that do not, must continue to operate all their present passenger trains until Jan. 1, 1975.

Those railroads that do join Railpax may drop all their own passenger service as of May 1. Then, in exchange for payments based on their present passenger-service losses, railroads can receive common stock in the corporation. Their payments, at the option of Railpax, might sometimes be made by transferring equipment or providing future services to the corporation.

According to a spokesman for the Federal Railroad Administration: "There is no question that the corporation will operate at a deficit at the beginning. But the idea is to turn the corner and make the system economically viable."

Congress authorized $40 million in seed money for Railpax. The railroads will shell out some $200 million (not much more than their annual losses for providing passenger service). And additional funds are available for loans—both to Railpax and to railroads needing financial assistance in joining.

"Tickets please." The railroad personnel here on the Capitol Limited are friendly, but the mood on this train is different from airlines: sedate rather than glamorous or swinging.

A relaxed, slow pace, in fact, is one railroad characteristic that keeps B. Morris Hopkins—a neighboring roomette passenger—riding the trains. A resident of Scott City, Kans., Dr. Hopkins is en route to a convention in Washington. He says he appreciates a couple of days away from the telephone where he can work and read undisturbed.

The train, with its 28 passengers, is quiet. Some passengers remember back to when all the seats were filled; when they had to wait in line to get served in the dining car.

Dr. Hopkins observes, "I don't like to fly." But he adds, "I don't think it makes sense to keep running trains like this for just a few people like me."

The railroads agree. Explains James A. Schultz, a vice-president at the Association of American Railroads: "Just as the stagecoach had no role when the railroad came along, running passenger trains is detrimental to the whole railroad system."

Mr. Schultz continues, "At one time our attitude was 'so what? We can make up for the loss through freight earnings.' "

But passenger losses ballooned, freight competition stiffened, and railroads decided they couldn't be so blase.

On the other side of the coin, Donald S. Beattie—executive secretary of the Congress of Railway Unions—charges that the railroads "deliberately ran [passenger service] into the ground. They preferred handling freight rather than people."

In agreement, Anthony Haswell—energetic chairman of the National Association of Railroad Passengers—points out: "We have been fighting in court to keep management from walking away from passengers. They have done everything they can to get rid of us."

Passenger complaints include the growing scarcity of conveniently timed service and the dirt and decrepitude of many passenger lines.

Aboard the Capitol Limited a porter comes to ask what time each passenger wants to be awakened in the morning. But no one is awakened—and no one is reminded of the change in time zone before going to bed. We lose an hour.

"You don't need any explanations, do you?" asks a porter, with a reassuring sweep of his arm that implies they'll be no problems learning the details of riding an overnight train. But soon one discovers on his own that all water, including drinking water, is shut off at station stops, and that the air vent circulates hot air instead of fresh air.

"Actually, passenger service was one of our assets until the financial situation got more and more bleak," says Mr. Schultz, defending the railroads. "Now it's one of our biggest public-relations problems. People don't realize that passengers are only a very small fraction of the whole industry."

James M. Beggs, Undersecretary of Transportation, says: "Personally, I don't see railroads regaining any position in long-distance passenger service. We should maintain a minimum of such service. But it won't grow."

"By 1985," Mr. Beggs continues, "85 to 90 percent of the people will live in population corridors. The demand for mobility still will be strong, and it will be for short-stage distances. Railpax will show that in such cases—300 to 400 miles—trains can be competitive with planes. If they can carry 60 to 70 percent capacity, they will make money."

Mr. Beggs' comments are not just speculation. Recent experience with the frequent high-speed Metroliner runs between Washington and New York already bears him out.

Added to that is the one-round-trip-a-day TurboTrain between New York and Boston. Both enjoy significant popularity with the traveling public in the Northeast Corridor.

Irving Banner, a businessman from Boston, explained to me during a recent Turbo trip that he became a rider for two reasons: It avoided the hassle and delay of getting to and from airports at each end. And it was less expensive.

A fellow passenger on the same train, Lawrence I. Phillips of Boston emphasized the same two reasons and added two more: His time is better spent on the train getting some work done than it would be getting to an airport. And he finds the airplane confining in comparison.

Both men justifiably complain, however, that the railroad bed and track are not good enough to test the Turbo's true potential for speeds well over 100 m.p.h. The ride on that trip, in fact, did not exceed 70 m.p.h. and the ride was jouncy.

According to the Federal Railroad Administration, the Turbo is "an exercise in equipment" to test whether the train can maintain speed around curves—thus eliminating the costly need to straighten track routes for high-speed travel.

In contrast, the Metroliner is regarded as "an exercise in people" to determine whether masses of people can be attracted back to the railroad. Its service is fast and smooth. About half its passengers have switched from other methods of travel. And about 80 percent of them say they'll stick with the Metro.

As Mr. Haswell of the passenger association notes: Trains over short-to-medium distances between cities can run fast enough to nullify planes in downtown-to-downtown service.

Meanwhile, daily commuters—by far the largest number of railroad passengers—are not included in the Railpax system. Their plight is yet another chapter in the woes of the railroad wayfarer.

How long trains like the Capitol Limited will run is another open question. A Chicago-to-Washington run will be part of the Railpax service. But the route could be quite different.

It's been a clear night and now it's a sunny morning churning through the Appalachian Mountains and cutting through small Maryland towns. Then the Capitol Limited backs into Washington's Union Station—at 10:40 a.m.—only 40 minutes late.

As the train brakes slowly to a halt, this correspondent recalls a recent telephone conversation with the railroad man she will soon be interviewing—at the only time he is available. Concerned about undependable rail service and that she might arrive too late, he had asked: "Couldn't you fly instead?"

ROTC, MYLAI, AND THE VOLUNTEER ARMY: CITIZEN SOLDIERS AGAINST PROFESSIONALS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the question of ending military conscription is before this Congress. It is not an easy question.

In the Sunday, March 14 Washington Post, Senator ALAN CRANSTON of California effectively presents the arguments against the so-called "citizen-soldier" idea. In Senator CRANSTON's words, advocates of this thesis "contend that the draft must be maintained to insure civilian influence within the military."

Most who support continuance of the draft, because they want to maintain the "citizen-soldier" influence also advocate basic changes in the existing draft law. The end of student deferments, establishment of a uniform national draft call, draft ceilings which limit the Presidential ability to induct men, a liberalized conscientious objection statute and a prohibition against sending draftees into a combat zone unless Congress has acted are some of the reforms advocated.

Mr. Speaker, a permanent military force of 2.5 million officers and men, consisting solely of volunteers, is not attractive to me. I share some of the concerns expressed by those pressing for a voluntary military. But, to quote the authors of "ROTC, Mylai, and the Volunteer Army" which appears in the spring 1971 issue of Foreign Policy:

> If you don't like the way the military functions, you can't expect it to improve by insulating yourself from it.

The "citizen-soldier," or even better, the "citizen-officer" issue should be at the center of the voluntary military debate. I think it will be useful to collect in one place three of the best articles devoted to this subject. They are the Cranston article, the Foreign Policy

article, and a statement authored by two career officers Col. Donald F. Bletz, USA, and Capt. Robert J. Hanks, USN, which appeared in the Sunday, February 14, 1971 Washington Post.

I also include two statements from the March 13 National Journal, which consider the role played by the draft in stimulating enlistments and participation in programs such as the ROTC:

[From the Foreign Policy, Spring 1971]

ROTC, MYLAI, AND THE VOLUNTARY ARMY

(By Ed Berger, Larry Flatley, John Frisch, Mayda Gottlieb, Judy Haisley, Peter Karsten, Larry Pexton, and William Worrest)

Voluntary professionals may replace citizen-soldiers in the American armed forces of the 1970's. Apart from the question of draft reform and plans to end conscription entirely after Vietnam, widely discussed in Washington today, the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) is under attack on many of the nation's campuses. ROTC has been asked to leave a number of universities, while falling enrollments, broken windows, burned-out offices and a hostile student environment have led each of the three armed services to cancel some of their programs. Still, ROTC currently provides a majority of the career officers in the military services as well as the reserve system.

ROTC has made an inviting target for critics of the Vietnam war. Those seeking ROTC's demise have also made much of the indoctrinary nature of its curriculum, the presence of external, government control of the program, and the militarization they feel that the ROTC student experiences—all occurring within an academic setting with the contrary goal of liberating and stimulating the students' powers of inquiry.

Defenders of ROTC have warned that its removal from the nation's campuses would severely injure the efficiency of a military that has increasingly come to depend on the technical and managerial skills that the ROTC graduate can offer. Such an argument is not a very telling blow to the case of the critics. Indeed, many of these critics are quite satisfied with an arrangement which may weaken the ability of the government to prosecute its policies in Southeast Asia, at the same time that it rids the campuses of an alien spirit. But several ROTC defenders have offered an argument that does alarm some of the critics.

ROTC AGAINST THE PROS

These defenders have argued that dismantling ROTC would result in an increase in the number of officers recruited from the enlisted ranks and in the size or number of the service academies. In the former case—recruitment from the ranks—tests have established that the average enlisted man, with less than a college education, scores higher on psychological attitude scales measuring authoritarianism, acceptance of military idealogy, and aggression than does the average college-bred officer candidate.[1] These same ROTC defenders have then claimed (without verifying the claim) that the latter case—an increase in the number of service academy graduates—would have the same effect. The average West Pointer or Annapolis graduate, they argue, is less flexible and able to think for himself than the average ROTC or Officer Candidate School (ocs) officer. Thus ROTC and ocs officers may provide a desirable "leavening," a counterbalance to the more aggressive values of academy graduates and "rankers." The Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges put it this way in a recent report: "The continued presence in substantial numbers in the Armed Forces of officers from a wide variety of civilian educational institutions and backgrounds is one of the best guarantees against the establishment in this country of a military caste or clique . . ."[2]

For those critical of the presence of formally accredited ROTC programs on campus, the suggestion that the death of ROTC would result in expansion of service academies and enlisted-oriented ocs programs should provoke serious reflection. If the citizen-officer defenders are correct, any changes in present recruitment that would result in a significant increase in the flow of professional soldiers from the enlisted and academy ranks might be counterproductive. That is the demise of ROTC would only temporarily dislocate military leadership plans. And any increase in the percentage of authoritarian, aggressive "leaders" would, we submit, be undesirable. But are the citizen-officer defenders correct?

The question concerns the nature of citizen-officers—ROTC and college-grad ocs types who serve for two or three years as platoon and company grade officers or pilots and then either stay on as careerists or (in most cases) resign. Some citizen-officers rise to high command, but all, whether they stay on or not, may be faced as lieutenants, due to the nature of modern, dispersed military deployment, with awesome on-the-spot decisions. For the inhabitants of many a Vietnamese hamlet or river village, survival may well depend on the attitude of the platoon leader, gunboat skipper, or helicopter gunship pilot approaching, guns trained, on their homes.

We know that the average ROTC or college grad ocs student scores lower on F-scale (authoritarianism) psychological measurements than the average enlisted man or non-college peer.[3] Thus, for those concerned about the attitudes and values of individuals placed in positions of military authority and responsibility the ROTC or college grad ocs officer would appear to be a safer bet than one acquiring his commission without first acquiring a college degree. It is probably not simply the fact of the college experience that makes the difference. Less advantaged youths, after all receive a different moral education in their environments than do the college-bound suburban children of the middle and upper-middle classes. But, for whatever reasons the difference between the two potential military leader groups is a known significant quantity.

What is unknown is just how such ROTC students compare with their service academy counterparts. Are the ROTC types more "flexible" than the academy types, as claimed? One leader of the anti-ROTC movement at Harvard thinks not: "An officer trained at Princeton kills on orders as quickly as an officer trained at the Point."[4] Is there any significant attitudinal distinction between the two types at all?

MEASURING ATTITUDES

The best way of answering such a question would be to measure the attitudes of the two groups in the field a year or two after graduation or commissioning. But the Defense Department does not appear ever to have conducted such an investigation; and our own research capacities did not allow for such an analysis. We had to be satisfied with administering an attitude questionnaire (with a near 100 percent response) in the spring and fall of 1970, to 90 randomly selected service academy (Annapolis) students, 177 ROTC students (110 Air Force and Army ROTC students from the University of Pittsburgh and 67 Naval ROTC students from Ohio State University) and 117 male non-ROTC college undergraduates.[5] Such a comparison may be of limited value if earlier researchers are correct when they claim that ROTC graduates quickly adjust and adapt to the codes and mores of the professional military. But such a claim is highly moot, and even if a certain amount of adjustment and adaptation does occur if significant differences between ROTC and academy types exist upon entry into the officer corps, it seems reasonable to expect that some of those differences would persist.[6]

Over the years, a number of studies have been made using attitude questionnaires to analyze service academy students, and to compare ROTC undergrads to non-ROTC undergrads. But to the best of our knowledge service academy and ROTC students have never been systematically compared. C. J. Lammers has compared the development of values and attitudes, i.e., the "socialization," of Royal Netherlands Naval College midshipmen and Candidate Reserve Officers, but the circumstances of that socialization process are not altogether the same as those we are dealing with. And furthermore Lammers was concerned only with "the socialization process," not with attitudes. John Lovell, in his study of "the professional socialization of the West Point cadet," compared West Pointers to a sampling of Dartmouth students, 82 percent of whom expected to perform military service upon graduation, but the sample did not appear to be exclusively composed of ROTC students, and Lovell did not pursue the attitudinal comparison very far. R. W. Gage and William A. Lucas have compared the attitudes of ROTC and non-ROTC students, and both have concluded that ROTC students are significantly more accepting of authority and military ideology than non-ROTC students; but neither study included a sampling of service academy students.[7] Thus the need for our own study.

THREE GROUPS

Our three sample groups do not spring from precisely the same social background. In terms of family income, parents' level of education, and father's occupation, our Annapolis respondents come from families with slightly higher incomes, better educated parents, and more professional fathers than either the non-ROTC students, who were next, or the ROTC students, whose social origins were slightly more humble than either of the other groups. But these differences in social origins are not relevant to the differences we found in the attitudes of members of our three groups—that is, *there was no difference in the response of representatives of one level of social origin from those of any other level.*

This surprised us, since one would expect lower class respondents to be somewhat more authoritarian than those whose parents were college graduates and professional people. And this would probably have been the case if our respondents had been sampled at random from the public at large. But Annapolis students were overrepresented in the upper economic echelons. And since these same Annapolis students were consistently more authoritarian, absolutistic, and militaristic than either of the other two groups, the "class differentials" were neutralized.

R. W. Gage, in his earlier study, found that ROTC students were more "patriotic" and accepting of military discipline than non-ROTC college students,[8] and we found that ranking to apply with every aspect of aggressiveness, absolutism, "patriotism," and military discipline tested for. *But our service academy students were consistently more aggressive and absolutistic than our* ROTC *sample.* When asked what their reaction might be if, while walking with their girl friend, someone were to make "a vulgar, obscene comment about her," nearly half (49 percent) of our sample of Annapolis officers-and-gentlemen-to-be indicated that they would offer some form of physical response, typically: "I'd kick his teeth in." Only 31 percent of the ROTC sample, and only 23 percent of the non-ROTC group, gave similar responses (see Table 1). No less than 60 of the 90 Annapolis respondents indicated that, if given the choice, they would prefer to serve in a "combat" capacity, while only 32 percent of ROTC students preferred "combat" duty to the alternatives offered: administrative or technical work. The question was more hypothetical for the non-ROTC male undergradu-

Footnotes at end of article.

ates, many of whom will see no service at all, but, for what it is worth, predictably, only 8 percent indicated that they would prefer combat service to the other less belligerent options.

TABLE 1

[In percent]

	Offer physical response to insult to girl friend	Offer verbal response or ignore insult	Prefer combat duty	Prefer administrative or technical service
Annapolis (90)	49.9(44)	16.1(29)	66.7(60)	25.5(23)
ROTC (177)	31.6(56)	57.6(102)	32.0(57)	64.0(113)
Non-ROTC control group (117)	23.0(27)	62.4(73)	7.7(9)	69.0(81)

Note: Figures do not always total 100 percent because some respondents had "no opinion" or "no preference."

John Lovell long ago noted that West Point students "tend to be more 'absolutistic' in their strategic perspectives than their Dartmouth peers." [9] Our study revealed the same distinction between our Annapolis and our Pittsburgh-Ohio State sample (see Table 2). Seventy-seven percent of the Annapolis sample agreed with the statement, "war is the inevitable result of man's nature," while only 55.3 percent of the ROTC, and 39 percent of the non-ROTC samples agreed. And twice as many Annapolis students (24 percent) agreed *strongly* with that statement as their Pittsburgh-Ohio State peers. No less than one in every three midshipmen could conceive of circumstances in which a takeover of the U.S. government by the military would be justified, while only 19.5 percent of ROTC, and 18 percent of non-ROTC students, were of the same mind. Only 8 percent of the non-ROTC "control" sample felt that the U.S. should ever use nuclear weapons in situations other than retaliation. A larger percentage (16 percent) of ROTC students, and a still larger percentage (28 percent) of Annapolis students were "first-strikers."

"MY COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG"

While only 39 percent of our *combined* sample of academy and ROTC officer candidates indicated that they would obey orders morally repugnant to them (see Table 3), nearly half (48 percent) of all our officer candidates who indicated a preference for combat duty, and 44 percent of those who indicated that they would offer physical violence to one who insulted their girl friend, would obey such orders. The same positive correlation between aggressive propensities and what we regard as undesirable behavior exists with regard to our questions about the use of nuclear weapons. Less than one in every five (19.5 percent) of our *combined* samples of officer candidates felt that the U.S. should ever strike first with nuclear weapons. But 27.3 percent of those showing a preference for combat duty, and 28 percent or our "physical force" group, were nuclear "first-strikers."

TABLE 2

[In percent]

	Agree that "war is the inevitable result of man's nature."	Disagree	Military Takeover might be justified	Regard "First-strike" use as acceptable
Annapolis	77(68)	22(20)	33.3(30)	28(25)
ROTC	55.3(98)	37(65)	19.5(34)	16(28)
Non-ROTC control group	39(46)	47.8(56)	18(20)	8(10)

Our heroic fighter sample were not the only ones to correlate positively to "first-strikers." We asked our subjects whether or not they agreed that "the practice of war is a science best left to professionals." Of those who agreed, 28 percent were also "first-strikers" (Table 3). One West Point cadet may have spoken for this group when he recently observed that "small tac nukes" could be of considerable value in suppressing revolution in Latin America: "Well, you have got to hold the spread of Communism [which he defined as 'sedition, and so forth'] down, and keep whoever is in government *there*. That's what's important." Lieutenant William Calley says that he went to Vietnam "with the absolute philosophy that the U.S.A.'s right. And there was no grey . . . there was just black or white." In another interview he told John Sack: "I'll do as I'm told to do. I won't revolt. I'll put the will of America above my own conscience, always." [10]

Moreover, as in the case of our fighter group, no less than 53.6 percent of those who agreed that war was a science best left to the control of pros indicated that they would obey morally repugnant orders. Over half (51.7 percent) of all officer candidates agreed with that pre-Nuremberg canon of the ardent statist, "My country, right or wrong," but no less than 67.2 percent of those feeling war to be a science best left to professionals, and approximately the same percentage of "fighter" types found this conscience-evading dogma attractive.

For one familiar with Morris Janowitz's distinction between "heroic" and "managerial" professional military officers,[11] this high correlation between "fighters," "professionals," service academy students (see Table 3), and undesirable propensities may be somewhat surprising, unless one is also familiar with John Lovell's research. Lovell could find no statistically significant difference at West Point between "heroic" fighter types and "managerial" types (our "pros") in terms of absolutism.[12] "Pros" are just as dangerous to have around as "fighters."

TABLE 3

[In percent]

	Percent who would obey morally repugnant orders	Percent who consider "first strike" to be acceptable	Percent who agree with "my country, right or wrong"
Combined officer candidates (267)	39.0(105)	19.5(52)	52.0(138)
Officer candidates preferring combat (117)	48.0(56)	27.3(32)	63.2(74)
Officer candidates offering physical force response (100)	44.0(44)	28.0(28)	69.0(69)
Officer candidates feeling war a science for professionals (125)	53.6(67)	28.0(35)	67.2(84)
Annapolis sample (90)	41.0(67)	28.0(25)	74.0(67)
ROTC			40.0(71)
Non-ROTC			19.5(23)

THE SCIENCE OF WAR

How did our three categories of students like the "pro" and "statist" tenets? No less than 72 percent of Annapolis respondents agreed with the remark that war was a science best left to professionals (with 33.3 percent agreeing *strongly*), whereas only 47.5 percent of our ROTC "citizen" officer candidates, and only 18 percent of the non-ROTC "control" group, agreed. And the same pattern held for the dogma found to be so attractive to our "pros." Almost three of every four Annapolis students sampled (74 percent) found the adage of Captain Stephen Decatur, U.S.N., "My country, right or wrong," to be attractive, whereas only 40 percent of the ROTC and 19.5 percent of the non-ROTC students approved of this pre-Nuremberg code of conduct.

The attitudinal distinctions occurred again when our subjects were asked their opinions about the military budget and the war in Vietnam. Only a few non-ROTC students and only a handful of the ROTC sample felt the military budget was too small (Table 4), but 39 percent of the Annapolis sample thought the budget inadequate. On questions relating to the Vietnam war, however, ROTC students were closer to their fellow officer-candidates than they were to their non-officer-bound peers. Four of every five non-ROTC students objected to the war in Vietnam, while only 36.7 percent of ROTC, and 28 percent of Annapolis students found the war objectionable. Only 10 percent of our sample of non-ROTC students expressed a willingness to volunteer for service in Vietnam, while 40 percent of the ROTC, and 60 percent of the Annapolis samples indicated they would volunteer for that war. Only one of every four non-officer candidate respondents imagined that he would obey a direct order morally repugnant to him; no less than 38 percent of the ROTC sample and 41 percent of the Annapolis sample indicated that they would obey such an order. Only 18.7 percent of non-ROTC students felt that the atrocities committed at Mylai were "extremely rare" in Vietnam, but the same percentage (37 percent) of the ROTC and Annapolis samples considered Mylai extremely rare."

TABLE 4

[In percent]

	Military budget too small	Object to presence of U.S. troops in Vietnam	Would volunteer for Vietnam	Consider Mylai extremely rare
Annapolis	39(35)	28.0(25)	60(54)	37.0(32)
ROTC	10(18)	36.7(65)	40(71)	37.0(67)
Non-ROTC control group	4(5)	78.5(92)	10(12)	18.7(22)

It could be argued that our officer candidate groups, having once committed themselves to military service, find Vietnam tolerable and Mylai exceptional largely because they recognize that they must live with a decision to serve that may one day thrust them into a Southeast Asian rice paddy or river delta. They may have come to accept the validity of "morally repugnant orders" as a result of their introduction to the military's traditions, mores, and missions—the military's point of view.

However, we think it more likely that they were *always* more positive toward the war and the military than those who avoided the officer candidate programs. We suspect that the reasons for the persistent attitudinal differences between those who are officer candidates and those who are not lie primarily in the process of self-recruitment by which means they selected military futures in the first place, and less in the process of military "socialization" taking place as they prepare for command. Our reasons are twofold, having to do with (1) self-selection and (2) the impotence of "militarization."

The research of William Lucas and C. J. Lammers shows that there is a self-selection process at work in both the American ROTC and the Dutch naval officer corps. "Militaristic" young men elect at age 17 or 18 to pursue a course that will make them officers.[13] Moreover, Lammers notes that the regular academy midshipmen, many the sons of naval officers, are considerably more accepting of military ideology than their reserve officer candidate counterparts.[14] That seems to be the case with our service academy and ROTC samples, and the reason may well be related to the reasons they gave for selecting Annapolis or ROTC. Nearly half of the Annapolis sample (48 percent) indicated that one of their reasons for seeking appointment was a desire to "be a career officer." Only 17 percent of the ROTC sample indicated that such ambitions had motivated them (Table 5). Nearly three in every four (73 percent) of the ROTC sample confessed that a prime motive for joining the program was a "preference to serve as an officer versus an enlisted man"

Footnotes at end or article.

(a few wrote in "to dodge the draft"). Slightly more Annapolis (26 percent) than ROTC (19.2 percent) students indicated that an important reason for joining was a "belief in military traditions and methods." Conversely, nearly half (47.5 percent) of the ROTC sample said that an important reason for seeking a commission was a desire to secure "training for assuming positions of responsibility in civilian life," while only 36.5 percent of career-bound Annapolis midshipmen gave a similar response. In short, the ROTC students appear to have more limited and "practical" reasons for service than the professional-minded middies. As one anonymous Annapolis ditty puts it:

Some join for the love of the Service,
Some join for the love of the Sea,
But I know a guy who's in Rotcie;
He joined for a college degree.

Similarly, just as Lammers found disproportionate numbers of naval officers' parents in his sample of Royal Netherlands Naval College midshipmen, we found that the fathers of 33.3 percent of our Annapolis, 12.4 percent of our ROTC, and only 2.3 percent of our non-ROTC samples had been commissioned officers. Moreover, when we added those whose fathers had served in a non-commissioned status we got similar results (see Table 6). Apparently many of the sons of military officers seek programs that will allow them to emulate their fathers.

THE IMPOTENCE OF MILITARIZATION

Once in the programs, a buttressing of prejudgments, values, and goals may occur. C. J. Lammers and William Lucas both maintain that officer candidates "socialize" one another over time, and Lammers hypothesizes that where initial motivation is low, such "socialization" may actually serve to drive the student out of the program.[15] But when we asked respondents to recall views held on entering college, or created an *ersatz* time-lapse by comparing various school years, *we did not find evidence of any significant shifts on the part of either officer candidate group in a direction away from that the non-officer candidate group might be taking.* All three groups, for example, showed a slight increase, from freshmen to seniors, in opposition to the war in Vietnam, a slight shift from conservative to moderate, or from moderate to liberal views, and a slight move toward a more critical view of the size of the military budget. In the case of immoral orders, to offer one illustration (see Table 7), fewer and fewer officer candidates indicated a willingness to obey immoral orders with each succeeding class. Not all of these differences were statistically significant, but they all point in the same direction as John Lovell's study of West Pointers, the Feldman-Newcomb study of college undergrads, and the Campbell-McCormack study of Air Force Academy classes.[16] Thus we feel that while there may be some reinforcing of previously held values taking place within the officer candidate programs that we did not detect, we doubt that there are many new values being created.

TABLE 5.—REASONS IMPORTANT IN DECISION TO SEEK COMMISSION

[In percent]

	Desire to make a career of military	Due to belief in military traditions and methods	Desire training for responsibilities in future civilian life	Prefer to be officer rather than enlisted man
Annapolis	48(43)	26(23)	36.5(31)	56(49)
ROTC	17(29)	19.2(34)	47.5(84)	73(130)

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 6

[In percent]

	Father a commissioned officer	Father served in military in some capacity
Annapolis	33.3(30)	89.0(80)
ROTC	12.4(22)	81.7(145)
Non-ROTC control group	2.3(3)	68.2(80)

Surely some traditions, mores, attitudes are "learned" by officer candidates—particularly by those at the "closed-circuit" service academies—but our data leads us to claim that the differences between our three subject samples are less a function of in-house "militarization" or "humanization" than they are a function of a self-selection (or joint-selection) process occurring when young men of 17 decide whether to seek a professional military career, or a program that offers leadership training for future civilian life and a chance to serve as an officer rather than an enlisted man, or no voluntary military service at all. It is this decision that separates the "fighters" and "pros" from the "citizen soldiers" and "civilian types." The liberal arts environment of academe may have *something* to do with the fact that ROTC students are less absolutistic, less aggressive, less militaristic than service academy students, but *our* data could not prove it. Furthermore if ROTC *units on campus do not significantly "militarize" any of those who volunteer to take their programs, neither do we find any evidence suggesting that the "liberal arts" environment of academe does any "liberalizing" of ROTC students.* The responses of freshmen ROTC students fall between those of their Annapolis and non-ROTC peers, and so do those of sophomores, juniors, and seniors. College education, four years of relative insulation from the school of hard knocks, apparently "humanizes" *all three* groups at approximately the same pace. If pre-college self-recruitment is the key factor, then the *particular* college environment may make very little difference, since our evidence, as well as the Lovell and Campbell-McCormack studies, suggest that there may be a progressive softening of many of the "hard-line" views held as freshmen by members of all three groups.

THE MYLAI MENTALITY

In the spring of 1969, Ronald Ridenhour, a college-bound Vietnam veteran, precipitated an investigation into the March, 1968 massacre of the villagers of Mylai. Before the dust had settled, two generals, three colonels, nine other officers, and six enlisted personnel faced courts martial.

TABLE 7.—WOULD OBEY ORDERS MORALLY REPUGNANT

	Percent
Combined Officer Candidate Freshman (78)	48.5(38)
Combined Officer Candidate Sophomores (55)	42(23)
Combined Officer Candidate Juniors (62)	35.5(22)
Combined Officer Candidate Seniors (70)	30(21)

Of the 20 men (14 officers and six enlisted men) involved, facing charges ranging from mass murder to suppressing evidence, one (Major General Samuel Koster) was a West Pointer. One (Brigadier General George Young) was a graduate of Columbia Military Academy and The Citadel ("the West Point of the South"). Twelve, including six of the officers, had entered the Army as enlisted personnel with high school educations. These included Captain Ernest Medina (charged with murder), Captain Eugene Kotouc (charged with murder), Captain Kenneth Boatman, Captain Dennis Johnson, Major Robert McKnight, Colonel Robert Luper (all charged with suppressing evidence or making false official statements), and six enlisted personnel, four of whom were charged with murder. Of the remaining six officers all had attended colleges in the South, several for only a year or two. These were First Lieutenant William Calley (charged with murder), who had attended one year of junior college, Captain Thomas Willingham (charged with murder), a graduate of Murray State College, Kentucky, Major Charles Calhoun, a Clemson graduate, Lieutenant Colonel William Guinn, who had attended the University of Tennessee and the University of Alabama, Lieutenant Colonel David Gavin, a graduate of Mississippi Southern College, and Colonel Oran Henderson, who attended military base extension centers of the University of Maryland and George Washington University. Captain Willingham, the Murray State graduate, was the only one of the eight charged as principals in the massacre who was a college graduate.

Members of one platoon, Lieutenant Calley's, were accused of committing the vast majority of the murders. The platoon appears to have developed the impression (as one of its members put it) that "if they wanted to do something wrong, it was all right with Calley. He didn't try to stop them." Calley impressed one soldier as "a kid trying to play war."

A few weeks before Mylai, Calley ordered one of his men Pfc. Michael Bernhardt, to shoot a woman running from them. Bernhardt called in Vietnamese for the woman to stop, but did not fire on her when she continued to run. Bernhardt was convinced that the woman was a noncombatant, but Calley was furious. Thereafter, Bernhardt explained, "I would just fire and miss on purpose. . . ." Bernhardt had been a junior and an ROTC honor student at the University of Miami before he enlisted "to test [his] courage under fire." Consequently he was only a private when his platoon entered Mylai. Bernhardt was the last of his platoon to enter the village. He was appalled by the indiscriminate killing going on. When he spoke of reporting the massacre to his congressman, Captain Medina warned him to keep silent. Bernhardt was the key source of Ronald Ridenhour's information about Mylai, and was a willing witness before the two non-West Pointers, Colonel William Wilson and General William Peers, who pressed home the overdue investigation.

When it appeared possible that the White House or the Army was prepared to allow Lieutenant Calley to leave the service before being formally charged with any crime, Captain William Hill, a reservist and thoroughly "civilianist" legal officer at Fort Benning (to which post Calley had been transferred during the course of the investigation), urged his careerist superior to overcome his reluctance to offend higher-ups and "to go ahead with the trial even if he had to defy the Pentagon [or the White House]." Hill was instrumental in precipitating the lodging of formal charges against Calley a day before Calley's separation from the service would have withdrawn him from the Army's jurisdiction.

When word reached West Point of the charges against General Koster, head of the Americal in 1968, and Superintendent of the Academy in 1969, the Corps of Cadets were assembled to hear Koster tell them that "throughout my military career the cherished principles of [our Academy's] motto—Duty, Honor, Country—have served as a constant guide to me." The Corps gave Koster a 90-second ovation. As one plebe put it, "everybody [here] seemed to sympathize with the general."[17]

Simultaneous with news of Koster's implication came word of the first recorded case of a West Point graduate ever to request a discharge on the basis of selective conscientious objection to a war. First Lieutenant Louis Font, 23, had been attending Harvard Graduate School in Government at the time.[18]

While our first data were being assembled, in late May 1970, the Army charged two officers, Captain Vincent Hartmann and First Lieutenant Rober G. Lee, Jr., with attempted murder and manslaughter for ordering their men to conduct target practice" on a number of Vietnamese huts in 1969. One woman eventually died of wounds inflicted during this target practice"; her nephew was wounded. Neither officer had ever attended college.[19]

In early 1968 Lieutenant Commander Aurelius Arnheiter, a graduate of the Naval Academy, was relieved of command of the U.S.S. *Vance*. Several junior officers of Arnheiter's command, Lieutenant (j.g.) William Generous (an ROTC honor graduate, Phi Beta Kappa, from Brown University), Lieutenant (j.g.) Edward Mason (an OCS college graduate), and Ensign Luis Belmonte (another OCS college grad), had complained that Arnheiter had hazarded his vessel, falsified its location while entering prohibited areas, sought to draw enemy fire on his ship, and generally taken the vessel, as Arnheiter put it, where the action is."

At one point, the junior officers claimed, he ordered Lieutenant (j.g.) Mason, in an armed motor whaleboat, to fire at a number of Vietnamese ashore. Mason refused. I can't see shooting a bunch of civilians or even shooting at them," he told Arnheiter. Mason says he feared that Arnheiter would interpret my shooting as somebody else's shooting and start shooting himself." The Vietnamese turned out to be refugees from a coastal village bombed out by American air strikes. As one crewman put it, "that kind of guy [Arnheiter] could start World War III."

Arnheiter's executive officer, Lieutenant Ray Hardy, another product of the Naval Academy, remained loyal to his chief and enforced Arnheiter's often bizarre orders. (Hardy acquired an ulcer in the process.) All of those who came to Arnheiter's defense (Rear Admiral Walter Baumberger, Rear Admiral Daniel Gallery, and Captain Richard Alexander) were Academy graduates. Admiral Gallery referred to the non-Annapolis critics of our veritable Captain Queeg as "oddball officers who should have been wearing beads and picketing the White House." Arnheiter himself called them a "bunch of dissident malcontents . . . a Berkeley-campus type of Vietnik/beatnik.[20]

Would that there had been a Mason at Mylai.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF "HARVARD BASTARDS"

What are the lessons of our experiment in attitude-behavior analysis and our excursion into the backgrounds of officers involved in "alleged misconduct" in Vietnam?

Certainly one conclusion is that those critics of ROTC who have suggested that "an officer trained at Princeton kills as quickly on orders as an officer trained at the Point" are probably incorrect. ROTC (and probably college-grad OCS officers) appear to be less belligerent and less militaristic than either non-college or service academy officers. (Indeed, one Ohio State NROTC student went so far as to note that he had joined ROTC to "work constructively to 'pacify' the military. . . .") This is not to say that the ROTC student is the ideal officer candidate. We would prefer officers from a still more humanistic mold, but we are not likely to get a lottery drafting of college graduates for Officers Candidate School for some time, and meanwhile the apparent contrast of service academy and ROTC student values suggested by our analysis ought to provoke those intent on driving ROTC from the liberal arts campus to some serious second thoughts.

We do not feel it proper that there be any formal relationship between the military and the academic community. ROTC, like OCS and the Marine Corps' summer training program for officer candidates, could well go "off campus." But it should be allowed—indeed, it should be encouraged—to "stick around." Some we are of the opinion that the military is going to be with us in the U.S. for some time, we feel that any "reform" that makes it difficult for a Princeton English major or a Pittsburgh philosophy major to become an officer is most undesirable. Major William Muhlenfeld recently put it nicely when he argued that it was—

Of utmost importance that [our] armies be led by just and compassionate men—men who understand that as leaders they are also public servants who have a profound responsibility to minister to the welfare of those they command, to serve with . . . the wisdom to see beyond their actions to the effects their actions wreak. This kind of leadership must come from the university . . . The paradox is that we must wait for the professors to learn.

One senior officer was more explicit: "[Lieutenant] Calley never would have become an officer if we were not so short-handed. Why are we short-handed? Because the bastards at Harvard wouldn't . . . step up to their responsibilities."[21]

TABLE 8

[In percent]

College major	Willing to obey morally repugnant order	Willing to respond physically to insult to girl	Willing to use nuclear weapons	Military takeover might be justified some day	Agreed with "my country, right or wrong"	Disagreed with "my country, right or wrong"	Felt military budget too high	Felt military budget too low	Feel military "most dangerous" to U.S. Government
Humanities (29)	14.0	14.0	37	14	14	72.5	72.5	6.7	55
Social science (100)	30.0	33.0	65	23	39	46.0	51.0	16.0	14
Natural science (102)	37.0	40.0	75	26	37	43.0	41.0	19.0	8
Engineering (117)	42.5	30.5	76	22	48	38.5	24.0	17.0	2

Our own notion of the "responsibilities" of "Harvard bastards" may differ somewhat from the Army's, but, in any event, for the benefit of the American GI, as well as the Vietnamese villager, we hope that college graduates continue to serve as officers.

THE HUMANIST AS OFFICER?

Which leads us to our second conclusion. We feel that English, philosophy, "humanities" majors should be encouraged to become military officers (and probably, for that matter, policemen, social workers, and government officials as well). Why humanities majors? Because these were the types who consistently gave the "best" responses to our questionnaire. Those who indicated that they were humanities majors[22] were *less* willing to obey immoral orders than were social science, natural science, or engineering majors (Table 8). They were the *least* willing to use nuclear weapons; they were the *least* likely to respond physically to insult; they were the *least* capable of imagining a situation in which a military takeover of the U.S. government would be justified; they were the *least* interested in endorsing "My country, right or wrong"; and they were the *most* critical of the size of the military budget.[23]

The trouble is that humanities majors do not seem very enthusiastic about joining the military, nor are they the bemedalled recruiting officer's dream-come-true. Isabella Williams has found them to be less interested than any of the other majors in joining ROTC, and more insistent than others on "the right of the soldier to criticize his superior officer and/or government policies without facing sanctions for his dissent."[24] Very few (less than 5 percent) of our ROTC sample were humanities majors. But they were disproportionately represented in that group of respondents who feel that the military, as an organization, constitutes one of the "most dangerous" threats to the American system of government (see Table 8).

Many military men, concerned as they are with "leadership," body counts, power, and discipline, are probably quite satisfied with any system that allows Yosarians, Pete Seegers, and Staughton Lynds to stay clear of the military. The advocates of a volunteer professional army argue the virtues of such a self-selection process. We are not as convinced of the advantages of any system that can do without the citizen officer or, for that matter, the citizen soldier.

THE CITIZEN-OFFICER

Which brings us to our third conclusion. *If you don't like the way the military functions you can't expect it to improve by insulating yourself from it.* William Lucas feels that ROTC is undesirable because it "does not reflect the composition and attitudes of society,"[25] and thus serves as no check on service academy Arnheiters and "up-through-the ranks" Medinas. But Lucas did not *compare* ROTC people to the other types of officer candidates. Had he done so, we feel that he would have discovered significant differences. Moreover, we are a little uneasy with the way Lucas has phrased his hypothesis. We are not at all certain that officers *should* reflect the "attitudes of society," as society is presently structured. The "up-through-the-ranks" and service academy officers probably *do* reflect such attitudes. What Lucas may have intended to say and, in any event, what we feel ourselves, is that the citizen officer should represent the noblest attitudes and values in American society—values which we maintain would include a refusal to obey immoral orders, a reluctance to sling nuclear weapons around, and a strong disinclination for any military coup or other invasion of the political process.

Some will say that we are naive—that one officer is as powerless as the next to effect any significant check on the ways of a military which, after all, takes its orders from civilians in Washington. We admit that having "good" officers does not mean that they will receive "good" orders. We concede that if a sensitive officer distinguishes between combatants and non-combatants, moral and immoral orders, he may still kill the combatants, may still obey the "moral" orders. But we have seen infantry lieutenants in Cambodia wearing peace symbols on the TV news, telling reporters of how they had deliberately led their men clear of the combat zone. We have seen young Army doctors refusing to collaborate,

Footnotes at end of article.

young Army lawyers demanding justice, and young junior officers protesting the war. A volunteer army would end all of that.

It is true that the most significant changes must occur higher up the ladder of authority (which is why we suggested politics and government service for humanities majors). But the vicissitudes of the antiwar movement have demonstrated the difficulties that dissenters will have in penetrating the political process. The military and the police are more accessible. We must all work towards the day when war and inequity no longer exist, but in the meantime, for the villagers at Mylai and those under the guns of Arnheiter, Mason, and the *Vance*, the presence of a "good" officer counts.

Which is why we were chagrined to find that 84 percent (31 of 37) of those who felt the military is "most dangerous," also favored a volunteer army! A volunteer army of "pros," void of citizen officers coming in out of the draft, would be dangerous. As Peter Barnes recently put it: [26]

An end to the draft would shield the army from the influx of citizen-soldiers who are the yeast of internal change. The army *needs* Yosarians, Ronald Ridenhours, independent-minded ROTC junior officers and J.A.G. lawyers—soldiers who do their jobs but who are not committed to the cover-your-ass system, whose loyalties are to civilians, not careerist values.

Critics of ROTC, ironically, the Army needs you!

FOOTNOTES

[1] R. W. Gage, "Patriotism and Military Discipline as a Function of the Degree of Military Training," Journal of Social Psychology, LXIV (1964), pp. 101–111; E. G. French and R. R. Ernst, "The Relationship between Authoritarianism and the Acceptance of Military Ideology," Journal of Personality, XXIV (1955), pp. 181–191; William A. Lucas, "The American Lieutenant: An Empirical Investigation of Normative Theories of Civil-Military Relations," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1967, passim.

[2] Cited in Harvard Bulletin (May 25, 1970), p. 26.

[3] i.e. Gage, loc. cit.

[4] Harvard Bulletin (May 21, 1970), p. 29.

[5] We asked West Point and the Air Force Academy for permission to survey random samples of their cadets, but neither academy authorized the study.

[6] The "earlier researchers" are Gene Lyons and John Masland, Education and Military Leadership: A Study of ROTC (Princeton, 1959), p. 169.

[7] C. J. Lammers, "Midshipmen and Candidate Reserve Officers at the Royal Netherlands Naval College: A Comparative Study of a Socialization Process," Sociologia Neerlandica, II (1965), pp. 98–122; John Lovell, "The Professional Socialization of the West Point Cadet," in Morris Janowitz, ed., The New Military (New York; Norton, 1946); Gage, op. cit.; Lucas, op. cit.

[8] Gage, op. cit., pp. 101–111.

[9] Lovell, op. cit., p. 129.

[10] Cited on Ward Just, "Soldiers," Atlantic (October 1970), p. 66; Calley, interviewed by Sack, "The Confessions of Lieutenant Calley," Esquire (November 1970), p. 229.

[11] Morris Janowitz. The Professional Soldier (Glencoe, Ill. 1960); "Changing Patterns of Organizational Authority: The Military Establishment," Administrative Science Quarterly, III (March 1959), pp. 473–493.

[12] Lovell, op. cit.

[13] Lucas, op. cit. p. 53; Lammers, op. cit. p. 109.

[14] Lammers, op. cit., p. 106.

[15] Lammers, op. cit., p. 119; Lucas, op. cit., pp. 75–77, 120–127.

[16] Lovell, op. cit., p. 129; Kenneth Feldman and Theodore Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students (San Francisco, 1969), I, p. 31; Donald Campbell and Thelma McCormack, "Military Experience and Attitudes Toward Authority," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (1957).

[17] New York Times, Nov. 25, 1969, p. 16, and March 18, 1970, p. 1 ff; U.S., Dept. of Army, U.S. Army Register, Vol. II (G.P.O. 1969), pp. 157, 742, passim; Seymour Hersh, Mylai 4 (New York: Random House, 1970), 20, 26, 32, 124, passim; Joseph Lelyveld, "The Story of a Soldier Who Refused to Fire at Songmy," New York Times Magazine (December 14, 1969), 32ff.

[18] New York Times, March 18, 1970, p. 17.

[19] New York Times, May 29, 1970, p. 1.

[20] New York Times, May 8, 1968, p. 12; May 10, 1968, p. 1 ff; U.S. Dept. of Navy, Register of Commissioned Officers (NavPers, 1966); Neil Sheehan, "The 99 Days of Captain Arnheiter," New York Times Magazine, Aug. 11, 1968, pp. 7-9, 69-75.

[21] Muhlenfeld, "Our Embattled ROTC," Army (February, 1969), p. 28; Atlantic, (Nov., 1970), p. 83.

[22] There was no statistically significant difference among choice of major in our universe of respondents on grounds of family income, father's level of education, or any other criteria.

[23] Cf. Feldman and Newcomb, Impact, I, p. 167.

[24] Isabella Williams, "The Other West Points," unpublished term paper, August, 1969, in possession of Prof. Peter Karsten, History Dept., University of Pittsburgh.

[25] Lucas, op. cit., p. 52, but see his more recent views in "Anticipatory Professional Military Socialization and the ROTC," in Charles Moskos, ed., Armed Forces and Society, forthcoming, 1971.

[26] Peter Barnes, "All-Volunteer Army?" New Republic (May 9, 1970), p. 23. See also Peter Karsten, "The American Citizen Soldier: Triumph or Disaster?" Military Affairs, XXX (1966), pp. 34-40.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1971]

ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

(By Col. Donald F. Bletz, USA and Capt. Robert J. Hanks, USN)

Career officers Bletz and Hanks are visiting fellows at the Harvard Center for International Affairs. Their views are their own and do not necessarily reflect those of their services.

The idea of an all-volunteer armed force for the United States has rocketed into orbit atop the antidraft flames which continue to burn brightly across the land. Unfortunately, too few citizens are examining all of the concept's ramifications, caught up as many of them are in the euphoric prospect of a draft-free future.

Most reservations about an all-volunteer force have so far centered mainly on its prospective cost. But there are additional, and some potentially disastrous, consequences. Foremost among them is the danger that we will develop what we have never before seen in America: a large standing defense force composed entirely of career military men who are isolated, even alienated, from the people they have sworn to defend. It is possible that this kind of force would lose touch with and sympathy for the aspirations of the American people.

Only since World War II has it been necessary to maintain a huge military establishment to discharge the world-power responsibilities which America inherited and to protect her from the vastly expanded uncertainties of the nuclear-electronic age. To do this, it has been necessary to rely on a device which heretofore was called into operation solely to meet wartime needs—the draft.

Today we find the draft and its inherent inequities called into question. The resultant clamor has shoved the all-volunteer force to the forefront as the best solution to the problem. Before the American people opt for this answer, however, they would be well advised to ponder two basic considerations: the impact the all-volunteer concept would have on the enlisted ranks, particularly in the lower levels and its more indirect effect on the officer corps.

Filling the ranks of a nation's armed forces is not a unique problem. For the last three decades, the United States has relied on conscription to do the job, and it has seen us through the greatest declared war in the history of mankind, an unprecedented cold war and two bitter but undeclared limited wars.

While the Army has perennially been the primary user of draftees and has thus taken the brunt of the criticism associated with conscription, the other services also have been affected by it. They have, of course, resorted at times to the direct use of draftees. But the draft's greatest effect on them has been manifested in the rise and fall of voluntary enlistment rates, geared directly as they are to the size of the draft call.

CASE AND EFFECT

For example, several months before the elections of 1964, President Johnson let it be known that he seriously hoped to eliminate the Selective Service program in the near future. Enlistments in all the services dropped off sharply when, as a result of the announcement, the probability of being drafted fell, or seemed about to fall. Many young men under threat of being drafted into the Army and sent to Vietnam had been "volunteering" for the Air Force or the Navy as a more desirable alternative.

This is in no way intended as criticism of those who chose that particular course of action. It was and continues to be a perfectly legitimate alternative, and its adoption was and is a legal prerogative of the individual.

These men brought with them to their respective services the same basic philosophical outlook as did the draftee, offering to their respective services the same individual strengths and weaknesses as the draftee. The Navy is used here as an example, but the same holds for the Air Force. The men who enlisted in the Marine Corps or the Special Forces or Airborne units in the Army are a bit different. Many of them, too, volunteered rather than being drafted, but they exercised their option to serve in the more adventurous organizations. They fall somewhere between the career man and the civilian-in-uniform in their outlook and, therefore, in their impact on the services.

Elimination of conscription would affect each of the services by removing the civilian soldier, sailor, airman and marine from the ranks. Whether this is a good thing is open to question.

If the armed forces of the United States are reduced to token or caretaker status, then we need not concern ourselves about the loss of the citizen soldier from the ranks, because the impact of the military profession on American society as a whole will be insignificant. If, on the other hand, the nation's armed forces are maintained at a level reasonably commensurate with great-power status, the loss of the citizen soldier is a quite different matter.

Past experience suggests that the citizen soldier would not necessarily bring to the armed forces significantly greater technical expertise or higher intelligence than would the volunteer we could "hire" if the price were right. What he has brought to the armed forces in the past is a bit of American liberal democratic philosophy which he has not been about to give up. In this respect, he has been a positive influence.

On the negative side, the citizen soldier has also brought along an ambivalent outlook toward his military obligation, in the sense that he sees it as a great inconvenience to

him and a disruption of his life which he would much prefer to avoid.

In any event, this ambivalence places a burden on the military establishment, since the task of the career officer and noncommissioned officer is made infinitely more difficult by the citizen soldier who constantly questions and stretches the system to the breaking point. At times, especially in an operational combat environment, this ambivalence can have disastrous results—lives can be lost because of it.

This, however, is part of the price a democracy must pay. For the most part, the strains the citizen soldier places on the system are the most positive contribution he makes. While many of his questions and complaints are superficial and pointless, more valid ones do call attention to weaknesses and shortcomings in the military profession and the national military system. Thus the citizen soldier helps to ensure dynamism in the system.

Emphasis on the positive contributions of the citizen soldier is by no means intended to detract in any way from the many regulars who constitute the bulk of the noncommissioned officer corps in all the services. Their professional expertise and devotion to their respective services and to the nation are the strongest possible combination any democratic society could ask for. But the touch of the citizen soldier provides a balance.

A REFLECTION OF SOCIETY

Never in its 200-year history has the United States possessed a military officer caste. The officer corps, ashore and afloat, has been broadly representative of the national body politic from which it was drawn and with which it generally remained in touch. Whatever "militaristic" caste influences emerged were never cause for alarm, because of the small size of the services and the necessarily limited power base they constituted.

The greatly expanded officer corps of today has been fueled from sources which span the nation's regional and educational spectrum. This broad base of intellectual persuasion, coupled with the relatively large proportion of Reservists on active duty (and the concomitant turnover rates as they come and go), has discouraged formation of a military officer caste—even had the Regular structure shown any proclivity to develop one.

Thus, the officer corps, despite its huge size, has remained basically a reflection of the society it serves. But the antidraft-antiwar influences now actively promoting the all-volunteer concept threaten to upset this inherent balance in two ways.

First, the demise of conscription would remove those pressures which now encourage many bright young men to seek a short-term commission rather than a shorter term as an enlisted draftee. This essentially skeptical, questioning young officer at once brings his own unique point of view into the officer corps and helps to prevent homogeneity—the first requisite of any caste system.

Secondly, the drive to eliminate ROTC units from the nation's campuses would eliminate this disparate source of officers which has promoted diversification, not only in the ethnic and regional background of the officer corps, but in its educational base as well.

So long as national security requirements dictate the maintenance of armed forces in the order of magnitude which prevails today, it will still be necessary to recruit college graduates via some form of officer candidate program. But as the all-volunteer officer corps takes shape, turnover rates can be expected to decrease dramatically, the size of this leavening input will shrink proportionately, and those who so elect a life in uniform will, quite likely, shed their differences rather quickly as they adapt to the military ethic.

If the United States is to remain a powerful and democratic nation it will require a military establishment well beyond the caretaker or token level. The armed forces can be expected, therefore, to continue to be a meaningful part of the American scene. Moreover, the armed forces of a democracy must be as representative of that democracy as is reasonably possible.

The citizen soldier is an ever-present force for dynamism, and he serves as the conscience of the nation in the services—a conscience that should not be removed. It is ironic that those who are opposed to the draft and all it stands for—particularly those of liberal persuasion—may very well foster the development of a militaristic defense system.

The ogre of militarism has haunted the United States from its birth, and the fear of it has been accentuated since World War II as the dictates of national security produced the largest standing military force in our history. That we have eluded the tyranny of militaristic control—be it civilian or uniformed—is due in no small measure to the way in which we have structured and manned the armed services.

Despite the siren call of the all-volunteer force, this neat solution carries inherent dangers which must not be ignored. And though professionalism and technical competence within the armed services will continue to suffer from the constant personnel instability, inevitably caused by the draft and reserve programs, in the long run they may very well be a far better bargain for the nation.

CONSCRIPT ARMY LURE TO BATTLE

(By Alan Cranston)

The longest peacetime draft in the history of the Republic has been followed by the longest war in our history. I believe that Americans would not be in Vietnam today were it not for the draft.

From 7,800 men called up in December, 1964, President Johnson was able to expand his combat forces by merely raising draft calls to over 40,200 in December, 1965. Without having to ask permission of Congress, the President was able to increase the size of the Army from 973,238 men at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to 1,397,899 by the election of 1966, when the first major rumblings of dissent were heard.

Despite the policy pronouncements of two Presidents and numbers of government officials during the 1960s committing this country to the defense of Vietnam, it was the uninterrupted stream of young Americans to Indochina that transformed mere rhetoric into reality. And it is the presence of 322,200 Americans in Vietnam that is preventing President Nixon from rapidly terminating the American commitment.

The Hatfield-Goldwater Volunteer Military Act of 1971 would require congressional decision-making before the country drafts again. This would remove the danger that we will fight again in an undeclared war.

Sen. Robert A. Taft once said, "The compulsory draft is far more typical of totalitarian nations than of democratic nations." The deepest difference between democracy and dictatorship lies in the degree of compulsion used by government in the lives of individual citizens.

A dictatorship compels people even to do things that they would be willing to do voluntarily. A German in the anti-Nazi underground once defined that regime for me as one under which everything not prohibited was compulsory. A democracy should never ask its citizens to sacrifice their freedom of choice if a valid alternative can be found.

A CONVINCING CASE

There is a valid alternataive to the draft. Defense Department studies, the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force and independent analyses have all demonstrated that a volunteer army is obtainable. They show convincingly that a volunteer army will neither undermine national security nor create a poor, black army.

As a consequence, critics of the volunteer army have focused on the "citizen-soldier" concept. They contend that the draft must be maintained to ensure civilian influence within the military and restrain the President's warmaking powers. They say that the draft serves democracy by evoking protest against it and thus inhibiting the President.

I believe that Vietnam tells us differently. Even granting the possibility that protest against the draft helped bring about the retirement of President Johnson, one can hardly ignore the fact that by the time LBJ bowed out, troop levels had exceeded 500,000 in Vietnam and casualties and costs were catastrophic. That we had an army of draftees did not stop the war, nor has it stopped it yet.

I find it impossible to accept philosophically the use of the draft as a legitimate way to place constraints on Presidents. Surely we can find a better way that does not disrupt the lives of a whole generation and confront the conscientious objector with the choice of going to jail or fleeing to Canada.

The draft actually increases the risk for those young Americans who do go to Southeast Asia. Because of the two-year limit on draftee service, draftees are hurried into combat and, if they survive after their short training period, they are retired from combat at just about the time when they've learned how to take care of themselves under fire—only to be replaced by raw, inexperienced draftees.

"INFUSION" WOULD CONTINUE

Some senior military officers want to retain the draft to infuse the armed forces with representatives of the civilian sector. One argued that "the draft gives us the turnover necessary to breathe fresh air into an otherwise close system." This suggests that under a voluntary system, the turnover of men would be significantly lower than it is under the present mixed volunteer-conscript force.

In fact, under a volunteer system, the turnover of men would be approximately 75 per cent of what it would be if conscription were maintained. The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force noted that out of an estimated 325,000 additional men needed each year to maintain a volunteer force of 2.5 million, roughly 215,000, or 65 per cent, would leave after a single tour.

Higher pay and other amenities proposed by the Gates Commission would provide a steady flow of volunteers. Men enter the service for a variety of reasons not connected with the draft or fear of the draft: technical training, inservice and postservice education, travel, service to their country or the desire to "become a man." Those entering as true volunteers provide nearly 50 per cent of all current enlistees.

Critics also fear that we will lose potential officers with liberal arts backgrounds. They perceive the current disruption of ROTC programs as adding to the alienation of the military. The fact is that there are today more students and colleges desiring scholarship ROTC programs than there are spaces or units available.

In addition to the 347 existing programs, approximately 50 colleges and universities are now actively interested in establishing their own. What is even more interesting is that some of the 12 schools that have dropped ROTC on their own initiative in the last two years have begun making serious inquiry into re-establishing their units.

COUPS ARE TOPHEAVY

I think that senior military officers also tend to over-estimate the influence that the draftee can exert upon the armed services. In Latin America, out of some 72 military

coups in the last 25 years, 60 were with conscripted armies. European experience has been similar.

Coups are mounted by high-ranking officers—by generals and colonels—not by enlisted men. And high-ranking officers are likely to be professional soldiers—draft or no draft. The presence of the draft has little bearing on whether or not a military coup is possible in this country, or any country, today.

It is in the nature of the military that the power to command obedience is great while the tolerance of dissent, especially from the junior servicemen, is limited. Most short-termers avoid confrontation with their officers and NCOs simply by following orders for their two years. Those who step out of line fill the ranks of the court-martialed, stockaded or undesirably discharged. The questioning of military procedures and policies by draftees cannot conceivably provide anywhere near an adequate check on military officers or their civilian chiefs.

Actually, a volunteer army will do more than a conscript army to make our military establishment more civilianized, better scrutinized and less independent of civilian control. The demand for a volunteer army has already begun to close the gap between the senior officer and the first-term enlisted man.

Faced with the prospect that they may have to attract and retain more men, the services have implemented several manpower policy reforms. At Ft. Carson, a private sits across the hall from the base commander's office with instant access to convey complaints from the enlisted men. The San Diego Naval Base has established a direct complaint line to the commanding officer. And at other bases across the country, superior officers are meeting the enlisted men in group discussion. This is in sharp contrast to practices in the recent past.

Military training often relies on dehumanization, humiliation and fear to instill discipline. But at Ft. Ord, the specter of the volunteer force has promoted a change to the "positive reinforcement" method of training and its concomitant uplifting of the trainee. This important experiment is revealing results beyond the expectations of the most optimistic civilians.

FITTING MAN TO JOB

Additional evidence that a voluntary force would increase civilian influence is found in a recent Defense Department study. Only 4 per cent of college graduates were placed in military jobs where their skills could be used with little or no additional training. Only 62 men, for instance, who qualified for Army accounting positions were placed in this military occupational speciality, although there were 463 openings and 912 inductees with accounting degrees.

Under a volunteer system, the more limited supply of men and the greater budgetary expenditures per man would promote greater matching of man and skills and less misuse of man power. As an increasing number of men were assigned to jobs where their civilian experiences were put to use, more men would be in a position to inform those already in similiar work of recent developments in the civilian sector.

More experienced volunteers would receive greater respect from the professional soldier, enhancing the likelihood of a better relationship between the two. Reduced transfers, appropriate assignment of military occupational specialties and longer initial tours under a volunteer system would all magnify this effect.

One of the most important ways the volunteer army would increase civilian control over the military relates again to the role of Congress. For the past 30 years, the draft has hidden from the public eye a large proportion of our military manpower costs. By using the draft to hold down first-term pay to less than half of unskilled blue-collar wages, the military imposes on junior enlisted men an implict tax of $2 billion dollars.

By not having that $2 billion appear in the defense budget, the Defense Department is understating the cost of defense to the nation while forcing 19-year-olds to bear a grossly disproportionate share of the defense burden. If the draft were ended and the implicit tax translated directly into tax dollars, Congress would be far more likely to pay attention to the number of men in the forces and the uses to which they were put.

Lateral recruitment has been put forth as another means of opening up the military to civilian influence. This recommendation is based on the Seabee program, in which men are brought into the military at a rank roughly commensurate with the skill they have to offer. With some 85 per cent of military skills directly related to civilian skills, a greater flow in and out of the military at higher ranks is a real possibility.

The American people must realize that the conscription of cheap, apparently unlimited manpower into the lowest ranks of the military, while maintaining relatively complete control from the top, is antithetical to a democratic society and further endangers the workings of a political system already under great stress. For the last 30 years, American families have become so accustomed to offering their sons to the armed forces that they have forgotten that conscription is not in the American tradition.

National conscription has existed for only 34 of the 200 years of American independence. Since World War II, the draft has become a bad habit of political convenience that needs to be broken before it further jeopardizes our freedom.

THE DRAFT AS MOTIVATION FOR VOLUNTEERS

The Nixon Administration hopes that improved life-styles in the military, increased pay and other incentives will attract enough men to enable the nation to move eventually to a voluntary system.

No one really knows if these measures will accomplish their goals, since any analysis of what motivates men to volunteer for military service is inherently speculative.

The most powerful motivation to volunteer service in recent years has been the threat of the draft. By enlisting voluntarily, men could avoid serving in the Army, which has supplied most of the combat soldiers for the Vietnam war, and could choose their military occupations, thus avoiding service in front-line combat roles.

The most recent analysis of the motivations of volunteers for military service was conducted by the Defense Department in November 1968. The Pentagon surveyed more than 17,000 officers and 48,000 enlisted personnel with less than three years' service; the survey did not include basic trainees or men stationed in Vietnam.

In the survey, the Pentagon asked the following question: "If there had been no draft and you had not had any military obligation at the time you first entered active military service, do you think you would have entered the service?"

Of those surveyed, 88.3 per cent answered in four categories: yes definitely, yes probably, no probably, no definitely. The remaining 11.7 percent said they had "no idea."

The Defense Department concluded that 47.9 per cent of those surveyed—the men who answered in the last two categories—were motivated to enter military service by the threat of the draft. The Pentagon noted that this represented 54.2 per cent on those who answered in one of the four categories.

The survey also showed that, in the absence of a draft:

17–19 year-olds would be more likely to volunteer than older men;

the less education a man has, the more likely he would be to volunteer for military service;

Negroes would be more likely to volunteer than white men.

Following are the survey's results:

[In percent]

	Yes definitely	Yes probably	True volunteers	No probably	No definitely	Draft motivated
Total	17.0	23.4	40.4	27.1	20.8	47.9
Service:						
Army	15.4	22.4	37.8	25.6	25.9	51.5
Navy	16.4	23.5	39.9	28.6	20.3	48.9
Air Force	15.0	21.9	36.9	31.7	19.8	51.5
Marine Corps	25.4	28.9	54.3	18.2	12.7	30.9
Age at enlistment:						
17 to 19 years	19.4	26.0	45.4	24.3	17.6	41.9
20 to 25 years	10.6	16.7	27.3	34.5	29.1	63.6
Education: [1]						
Less than high school	26.3	29.1	55.4	14.0	13.5	27.5
High school graduate	19.4	25.5	44.9	26.6	17.4	44.0
Some college	7.5	18.5	26.0	35.3	30.6	65.9
Race:						
White	15.9	23.4	39.3	27.8	21.2	49.0
Black	25.3	25.5	50.8	21.8	15.6	37.4

[1] At time of entry on active military service.

FEASIBILITY: HOW MANY TRUE VOLUNTEERS?

Central to the volunteer army debate is the question of feasibility—whether enough men could be recruited without the inducement of the draft and without unacceptably high expenditures.

The Army now believes the job of attracting volunteers would be a lot tougher than estimated last year by the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force (the Gates commission).

A key to answering the feasibility question is determining how many "true" volunteers the Army is getting now. A true volunteer is a man who is motivated to join by reasons other than the threat of the draft.

New Army analysis: On the basis of the first six months of experience with the lottery system of induction, the Army estimates it is receiving 60,000 to 70,000 true volunteers a year. The lottery system was instituted in December 1969.

To arrive at an estimate of the number of true volunteers, the Army first arbitrarily divided the pool of draft-eligible men into three categories, according to lottery sequence numbers (1 through 120, 121 through 140, and 141 through 166). The three categories contain roughly equal numbers of men.

Assumptions—The Army then based its analysis on a series of assumptions.

It assumed that all enlistees with lottery sequence numbers 241 to 366 are true volunteers, since they could have expected to escape the draft. (The highest lottery number drafted in calendar 1970 was 195.) There were 5,900 enlistees with lottery numbers 241–366 during the six-month period.

Since the three lottery sequence categories contain roughly equal numbers of men, the Pentagon assumed that each of the first two categories would produce the same number of true volunteers (5,900) as the third.

On the basis of the first two assumptions, the Pentagon found that 47.8 per cent of enlistees with lottery numbers were true volunteers. It then assumed that the same percentage of true volunteers existed among men (primarily 17- and 18-year-olds) who enlisted although they had not been assigned lottery numbers.

Results—On this basis, there were 17,700 estimated true volunteers with lottery numbers and 14,100 without lottery numbers, for a total of 31,800 volunteers for the six-month period—or an average of 5,300 a month.

For a full year, total enlistments would run about 133,400; the Army estimates that 60,000 to 70,000 would be true volunteers, and the others would be draft-motivated.

Army spokesmen stress that in the first few months the lottery system was operating, some registrants with high numbers may not have understood their relative immunity from induction. This would tend to inflate the estimate of true volunteers in the Army's analysis.

Consequences: The Army estimates that it will need 243,000 replacements to maintain an average strength of 1,024,000 men in fiscal 1972.

The Gates commission estimated last year that Army enlistments would total about 97,000 a year without the draft. The shortfall of 146,000, it said, could be offset by increasing enlistments through pay raises, more effective recruiting and other steps.

The commission did not have the lottery experience to work with in arriving at its estimates of true volunteers.

By the Army's reckoning, the shortfall would be 183,000 to 193,000.

THE NEED FOR INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the need for increased social security benefits grows more pressing day by day. Each time the cost of living inches upward, the 25 million retired Americans whose livelihoods hinge on social security are pushed deeper and deeper into what most people would consider poverty. Inflation is slowly eroding away the dollar's buying power. Everyone is a victim of this alarming trend, of course, but nowhere has its impact been more harsh than on the country's elderly. They are in a financial plight virtually unprecedented in recent American history.

The incomes provided by social security are modest enough. Coupled with the inflation that is driving up the cost of virtually everything sold in the American marketplace, they are nothing short of trifling. Most Americans are not aware of the dreary and disheartening existence this forces on the elderly. Unable to buy anything more than the rudimentary necessities—indeed, they often cannot buy even enough food and clothing—the elderly find their lives are growing more and more bleak.

The Senate, as you know, has just passed legislation granting significant new increase in social security benefits.

I intend to do everything within my power to hasten this bill's enactment into law.

Most Americans find this era financially troublesome; the elderly find it next to impossible.

Social security increases—major increases—are among the very top priorities of this Congress.

AT LEAST ONE SHARE OF STOCK FOR THE PUBLIC

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently in one of our prominent newspapers, there appeared an article under the title of "Responsibility" with a subtitle "At Least One Share of Stock for the Public."

It is evidence once again how conscious America's free enterprise system and business are of the problems of today. Too often we legislate to force right things to happen and fail to recognize the right things that have happened.

The purpose of my unanimous request to have this put in the RECORD is to call to the attention of my colleagues and others who might read it to the fact that America's business and businessmen do have a conscience and a concern.

The article follows:

RESPONSIBILITY: AT LEAST ONE SHARE OF STOCK FOR THE PUBLIC

(By Philip M. Stern)

In recent months, many of America's major corporations have taken steps to meet public demands that they look beyond "mere profit-making" and consider the impact of their activities on the society as a whole. What remains uncertain is the real significance of these changes and the effect they will have on corporate policy.

During the last fortnight there have been two major developments. The Chrysler Corporation announced the establishment of an "Office of Public Responsibility" headed by three top officers, with a directive to "continually review and challenge the corporation's practices" in such areas as pollution, safety and equal opportunity. A few days later General Motors told of naming a committee of six prestigious scientists to advise G.M. on the environmental effect of its products and operations.

G.M. has been particularly busy in this area. Last summer, the company created a "Public Policy Committee" of its board of directors and since then it has departed sharply from tradition by appointing its first black to the G.M. board (activist Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia) and by naming an "outsider," California pollution authority Ernest Starkman, as a vice president in charge of environmental activities. It has also: Funneled some $5-million of its bank deposits into black-owned banks; given a $1-million order for truck cushions to a black-owned company in Watts; launched an experimental program of toll-free calls to Detroit from complaining G.M. car owners.

CRITICS INSPIRE CHANGE

The First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company is studying the possibility of turning over as much as a third of its 24-man board to consumer representatives, blacks and possibly even militant feminists. The Quaker Oats Company refused to move ahead with a new plant in Danville, Ill., until the town adopted an open housing ordinance. And a growing list of companies has appointed urban affairs directors to press for minority training or investment programs.

Such changes have been inspired in large measure by a sharp increase in public criticism and by the activities of public-interest groups. At last spring's annual shareholder meetings, usually tranquil affairs, both stockholders and management were confronted by protests against company policies on such matters as pollution, South African apartheid, safety and minority opportunity. Groups like the Council on Economic Priorities are researching and publicizing company attitudes in such fields.

The corporate responsibility question was most systematically raised by a group of young Washington lawyers who last spring mounted a "campaign to make General Motors responsible." They sought support from G.M. shareholders for such proposals as enlarging the G.M. board of directors to include a black, an ecologist and a consumer representative. In pressing such issues, the protestors obliged the largely conservative trustees of universities, retirement and mutual funds, insurance companies and the like to consider the social impact of the world's largest corporation, and of their investment in it. The insurgents won less than 3 per cent of the votes but G.M.'s subsequent response suggests that their campaign was far more effective than the vote indicated.

Thus there has been some progress in the campaign to increase corporate responsibility—but how significant has it been?

Campaign G.M. and other activities have sharply broadened public and corporate awarness of the "responsibility" issue, and even those most critical of the companies will grant that the steps they have taken when measured against the level of such activities a year ago, represent a substantial change.

Skeptics point out, however, that there has been no apparent change in the corporate managers' concept or their mission—profit-making—and where the exercise of "responsibility" costs money and reduces profits, it conflicts with that mission. Thus they fear such programs will never get very far.

DOUBTS VOICED

Even in the short run, these skeptics say, the actions to date have not made the corporate managers of bureaucracy any more accountable to forces outside the company. They argue that the new "public responsibility" units are manned by company men, unlikely to be vigorously critical of their colleagues. Information about internal goings-on, it is felt, will, in general, still be dispensed to the public only to the extent the corporate bureaucracy find it convenient. Boards of directors, the critics believe, will remain almost entirely self-selected, with no meaningful participation by shareholders and no voice at all for other affected groups such as employes, customers and the public at large. Moreover, the critics say, most directors are, in effect, just occasional visitors to the corporation, with their attention focused elsewhere, and are poor matches for a naturally protective corporate bureaucracy. So while G.M.'s new director, the Rev. Leon Sullivan, has vowed to "do what I can to help my brothers, particularly my black brothers," some question how much change he can effect at G.M., especially if he lacks an independent staff of his own.

To attack the self-contained nature of corporate power, "Campaign G.M.—Round II," now in progress, proposed opening up the selection of corporate directors to "constituent groups" other than shareholders. Under the insurgents' proposals, three members of the G.M. board would be elected, respectively, by G.M. employes, dealers and car owners, subject only to veto by the shareholders.

While the proposal is expected to win no more than a minute fraction of G.M.'s shareholders, it will doubtless cause much debate between now and the G.M. meeting in May, not only on the general question of "corporate responsibility" but on the extent of a corporation's unaccountability to the public it affects. And, as recent history attests, the mere ventilation of these issues can have considerable impact on corporate management.

THE SLEEP OF THE STATESMAN

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there are times when many of us feel that our involvement in Indochina is more dream than reality. We, therefore, lose ourselves in illusions of withdrawal, deescalation, Vietnamization. The names differ slightly, but the intent is the same; to conceal from ourselves and each other the frightening truth of our continuing presence. If withdrawal is but a mirage then killing and maiming are but hallucinations incapable of unnerving us and we need carry their burden no longer.

Russell Baker perceives the nature of such dreams and tries in his column to awaken a slumbering nation. I insert that column in the hope that my colleagues will take the opportunity to read it and attempt to assess the nature of their own dreams:

THE SLEEP OF THE STATESMAN

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Gaze deeply into my pupils as I spin this glittering antenna in my hand. Round and round it goes. It is one of Secretary Rusk's antennas that he used in the old days to detect signals from Hanoi. Secretary Rusk's antennas were very sensitive, remember. Very sensitive. "The Secretary has very sensitive antennas," they used to say at the State Department. Do not fight me now. Lie back and breathe deeply.

You are no longer going to think of Secretary Rusk's antennas. You are going to sleep, and you are going to clear your mind of all thoughts of falling dominoes. You are not going to think of Paper Tiger any more. You are going to forget the hawks and the doves, and sleep.

I want you to clear your mind of the fish hook. You are no longer going to think of the parrot's beak. You are going to forget all about the tiger cages. You are no longer going to remember the coonskin. You are going to forget all the dragon ladies. You are going to sleep, sleep.

You are going to forget about the body count, the bombing pauses, freefire zones and Tet.

Do you remember Pacification? If so, I want you to put it out of your mind, and sleep. Do you remember strategic hamlets? If so, erase the memory and sleep, for you are very, very old if you remember pacification and strategic hamlets, and you want to sleep very, very much.

You want to forget all about captured documents. Close your eyes and let COSVN dissipate from memory, as though it had never existed. Sleep and make the tunnel go away forever, as well as the light at the end of it. Forget the reports of captured enemy rice supplies and sleep.

I want you to stop thinking of all the occasions on which the corner was turned, and sleep. Sleep, and in sleep let the iron triangle cease to be even a memory. Let there be no such place as the Michelin rubber plantation, and let there never have been. Sleep.

Your mind is drifting free now because great weights have been lifted from it. Sleep deeply, and away will go all memory of the weighty bawlings of "no wider war" and "honor our commitment." In sweet sleep, let search-and-destroy cease ever to have existed. I want your sleep to help you forget that those American casualties, which were always light to moderate no matter how heavy they were, were ever casualties at all. In sleep, dream 50,000 men back into life and restore the bodies of the hurt. Sleep.

Sleep profoundly, for in the profoundest sleep there is blessed forgetfulness of privileged sanctuaries, interdiction and incursion.

You will keep your eyes tightly closed and dive deeply, deeply into the sweet springs of sleep's oblivion, there to be washed clean of the memory of Bao Dai, Big Minh, General Khanh, Madame Nhu and Hamburger Hill. Watch this glittering antenna spin and let fierce Meo tribesmen vanish in sleep.

In sleep purge your mind of thoughts of Thich Tri Quang, Ngo Dinh Diem, Nguyen Cao Ky. The Pathet Lao cannot survive if you sleep. Sleep and let Lon Nol and Souvanna Phouma be gone forever.

Gone with Ellsworth Bunker and Henry Cabot Lodge and Ambassador David Bruce and Xuan Thuy, coming and going, going and coming, coming nowhere, going nowhere, endlessly, endlessly, except to be gently forgotten in glorious sleep.

In your sleep, forget Vietnamization, another fruitless session of the Paris peace talks today, bombing halt, Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, Gulf of Tonkin resolution, Melvin Laird, air force briefers, Ho Chi Minh Trail, no ground troops, Cooper-Church amendment. Sleep with a profundity you have never slept with before.

Sleep away all thought of Professors Henry Kissinger and Walt W. Roston and of the deans—Bundy, Acheson and Rusk. In such an all-obliterating sleep as you have never known, cease remembering proposals to bomb 'em back to the Stone Age. In sleep, cast off all remembrance of protective reaction and protective encirclement.

Sleep. Sleep. Sleep, until ditches filled with bodies may lose their existence, and the dread of becoming a pitiful helpless giant can never again haunt your sun-filled afternoons. In sleep, forget.

See my antenna spin. See how it glitters in the light, even through the deepest darkness of unutterably restful sleep, with the bone-eating brightness of liquid fire in the night. Sleep warm in its brightness. When you awake you shall think of sports or flowers, or of bills and of nice fun things to do after work.

GEORGE L. DeMENT—A EULOGY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago lost one of its great men last weekend with the death of George L. DeMent. Mr. DeMent had been chairman of the board of the Chicago Transit Authority since 1963. During that time, the mass transit system of Chicago became one of the best in the Nation.

George DeMent was recognized as a national expert in the field of metropolitan transportation. Just last year, Mr. DeMent was honored by his colleagues by being named as the president of the American Transit Association. In addition, he was president of the Institute for Rapid Transit.

Prior to becoming the head of the CTA, Mr. DeMent served as the commissioner of public works for the city of Chicago. As commissioner, Mr. DeMent planned the initial stages of the rapid transit lines which became a reality during his years as head of the CTA.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his family and tell them that the rapid transit lines along the city's expressways serving thousands and thousands of commuting Chicagoans each day will serve as a fitting memorial to the dedication, vision, and leadership of George L. DeMent.

ZAMBIA: SANCTUARY FOR MURDERERS AND KIDNAPERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, kidnapings in the Middle East and in Latin America make frequent headlines these days. In Russia, detention of Russian citizens on criminal charges provided an avalanche for adverse public opinion; yet knowledge of the kidnaping of 6 Portuguese civilians 2 months ago and their detention—if not deaths—in the Red Colony of Zambia has barely reached the American people.

Possibly these strange double standards are intentional because our State Department and political leaders do not want the average American to be informed of the critical situation which threatens all of the whites in South Africa—to a great extent, because of the agitation and encouragement of U.S. foreign policy "experts" who find it easier to lead the blacks than fool the whites in that area.

Is it really worth trading off the lives and futures of white minorities in South Africa simply to try to win a few votes in the United Nations?

Exemplary of the inflammatory U.S. racist propaganda was a news release dated February 26 from the Democratic National Committee, which in attacking the Nixon administration on Africa, had this to say:

AFRICA

The report seems to regard Africa as easier to deal with since in the past it has "depended less than other areas on American leadership and assistance" and therefore should be more prepared for the neglect contemplated under the Nixon Doctrine.

Two issues dominate all others in Africa—economic and social development in those countries already free and independent and the demand for racial and political justice in those countries in Southern Africa which are dominated by a racist white minority. The response of the Nixon Administration on both issues have been neglect and cynicism.

The failure of President Nixon to find a way to meet with either President Kaunda of Zambia or President Nyerere of Tanzania during their visits to the United Nations last October is the most flagrant example of the no-profile policy being pursued by the White House.

Africa is a continent with enormous growth

potential—yet the Administration fails to show any concern for the aid needed by Africa.

The racial and political crises in Rhodesia, Portuguese Africa, Southwest Africa and the Republic of South Africa (an area containing thirty-four million Africans dominated by four million Europeans) continue to deepen. These minority regimes pursue policies of repression which are leading toward violence, to polarization between black and white, and to the risk of Communist gains feeding on this repression of a huge majority.

Ridiculous. Note the recent Ford Foundation pow-wow in Lagos, Nigeria—the administration's announcement of trade with Red China and continued East-West trade with Russia but stiff sanctions against trade with the Christian nation of Rhodesia. Yet the American people are led to believe by our democratic national spokemen that if the civilized countries of Southern Africa are not overthrown, we risk Communist gains in those areas. Since our policy under both parties seems to be that only Communist nations and Red-puppet tribal states in Africa are in our graces and our national policy is open trade with Communist China and Russia, we may well wonder who is trying to fool whom? It is hard to find even a dime's worth of difference.

What seems to bug the national Democrats the most is that President Nixon did not stop running the country to go to the United Nations to shake hands with their favorite rabble rouser, Kenneth Kauanda of Zambia. Chief Kauanda, who runs a fair police state, is probably better remembered for the house arrest of newsmen who were in Lusaka last year covering Kauanda's Communist peace parlay—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 24, page 32321.

So the Republican retaliation to counteract Kauanda's snub was to pick up their share of the marbles by sending a U.S. jet to return Whitney Young's remains from Nigeria.

Since the attitude of the Nixon administration seems to vary little from the outlined anti-white attack by the democratic spokesmen, one must logically conclude that public opinion makers in the United States would regard without exception that every nonblack in Africa is a heathen racist whose death or destruction is essential to peace in Africa.

I include a news clipping discussing the kidnaped Portuguese and the new Red travel policies of the new American Revolution, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 15, 1971]

ZAMBIA ACCUSED IN KIDNAPING

(By Jim Hoagland)

LOURENCO MARQUES, MOZAMBIQUE.—Fear is mounting in this Portuguese African territory that five Portuguese civilians kidnaped by an African guerrilla movement two months ago are dead.

The fate of the five men, who are believed to have been taken into the neighboring country of Zambia, could have important economic and diplomatic consequences for Southern Africa.

Zambia, which allows anti-Portuguese guerrillas to operate from its territory, depends on Portuguese railways and ports in Angola and Mozambique to export about two-thirds of Zambia's valuable copper production.

Large quantities of food and other vital supplies are also railed into Zambia from the Portuguese-controlled harbors.

In the wake of the kidnaping, Portugal has been examining plans for economic retaliation against Zambia, an important official in Mazambique hinted last week. And the incident has further embittered the already strained relations between the two nations.

ZAMBIA ACCUSED

A government statement published here last Friday directly accused Zambian authorities of having refused to intervene to protect the hostages after they were brought into Zambian territory.

Zambia has officially denied having any knowledge of the kidnaping. In its denial, Zambia countered by accusing the Portuguese of illegally holding three Zambian citizens who mistakenly wandered across the Mazambique border last month.

The sharp wording of the Portuguese statement, and the fact that it publicly raised for the first time the possibility that the Portuguese may have been killed by the guerrillas, leads some observers here to think that the government has given up hope for the hostages.

According to Portuguese military sources, eight to 10 armed insurgents belonging to an exile organiaztion known as Coremo captured six men working on a rural resettlement project about 50 miles from the Zambian border on January 15.

One of the whites was unable to make the three-day march to the border, and either died or was killed in Mozambique. About 50 African villagers also taken prisoner by the guerrillas escaped or were released before the party reached Zambia.

CLAIM HOSTAGES RELEASED

Portuguese sources say Coremo (Mozambique Revolution Committee) staged the kidnaping to draw publicity and support, and planned to produce the hostages in a press conference at Coremo's headquarters in Lusaka, the Zambian capital.

But it appears that the Zambians, deeply embarrassed by the incident and well aware of their vulnerability to Portuguese reprisal, wanted no part in sanctioning the abduction and told the guerrillas that the hostages were their problem.

Corema has taken credit for the kidnaping, but asserts that it occurred much deeper inside Mozambique and that the hostages were released unharmed, in Mozambique. Coremo, which is thought to have no more than a few hundred members, is considered an insignificant rival to the much stronger guerrilla group known as Frelimo which operates largely from Tanzania.

The Portuguese fear that the guerrillas may have decided to resolve the awkward problem of the hostages by executing them. The entire incident seems to have upset authorities in Mozambique much more than the occasional death of Portuguese civilians from guerrillas' mines and ambushes.

"That is part of the luck of war," one source said. "This was not. And Zambia could have prevented it."

The abduction was almost certainly among the subjects discussed last month at a meeting between top security officials of Portugal, Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia and South Africa held in Salisbury, Rhodesia.

CONFERENCE ON ZAMBIA

A major purpose of the conference was "to discuss the relations of Zambia with its neighbors, in the international context" Jose Ramires Ramos, director of Mozambique's civilian intelligence system, disclosed in an interview last week.

"Zambia is still very dependent on us economically," Ramos said. "We have some cards in our hands and we were examining them."

In 1970 Zambia, which is the world's third largest exporter of copper, shipped 143,000 tons of the metal through the Angolan port of Lobito and almost twice that amount through Mozambique ports. Zambia's only other outlet is the longer, more expensive road trip to Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

For their part, the Portuguese are reluctant to lose the foreign-exchange earnings that the Zambian imports and exports bring. Their willingness to even consider economic reprisals is an indication of how seriously they view the kidnapping, qualified sources feel.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1971]

ROGERS DECIDES TO DROP CURBS ON CHINA TRAVEL

The State Department lifted today 20-year-old restrictions on the travel of American citizens to Communist China.

Following up earlier measures which loosened restraints, Secretary of State William P. Rogers ordered that passports would no longer carry a stamp stating they could not be used for travel to the Chinese mainland.

Such a restriction is being continued, however, on travel by Americans to North Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba.

President Nixon had pledged last month to see what more might be done "to create broader opportunities for contacts between the Chinese and American peoples."

Rogers' action, reportedly with presidential approval, is unlikely to have much effect on actual travel. However, it serves as another clue to administration policy toward the Communist areas.

Nixon reported in his "State of the World" message last month that 270 Americans last year received special U.S. permission to go to China, bringing the total in recent years to 1,000. Peking had admitted only three, he said.

Under present regulations, the State Department's travel bans were to end automatically today unless the secretary acted to continue any or all of them.

Some of Rogers' advisers proposed dropping the restrictions entirely because U.S. courts in recent years have struck down attempts to enforce them. Many U.S. citizens have traveled to the off-limits areas without official permission.

But others argued successfully that the department's curb on visits to North Vietnam by Americans should be continued because of the war. They also viewed the diplomatic situation as inappropriate now for dropping the restriction toward North Korea.

Cuba came under a different category because the U.S. travel ban there is part of the hemisphere-wide campaign to isolate the Castro regime.

U.S. policymakers indicated that Washington, as a leader of the anti-Castro effort, should not appear to undercut the continuing Inter-American sanctions against Cuba by lifting its travel restriction.

Though ending the ban toward Red China is unlikely to boost U.S. travel there as long as Peking keeps its doors closed, U.S. diplomats privately anticipated another round of criticism of U.S. policy from Nationalist China.

BLUE ANGEL APPRECIATION DAY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 21, 1971, is a day of great significance to the people and to the communities of California's Imperial Valley. In honor of the U.S. Navy flight demonstration team, the Blue Angels, in this their 25th anniversary year, Imperial

County has declared this day "Blue Angel Appreciation Day."

Imperial County is the winter training ground for the Blues, and our citizens have had few associations or relationships which invoke more inspiration or more community pride than this one.

The Blues, representing the highest ideals and the highest caliber of our Nation's youth, have made a contribution to the Imperial Valley which far transcends their thrilling, awesome precision flight through our clear, blue skies.

They have given us, by their very presence, a sterling testimonial to the excellence of achievement of which our American young people are capable. They have deeply inspired young and old alike with their determination, dedication, and their resulting successes.

Imperial County has been termed the Blue Angels' second home by Vice Adm. Bernard Strean, chief of naval air training at Pensacola, Fla., and we cherish that designation.

As our 80,000 people from this great valley pay tribute to the Blues on March 21, I respectfully invite the Congress of the United States to join us in this acknowledgement.

For Blue Angel Cmdr. Harley Hall, U.S. Navy; Lt. Comdr. J. D. Davis, U.S. Navy; Capt. Kevin O'Mara, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Jim Maslowski, U.S. Navy; Lt. Skip Umstead, U.S. Navy; Lt. Bill Beardsley, U.S. Navy; Lt. Bill Switzer, U.S. Navy; and Lt. Dick Schram, U.S. Navy; the Blue Angel pilots; and for Lt. Comdr. Mack Prose and the 90-member Blue Angel ground crew; I ask special congressional recognition and appreciation for their inspirational contributions to our youth, and to our country.

I submit for your further enlightenment, an article from the Imperial Valley Weekly, which depicts the community spirit and involvement generated by the Blue Angels:

SUPERVISORS DECLARE MARCH 21 BLUE ANGELS APPRECIATION DAY: PUBLIC IS INVITED TO FAMILY DINNER AT FAIRGROUNDS

Honoring the Navy's Flight Demonstration Team on their Silver Anniversary Year, Imperial County Supervisors Tuesday passed a resolution designating March 21, 1971, Blue Angels Appreciation Day.

The resolution, presented by James Logan manager of Imperial Valley Development Agency, authorized the celebrating of Angel Appreciation Day with a public dinner at the California Mid-Winter Fairgrounds at Imperial and appropriate public ceremonies to "individually honor for their long hours of hard work to accomplish their missions" Blue Angels Commander Harley Hall and the officers and enlisted men that comprise the Flight Demonstration Team.

The dinner is planned for Sunday, March 21, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.

In the resolution, the Supervisors cite the Blue Angels as representing:

The finest in military aviation;

The highest type of American youth;

An outstanding example to youth of the perfection that can be achieved through teamwork, training, practice and discipline; and

For establishing their winter home here to take advantage of Imperial County's unexcelled winter weather, which they thereby publicize throughout the world.

"The Angel Appreciation Dinner will be a cooperative effort of people from throughout the county, set up through the help of Chambers of Commerce," Logan stated.

"It will be open to the public as a family dinner to give our children as well as the rank and file of our people an opportunity to meet the members of the Blue Angel Team."

VOLUNTEERS FOR OUR ARMED FORCES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the critics of the volunteer force ask where will the recruits come from when we end the draft. A most eloquent answer to this question appeared recently in the New York Times in an article written by John H. Caldwell of New Canaan, Conn.

New Canaan is one of the 10 wealthiest suburbs in the Nation—the average family income is $24,861 per year. In spite of the myth that the affluent do not volunteer for military service, Mr. Caldwell's son Douglas enlisted in the Marines. He is now a company commander and has decided to make a career in the Armed Forces.

Why has not our son come back to all this? How did he resist the peer pressure in the first place and enlist? "Hey Caldwell, why aren't you going to college?" He is now, 3 nights a week after work as a marine company commander.

Why is our son staying in the service? Do not most of us start on a job, give it a try, find we like the work, and do well at it, and make it our career? That is, you do when you pick a civilian job. Whatever job you take, you do not expect people to be hostile to you.

Mr. Caldwell stresses that support for his son's career is based on his belief in the connection between voluntarism and a free society:

Each of us is a consumer of liberty. That is what the United States is all about. It is so easy to do. We take it for granted. It is our right. Protection of liberty. Who is to do it, when it involves military service? Our national dilemma. In a democracy, each one must make his own decision. Our son chose his occupation: Marine. We are proud of his occupation.

I commend this item to your attention:

MY SON IS A MARINE

(By John H. Caldwell)

President Nixon's goal is an all-volunteer armed forces by mid-1973. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee flatly says it is "a flight from reality." The Secretary of Defense believes he can meet that goal if "the general public gives support by a positive attitude toward military service." The Caldwell family is part of that "general public." Our son is a Marine. He is staying in.

Douglas Caldwell. At 18 a private. Worse, from the point of view of many of his peers and their parents, he was just an infantryman, a "grunt." At 20 he was a second lieutenant. He was at Hue in the Tet offensive, leading a 50-man rifle platoon. At 22 he was an infantry company commander. At 23 he was a captain in the regulars. In the vernacular, he is a "lifer."

To meet the President's goal—in just two more years—Secretary Laird must find or retain some 3,000,000 "lifers." Your son may be one of them. Perhaps.

Douglas Caldwell. Our only child. A Marine! Almost incredible. The deck was stacked against the Marine recruiter. At our son's age I had a beard, attended a radical college, was antimilitary, antidraft, and I happily demonstrated against Mayor ("I am the law!") Hague in Jersey City.

Military recruiters do not find many privates in New Canaan, Conn. Of our son's high school peers 95 per cent went directly to college, vs. 40 per cent for the nation. The town is one of the nation's ten wealthiest suburbs. Annual per family income is $24,861. Among its 20,000 residents are an Under Secretary of State, Secretary of the Army, the Ambassador to France.

Why hasn't our son come back to all this? How did he resist the peer pressure in the first place and enlist? "Hey Caldwell, why aren't you going to college?" He is now, three nights a week, after work as a Marine company commander.

Why is our son staying in the service? Don't most of us start on a job, give it a try, find we like the work and do well at it, and make it our career? That is, you do when you pick a civilian job. Whatever job you take, you do not expect people to be hostile to you.

But it is something else, isn't it, to volunteer or be drafted as a soldier, sailor, airman, marine? The truth is society seems to say to its youth: if you get stuck with military duty, just serve your time. Then get out. Get out fast.

You may agree, grudgingly, the nation requires armed forces. But *my* son serve? Never unless drafted. Volunteer? Are you nuts? My wife and I hear this viewpoint quite often, expressed in the form of a friendly question: "Your son must be back home and out of the service by now, and what is he doing?"

Senator John Stennis has a real basis for saying the concept of an all-volunteer military service is a "flight from reality." Secretary Laird has put the matter squarely to American parents and their children. It could be possible, by mid-1973—to have that zero draft—if—"the general public gives support by a positive attitude toward military service."

Who is going to help—in the next two years—to overcome all those no-no's? Some of them are:

Parent Pressure: Your pressure favors college against military service. Understandable. Yet your son chooses to volunteer. Will you give him emotional support? Take an interest in his work? Be proud of his success? He would appreciate that. Expect it, too. Isn't that the kind of warm parental embrace you give to all your children, whatever they do?

Peer Pressure: Suppose one of your peers says he might volunteer. Do you jump on him? Or do you help him test the strength of his budding convictions? That is probably why he let you know what he had in mind in the first place.

To volunteer or to reject military service: at age 18 you really are making your own personal political assessment. You are likely to live an additional 50–60 years. What will the world be like in that time—your lifetime? It is human to hope there will be no war then. But to be antimilitary service is something else. During the remainder of your life do you believe the United States should maintain armed forces? If you all say no-no at 18, what then?

Pressure through Media: The anti-military viewpoint is heard often. Everyone has an opinion on world affairs. Entertainers, for example. They appear on TV and radio talk shows, do their thing, and then sit down and chat with the host. They are articulate. Many are antimilitary to varying degrees. They have a cumulative impact on opinion.

For all of us, the root question is: Does the United States require armed forces? Each

of us is a consumer of liberty. That is what the United States is all about. It is so easy to do. We take it for granted. It is our right. Protection of liberty. Who is to do it, when it involves military service? Our national dilemma. In a democracy, each one must make his own decision. Our son chose his occupation: Marine. We are proud of his occupation.

Mr. and Mrs. John H. Caldwell live in New Canaan, Conn., the permanent residence of their only child, Douglas, who is making his career in the Marine Corps.

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Whitney M. Young, Jr., director of the National Urban League for the past decade, is dead at the age of 49. Respected among blacks and whites alike for his straightforward and workmanlike approach to the civil rights struggle, Mr. Young broke down racial barriers that had withstood all assaults but his. In one 2-year period alone—from 1964 to 1966, when the Urban League shook itself out of what Young considered a kind of moody weariness—he almost singlehandedly got jobs for 40,000 blacks and helped 8,000 others to move up to better jobs.

A negotiator so skilled and so convincing that he was virtually unrivaled in the civil rights movement, Mr. Young knew how to get things done. He stayed away from the bullying tactics and menacing talk that had become fashionable among civil rights workers. He used reason, not threats. His battleground was the corporation boardroom, not the streets.

Once, when commuting between his suburban home in New Rochelle, N.Y., and New York City, he asked himself:

Should I get off this train this morning and stand on 125th Street cussing "Whitey" to show I am tough? Or should I go downtown and talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed Negroes?

Everyone concerned about civil rights is thankful he chose the latter course.

Widely described as a moderate—a term he disliked, since his dogged tenacity in pursuit of social justice yielded to nothing—Mr. Young quietly achieved goals other people could only shout about.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD newspaper articles paying tribute to Mr. Young:

[From the Washington Post]

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

Whitney Young's sudden and untimely death—he was only 49 years old and at the summit of his usefulness—takes from the contemporary scene another of those Negro leaders who worked at once for Negro rights and for interracial understanding, knowing them to be inseparable. Like the late Martin Luther King Jr., he opposed violence yet sought with the most ardent militancy to achieve for black Americans full equality of economic opportunity. As executive director of the National Urban League during the past decade, he worked tirelessly at the task of opening fields of employment previously closed to blacks. His tactic was to go straight to the top echelons of authority in commerce and industry and demand a fair chance for black workers.

Jobs, Whitney Young believed, afforded the master key that would, in time, open every other barrier to full racial equality. In trade after trade, he pried open doors which had been relentlessly closed and locked. Behind his quiet and cultivated demeanor, there was an extraordinary quality of force. Behind his personal charm, there lay the genuine toughness of conviction and dedication. He was a pragmatist, preferring accomplishment to rhetoric and effective influence to the assertion of power. His death diminishes all of us, for he appealed to the best in our national character—the capacity for reform and yearning for justice.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

Whitney M. Young Jr., who passed on Thursday, was a leading spokesman for the moderate factions in the civil-rights struggle in the United States. He led no demonstrations and served no jail sentences.

Mr. Young became executive director of the National Urban League in 1961. During his time in the post he sought to obtain job commitments for blacks in urban ghettos.

As his train from New Rochelle, N.Y. moved through Harlem, he once observed: "I think to myself, should I get off this train and stand on 125th Street cussing out whitey to show I am tough? Or should I go downtown and talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed Negroes?"

His choice was to go downtown. Between 1964 and 1966, when the league undertook a massive reorganization program, the league obtained jobs for 40,000 unemployed blacks and better positions for another 8,000.

"Someone," he once remarked, "has to work within the system to try to change it."

He thought of himself as that someone, and during his years as executive director of the Urban League his efforts to lead blacks into the mainstream of American society brought him wide respect from blacks and whites alike.

[From the New York Times]

FORCE FOR UNDERSTANDING

Whitney M. Young Jr. made himself a healing force in the tormented relations between blacks and whites. As executive director of the National Urban League, he applied his impressive resources of intelligence, energy and charm to leveling the walls of the slums through expanded opportunity for education and good jobs.

He hated to be called a "moderate" because that term might imply some lack of passion for eradicating social evils he loathed. But he never equated dedication to constructive change with pointless militancy, violence or villification. "We are all in the same boat," was his constant rejoinder to those who advocated separatist solutions.

Despite disappointments, Whitney Young did not abandon his faith in the efficacy of joint effort for a better society. His chief regret was that so many others—both white and black—failed to stay the distance.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1971]

WHITNEY YOUNG: COMPROMISE WAS HIS BYWORD

(By Robert C. Maynard)

In Atlanta in the middle 1950s, a group of young black professionals, unhappy about the direction of leadership from their elders, were planning to release a hearty blast at them and the city fathers.

The dean of the Atlanta University School of Social Work was apprised of the plan and urged that the older leaders be informed before the criticisms were made public. To the amazement of the younger men, the older leaders supported virtually all the criticisms and helped pay for printing the pamphlets.

Whitney Moore Young, Jr., the School of Social Work dean, had demonstrated once again the guiding principle of his life: persuasion and moderation can succeed in solving difficult problems.

He had proved it before in a Jim Crow Army, when he became the moderator between the white officers and the angry black soldiers. And he would prove it again and again as he rose to the leadership of the 60-year-old National Urban League.

"Nobody who's working for black people is a moderate," Young once told an interviewer. "We're all militants in different ways. I can't afford the luxury of a completely dogmatic position."

Psychologist Kenneth Clark, a friend for many years, said the role that Mr. Young had chosen for himself "was one of the most difficult roles a man could have chosen. He was sniped at from all sides, but he realized the importance of maintaining bridges of understanding, no matter how difficult."

Clark and others gave as an example of the difficulty of the role Young played, the constant criticism he received from blacks for his conciliatory relationship with the Nixon administration.

At a point last year when the NAACP was criticizing the administration for being "anti-Negro," Young said the administration, "isn't so bad," causing a minor uproar in civil rights and black circles.

A common reaction was that Mr. Young was seeking a position in the Nixon administration, but an official of the administration said privately yesterday that Mr. Young could have had a job there, anytime he wanted one.

"It was important to Whitney," one of his friends said yesterday, "to keep those bridges of communications open between blacks and the administration. That to him was crucial."

Mr. Young lived with his wife Margaret in suburban New Rochelle, N.Y. He recalled once that as the commuter train came through Harlem he asked himself:

"Should I get off this train this morning and stand on 125th Street cussing "Whitey" to show I am tough? Or should I go downtown and talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed Negroes?"

From the time he became the director of the National Urban League in 1961, Mr. Young placed the goal of jobs for blacks at the top of his list of priorities. By 1966, the Urban League, with a present budget of $35 million for its national and local operations, could claim to have helped 40,000 blacks go from unemployment to jobs between 1964 and 1966.

The impact of Mr. Young's leadership was evidenced in the reaction to his death:

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew:

"The sudden and untimely death of Whitney Young is a serious setback to the forces of moderation . . . He never allowed his energy to deteriorate to irresponsible action, and his was always a calm, reasonable, persuasive voice."

Lawrence O'Brien, Democratic National Chairman:

". . . one of the heroic figures of the 1960s . . . His tragic death is an incalculable loss, not only to those on whose behalf he fought for so long, but to men everywhere who hold truth and justice and equality to be the most transcendental of goals . . ."

Secretary of Labor James Hodgson:

"All of us are poor because of the loss of Whitney Young. But everyone is richer for all this courageous fighter gave us in a life of untiring service."

Frank Stanton, president of CBS:

"Whitney Young's death is a loss to the whole nation and a loss our country can ill

afford at this critical period. He will take his place in history as a great humanitarian and a great leader."

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), who had been with Mr. Young in Lagos, Nigeria, the day before he died:

"Just yesterday in Lagos, he was so vital and alive, participating actively in the kind of work he loved so well."

Whitney Young was born July 31, 1921, in Lincoln Ridge, Kentucky, the son of the president of Lincoln Institute, a Negro high school. His mother was a teacher. He graduated from the school his father headed at 14 and went on to a Negro college, Kentucky State.

He had planned to become a physician after spending a year as a teacher, but he entered the Army in 1943 and was sent to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to learn engineering. It was after that, when he was with an Army road-building company, that he found himself in the role of peacekeeper between the white Southern officers and the black enlisted men.

"That was the beginning of my work in that field—being an intermediary between whites and blacks," Young recalled last year.

"I would say to the brothers in the company, 'I agree you are getting a bad deal, but what's it going to take to get you to fall out in the morning.' "

Then, as he recalled for Tom Buckley of The New York Times, he would take the grievances of the men to the white officers and "we'd extract the conditions."

When 1st Sgt. Young's black fellow soldiers accused him of "Uncle Toming" to the white officers, he told them, "O.K., you take over." Nobody wanted to.

Out of the service, he took a master's degree in social work from the University of Minnesota and worked for a time as the director of the Urban League in Omaha, Neb., before joining the faculty of Atlanta University.

It was while he was making a speech at an annual meeting of the Urban League in Washington that he came to the attention of Lindsley Kimball, who scouted worthy causes for Rockefeller family philanthropies.

Impressed with the "strong, logical, sensible address," Kimball approached Young, arranged for him to spend a year at Harvard thinking and reading, in preparation for replacing Lester Granger, who had headed the Urban League for many years.

The Urban League had long been regarded by others as a civil rights organization, but that is not how it regards itself. It is, to those who have served over the six decades of its existence, a social service agency. It seeks to help blacks with jobs and other social needs.

In the tumult of the 1960s, Mr. Young pursued jobs for blacks with vigor among all of the top corporations of the nation. He was considered very successful at his mission.

Once, he took a position that many in his organization thought would lose support among white donors. He decided to be among the 10 leading civil rights leaders who sponsored the 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. If it lost him any support, it did not seem to matter to him or to the Urban League.

At a time in the middle 1960s when Martin Luther King was opposing the war in Vietnam, Mr. Young toured the country at the request of President Johnson and praised the war effort. He criticized King for his antiwar stand, linking civil rights and the war.

Through the years, his role as a moderate created uncomfortable moments for Whitney Young, but two of his friends yesterday, who have known him through the years, suggested that his role was one that will be hard to fill.

"This struggle has such a thin front line," said Kenneth Clark. "When we lose a Whitney Young there is no one to replace him."

Carl Holman, vice president of the Urban Coalition, said, "There just aren't any more Whitney Youngs around. It's devastating."

"To lose a Malcolm X, a Martin Luther King and now a Whitney Young," Clark said, "is fantastic. They were each irreplaceable men, although so different."

TWENTY-FOUR YEARS IN THE LIFE OF LYUBA BERSHADSKAYA

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to attend a lunch given by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) to meet Mrs. Lyuba Bershadskaya, a Soviet Jew who was permitted to emigrate to Israel in July 1970. This remarkable woman was a ballet dancer and later a member of Ambassador Averell Harriman's staff in the American Embassy during World War II. In 1946, she was arrested for her association with Americans and sent to Siberia where she endured 10 years of imprisonment at forced labor.

In 1956, Mrs. Bershadskaya was released from prison, but not freed from official oppression. For many years, she was unable to obtain work and lodging because she is a Jew. Her experiences are described in a moving article in the New York Times magazine of March 14, 1971. The article was written by Miss Trudie Vocse and is entitled "24 Years in the Life of Lyuba Bershadskaya." I am inserting it in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues.

Mrs. Bershadskaya's story is an inspiring example of great personal courage and determination, and an outrageous example of Soviet oppression and antisemitism. I share her hope that the Soviet Union will grant exit visas to all who desire to emigrate, and I support her efforts to illuminate the plight of Soviet Jewry for concerned Americans and members of the world community.

[From the New York Times Magazine, March 14, 1971]

24 YEARS IN THE LIFE OF LYUBA BERSHADSKAYA

(By Trudie Vocse)

[NOTE.—Trudie Vocse is a pseudony. She is an American novelist and poet with relatives living in the Soviet Union.]

At first it was easy to listen to Lyuba Bershadskaya—it was all music. I was standing on a maroon carpet in a dark corridor outside her New York hotel room, while from behind the shut door waves and waves of lovely Russian sounds flowed out. There was a bell to ring, and in the dimness I pushed it, but nothing happened—only more and more of that skipping Russian tide, full of *gdye* and *horosho* and *znayesh*. The hallway was perfectly still; the only stir was the stir of this intricate birdlike foreign voice.

It belonged to a vistor six months out of Russia who had flown in from Israel the evening before. Two American organizations—the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews and the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations—had invited her to come. Beyond these few cool facts I knew only one more fact—Lyuba Bershadskaya had survived 10 years of forced labor in Siberian prison camps. In 1946, she had gone into prison a Soviet citizen; in 1956, she emerged a passionate Jew, determined to get out of the Soviet Union. On July 10, 1970, the Soviet Government issued a visa to Lyuba Bershadskaya to leave Russia for Israel—14 years after the start of her struggle to escape, 24 years after her arrest.

The visitor who finally opened the door was a striking woman in her middle 50's, wearing a white sweater and dragging after her the cord of a white telephone, all the while animatedly pouring out Russian syllables. Her face was splendidly strong and utterly—almost stereotypically—Russian, with great smooth cheeks, a brief elfin nose that slid upward in profile, and Tartarishly slanted eyelids. Her hair was short and gray, with businesslike bangs. A tiny chip of gold glinted in her smile. Her manner was warm, close; I began to feel I had never not known her. Her full name, I soon learned, was Lyubov Leontyevna Bershadskaya; it was unthinkable to call her anything but Lyuba. "My husband has friends in New York that he used to know in Russia," she explained in English, and went back to the telephone and Russian.

Lyuba hung up. "A terrible situation! No wonder he didn't write Nikolai—imagine that, 43 years married, and now he leaves her for a young girl!" Somehow this shred of anecdote, with its overtones of vaudeville tragedy, set us laughing. Suddenly Lyuba was telling a joke. "A Jew comes to OVIR," she began. "What? You don't know what is OVIR?" (It stands for the Government agency in charge of issuing visas to leave the Soviet Union.) "So he comes to OVIR, and he says he wants to be reunited with this blind brother. 'You want to be reunited with your brother?' says the official. 'Then tell your brother to come here.' 'No, no,' the Jew protests, 'you seem to have misunderstood me. I said my brother is blind: I didn't say he's crazy.' "

I went to the telephone to order Lyuba's lunch: apple pie and tea. A teasing family mood had taken hold of the room. Here was all this handsome American plumbing, the gleam of all that furniture—standard hotel bed, shining end tables, plump-but-hard easy chairs: it seemed grotesque to be hearing Russian jokes in such a place. It seemed grotesque even to be laughing. A moment ago, coming into indoor warmth from the frigid New York streets, I had said without thinking, "It's Siberia out there." Siberia! Another joke. And here was Lyuba, who had been there. The point of the laughter all at once came clear: we were reluctant to speak of the thing Lyuba had come to tell. We fussed about, ruminated over where to sit, dragged chairs. I took out my pen and puzzled over the list of formal questions I had ready. Then I tore the page out of my pad and folded it away. Instead, I asked Lyuba how it was she could laugh so easily.

"To laugh and to joke is better than to cry. In the camps many people wept. Many people sobbed and screamed, many got crazy. I stayed calm," Lyuba said. Her gaze turned inward. "Before the camps I used to be gay all the time. I never cried, except at films. At films I cried very much. But in the camps I never cried, never. I was all the time thinking of one thing."

The door opened, Lyuba's mouth snapped shut. She stared at the wall behind me. The bellboy had come in and was setting up a little table, laying out forks and plates and pots of hot water.

I looked at Lyuba and waited for her to go on. "It's only the lunch," I said. Her face was divided—she wanted to be polite, to comply. "You see, I had this *idée fixe*. . . ." But it was a murmur and died away. She could not speak. It was ludicrous, it was outrageous: Lyuba was afraid of the bellboy. The man finished and left. "A habit," she

explained, with mocking self-consciousness. "In Moscow, the bellboys. . . ." It came out part anger, part defiance, part shame and apology. "In Moscow the bellboys are official eavesdroppers." But the anger took over:

"All that time in the camps I thought how I wanted the whole world to know. I was thinking how I would write it all. Write! Write! I thought only about writing. And the first day, the very day I came to Israel, I sat down and began. And in a month I was finished. I wrote one whole day after another, because I had only to set it down. Now I have written my book. It was all in my mind, ready, saved up."

I asked whether she had ever thought of herself as a writer before—whether she had ever written, even in childhood, poems or stories. No, she said, never. Only this book.

She lifted the manuscript out of her suitcase. It was moderately thick, and all in Russian. She held it as if it could burn her. "This book, this book," she said. "Everything is in it. It would be the greatest crime if my book were not read in America. Even those who have published abroad—the novelists—have not told all there is. What happened to me is the biography of thousands." She returned it to the suitcase as if the suitcase were a cradle, and out of this cradle she took a smaller sheaf of papers. "Here are two translated episodes. In Tel Aviv someone translated for me, but he was sick, his wife wouldn't let him work at it a lot. . . ." I leafed through the pages. The handwriting was clear but the language was awkward. It was about Lyuba's journey to Siberia. I began to read.

For 28 full days and nights she traveled in a locked iron cage on a train headed for the town of Mariinsk, Kemerovo District, Siberia. The journey began on Dec. 15, 1946, and ended on Jan. 13, 1947. Fifteen hundred other prisoners were on the same train; except for Lyuba and five other women classified as political detainees, all were criminals. The six women were confined together in the tiny cage, which was furnished only with a plank. There was room for four on the plank. The other two sat on the floor. At night, five could manage to stretch out their legs, while the sixth had to arrange herself in a crouching hump, with legs tucked under, close to the door of the cage. They took turns at crouching.

During the whole 28 days they were given water only three times. The daily food consisted of heavily salted fish, so a choice had to be made between hunger and thirst. The six women chose not to eat the fish. Lyuba had in her pocket the peelings of some oranges which her mother had brought to the prison in Moscow—at that time, the investigation of her case had been still under way, and such things were still permitted. Lyuba distributed bits of the orange peel. They all chewed it slowly, letting tears fall into their mouths to moisten the bitter taste. Three times a day they chewed the peels. They were tortured by hunger; they expected to die of thirst. No one slept. The journey went on slowly—every two or three hours, the train jerked to a halt. The prisoners screamed for water, but no water came, and the train went on.

Armed soldiers passed through the carriages constantly, frightening the screams into whispers. Now and then, a soldier would remove a corpse. The soldiers never spoke. There were more and more corpses.

On New Year's Eve, it was Lyuba's turn to crouch by the cage door. She huddled there dully. On the plank the women were weeping—tears without noise. Shrieks wafted out of the far cars; for water, for removal of the dead. Lyuba's head was pressed against the grates of the cage; a guard's legs moved back and forth inches from her eyes. She could smell him. Suddenly the legs squatted down. A little soldier, terribly young, breathed in her ear: "Ssh! Want some soup? Hey! Wake up!"

The women on the plank stirred. No one could understand what was happening. And all at once there was a pail of soup in the middle of the floor. The commandant was asleep; the little soldier had unlocked the door. He stood in the narrow space beyond the cage, watching, whispering for them to hurry—if he got caught, he'd be shot. The smell of the soup dizzied them. It was real food, something to swallow. They wanted it. Out of nowhere, one of the women found a spoon. One spoon. She put it on the floor. No one picked it up. Each was waiting for the next to begin. They were all looking into one another's eyes. Every face was as pitiful as the next. They all pitied one another, and no one could bear to be first. Someone picked up the spoon and they passed it around. But no one dipped into the pail. No one touched the pail. "Eat!" said the soldier. No one ate. "Idiots!" He took the pail away and locked up the cage.

Thirteen days later, the train hissed onto a great snowy field in the heart of a Siberian storm. The prisoners were herded out into the depths of the wind and snow. They saw an endless collection of soldiers, guns, dogs, officers, officials—and there, piled up on eight waiting wagons, the frozen bodies of those who had died on the way.

There was more to read, but here I stopped.

"Tell me about when you were little," I said to Lyuba.

"I was the only one in my school who didn't belong to the Pioneers—that's the first echelon. After that, when you're older, it's Komsomol, and then the party. I used to come crying to my mother, 'Everybody has a red tie but me.' But she wouldn't let me join."

Somehow it was difficult to go forward. I put down my pen and picked up the manuscript. I understood why Lyuba had handled it as if it contained a conflagration. The rest of it demanded to be read.

From Lyuba's manuscript:

"The following incident took place.

"They brought these women from Western Ukraine. They had been collected from various prisons of different towns. They had been arrested while pregnant and had given birth to children in prison. They were 320 in number.

"They had been told in prison before being sent to Siberia that they must give up their children and they themselves go to camp. Not one of them agreed.

"A scandal broke out within the walls of Krasnaya Presnya, the Moscow women's prison. Women sobbed; the shouting and moaning were such that the walls shook. In the end, the authorities 'softened' and informed the mothers that they would go to the camp with their children, where they would bring them up and work.

"So holding their children still more firmly, the 320 mothers were quieted.

"And then they brought the 320 mothers with their children, the oldest no more than six months of age, to the Mariinsk at the end of January, 1947, in the middle of the Siberian frost. They lived for a week without letting their children out of their hands. Like intimidated animals, the tiny children, exactly as if understanding something, lay quietly in their mothers' arms.

"At the end of the week the mothers were unexpectedly told to collect the children and wrap them up more warmly: the whole group was to be sent somewhere else. Carts containing straw stood beside the guardroom and it was suggested to the mothers that they should put the children in the carts because of the long journey before them.

"Trustingly, the weakened mothers carefully put the children in the carts and formed themselves in fives behind them. This army of mothers, in the order of a convoy, spread itself out widely, ready to march. The gates opened. The carts pulled forward. And the gates closed behind the last of them. The mothers, at their wits' end, did not understand for a moment what had happened. Then they thought it over and it became clear that their children had been taken away right in front of their eyes.

"For three days and nights the women lay in the snow beside the guardroom. They no longer wept but howled. For hours they neither ate nor drank nor left the gates. They let out animal-like noises, knowing they would never see their little ones again. All the other prisoners were held locked in the huts until the exhausted women had recovered and been put back in the huts. Some had to be carried on stretchers.

"The cries of the mothers were long heard throughout the camp. Anybody who was at the camp of Mariinsk in those years will never forget those terrible cries!

"Such were the ways of the M. V. D. in those years."

I set Lyuba's manuscript down in the suitcase that was its cradle and said: "Tell me about your mother and father."

"My father died when I was a year old. My mother was a young woman of 30 then, beautiful, and elegantly educated—she could speak English, French and German. To us she spoke mostly German. I was the youngest, the baby. There were six of us—my three sisters and my two brothers."

"Where are they now?"

"Dead, all dead. I will tell how one of my sisters died. It was only three years ago. My sister's husband was chief of a big plant, a nice, clever man. He worked 15 years at this big job and all that time he and his family lived in a flat with a common kitchen shared by many families. For 15 years they promised him a separate flat, and for 15 years my sister hoped and hoped. One day he came with the news: a new flat! It had one room and a kitchen all to itself—the room 20 square meters [about 215 square feet], the kitchen 6 square meters [about 64 square feet]. So they moved in, and they had a housewarming. And on that day, in the middle of the party, in the separate kitchen, my sister fell dead of a stroke. That is one sister. I had another sister who died another way."

"How?"

"At Babi Yar."

"And your mother?"

"She died when I was in prison."

"Were you ever conscious of anti-Semitism when you were a child?"

"Never. I didn't feel or know any difference between Jews or Russians. I think it was because no one ever took me for Jewish. I was brought up in Kiev, in the Ukraine, where they aren't fond of Jews. But also my mother was exceptionally protective. She never let go of my hand. She checked all my friends. She chose my world for me. We never talked about differences—Jews, Russians. But I remember one episode. Someone got beaten up in school, and Mama said: 'You must protect Jews.' And later, when I had boyfriends, she wanted only Jewish boys.

"My mother's mother was pious, Orthodox—she spoke only Yiddish. But my mother's father made friends with actresses and gypsies and lived to be 109. My grandparents were well-off; my grandfather was a wood merchant, and my mother's dowry when she got married was a factory that made nails. My mother was sent to a fashionable school that didn't take Jews—she was one of only three in the whole school. She was educated like a Russian; this was very unusual for Jews. The factory is still there—in Cherkassy, the town I was born in. I was born April 25, 1916. The next year, the Soviets took over the factory, workers and all, and my father died, and my mother moved with all of us to Kiev. We lived poorly, we had nothing."

"Is that why your mother was angry at the

Government? And wouldn't let you join the Pioneers?"

"In the beginning, when she was young, she felt it for herself, for what she had lost. But afterward it was different. She saw what was happening to people who had other backgrounds. She saw everything and she felt it for everyone."

"But you yourself were born into Communism: you never knew anything else."

"In school I was like everyone. I wanted to have the red tie. Still, I had something else—I loved dancing. My teacher—she died when I was 7—was a pupil of Isadora Duncan. I went to regular school all along, but I was dancing in the theater at the same time. Later, I studied with Professor Zacharov—he's in charge of the opera theater in Kiev now. But when I was 6 or 7 I was dancing in a Jewish operetta, 'Reyzele.' And I had the part of a little boy in 'Tsvey Shvester,' a play put on by the Kunstvinkl, the Yiddish theater they used to have in Kiev. I played 101 performances. I didn't know Yiddish, so they copied the lines out for me into the Russian alphabet and I memorized them.

"From then on, I was always dancing. In Moscow, I went to the Institute of Art—I studied cinema—but I went on dancing until 1944. I was with the Bolshoi Theater when Zacharov was there. But the Bolshoi didn't pay well, so then I gave concerts. And I began to teach classical ballet; I had a group until 1946."

"And you did all these things—the institute, and dancing and teaching—while you were a wife and mother too?"

"I was married at 17—in 1933. My husband came from a family of bakers. They were very religious people. I had to go to the ritual bath before the wedding. My husband's brother makes matzoth in Moscow even today. My older son was born in 1934, my daughter in 1937, my second son in 1941. My second son was born 18 days after the start of the war. We had no food, no lights. Moscow was starving. The only thing we had to eat was what the Americans sent in. My husband went into the army. And I went to work for the American Embassy."

"How did that come about?"

"For two years I had been taking English courses. At that time, my English was really very good—much, much better than now. I had this friend from the institute, Alla Karavayeva, who was in the cinema. She played the leading role in 'Mashenka'—you're familiar with 'Mashenka'? No? A well-known film. Alla Karavayeva was engaged to an English captain—his name was Maurice Chapman. He lived at the Hotel Savoy in Moscow. One day in 1942 I went to visit them there, and Chapman had a friend visiting, too. Lieut. Col. Mark Cape, who was chief of staff of the American military mission in the U.S.S.R. He liked my English and invited me to come as a translator.

"I worked at the military mission until it left Moscow in 1945. Then the military attaché at the American Embassy, General Roberts, took me into his office. I worked for Ambassador Harriman on Spasopeskovsky Street. He was always very kind to me. He gave me little gifts which I treasured, but I wasn't allowed to bring them out when I left. My chief was Col. Crockett James, the grandson of Davy Crockett—he was from Tennessee. The counselor of the Embassy was Mr. Kennan. He was there with his wife and two little daughters.

"In spite of the war and all the hardships, I was immensely happy in those years—I had my job and my dancing and my children. I worked at the American Embassy until 1946, when I was arrested. They arrested anybody who had anything to do with Americans."

"What was the trial like?"

"Trial! What trial? There was no trial. They said there was no crime; it was a question of suspicion only. There were no witnesses, no lawyers; there was nothing. They held a troika—three judges. I wasn't there; I never saw it or knew anything about it, only what they told me. They came in the middle of the night. I was in bed asleep—it was 2 A.M. on March 21, 1946. At the door there was a soldier with a gun, hauling in a street cleaner. In those days they always used to grab the street cleaner, anybody at all, right off the streets, to be a witness when they came to search. They said: 'Militia checking your documents,' and pointed the gun, and kept turning things inside out and asking me questions until 10 the next morning. Then they took me to Lubyanka Prison.

"Lubyanka Prison is on one of the main squares of Moscow. A great, beautiful, impressive building, made all of glossy black marble. When tourists come to Moscow this is one of the places they show—shining Government offices. All the outside parts of the building—the sides facing on the street—house the offices of the secret police, but inside, deep and away from the street, in the core of the building—there they hide the prison. They took me to a door, and on it was a sign: 'Waiting Room.' But in Russian these same words can also mean 'Eternal Resting Place.' This was how they mocked whomever they made go through that door.

"I was in solitary confinement there for nine months. There was a little chair and a wooden bench to sleep on. For the first three months, my mother was allowed to bring something to the prison for me every week. That was how the orange peelings got into my pocket. But I was never allowed to see anyone, and I couldn't write letters and no one could write to me.

"During these nine months an investigator came to talk to me five—no, I think six—times. He wanted me to sign a paper, to confess. He would say he had documents to prove I was 'in criminal connection with Americans.' I would say, 'Show me the papers.' 'If I say so it's enough,' he said. He never showed me anything, but once he sat on the chair and read from a page which he said was a letter from my husband. I laughed in his face. The letter was all about how I was a spy, and denounced me. I said, 'You don't expect me to believe that fake letter!'

"Afterward I found out that many who were told about such letters really believed. They felt isolated, abandoned, and it was easy for them to believe their families had come to suspect them. Later on, we heard that at that time there were 30 million political detainees in the Soviet Union. And the prisoners knew this; we knew. In the camps we understood this massiveness. You could get arrested for anything—for telling an anecdote. In one of the camps there was an old woman, an illiterate peasant, who had been arrested for the crime of having two little lambs named Stalin and Lenin. She used to summon them—'Here, Stalin, here, Lenin, come!'—and so they sent her to Siberia for disrespect.

"After the nine months in isolation in Lubyanka Prison they put me in Butirskaya Prison. I was in a cell with 28 other women. After a month, they herded us into the Black Crow. This was a truck fitted with bars all around inside, but no one could guess its use. On the outside it looked like an ordinary delivery vehicle. It had big letters all over it that said 'Bread,' and it went right through the streets of Moscow without attracting any attention. In this way we were brought to the train for Marünsk. And this train also would not make you look at it twice—on the outside it seemed no different from a regular passenger train, but inside there were the cages, exactly like zoo cages.

"I was 30 years old when I went into the camps and 40 when I came out—the best years of a woman's life. I spent 10 years in three different camps: Marlinski, Kazakhstan—that means 'Dead Field,' it was a desert full of sand—and Mordoviya. These were all old political camps, in use since 1927. Until 1949, they kept the criminals and the politicals together, and the criminals tortured the politicals.

"The camps were huge, huge, with a great closed gate and fences, and all around were three rows of barbed wire, and inside the barbed wire soldiers stood watching, with guns and dogs. Many, many dogs. Dogs in packs, only each one was on its own chain, and we would hear them always barking and barking, and the chains ringing out, scraping. In the four corners of the camp there were tall sentry posts. Each one had a soldier with a machine gun, and sometimes they would call down to us, 'We don't have to waste good Russian bullets on you, you're finished anyhow.' They were all warmly dressed and fed, and when they shouted we would look up at them in their good thick, heavy uniforms; we were always in agony because of the cold. Everyday there were between 60 and 70 deaths—some from cold, some from hunger, some from suicide.

"We were kept in long barracks. All the land was flat and stretched far, and on this distant flatness you could see barracks and barracks in endless rows, with a few tiny windows high up under the roofs. We slept in wooden bunks three tiers high, on straw mattresses and straw pillows. We had to use our jackets for blankets. There was one immense building they called the dining hall. A stink of fish was always coming out of it, and the wind brought the smell everywhere. The smell itself—when I think of it now I want to vomit. The only other building was the washhouse. It was unheated, and it was a torment to wet your body in the icy air. We were allowed to wash every ten days.

"I did all sorts of work. Some of it wasn't even for beasts to do. The easiest time I had was two years working in a laundry—I had to wash 200 soldiers' uniforms every day. The working day was from 6 in the morning until 6 at night. When they found out that some of us were talented people they took us out every night and made us perform for the camp officials. So from 6 to 6 we had to slave, and from 8 to 10 at night we had to sing and dance for them. They made us organize a sort of theater.

"One day—this was at Kazakhstan—I refused to work. It was too much. An animal couldn't do what they expected of me. So they had a trial. A judge came from Moscow—his name was Duzhansky, a Jew. He was very nice to me. Even before he said anything he gave me a reassuring look. He told them: 'You can't do anything to her. It's against the law that she's here. There was no crime. There were no witnesses.' I had to go back to work, but they didn't punish me for striking.

"Soon after the trial, there was a strike that lasted 40 days. It was spreading, the whole camp refused to work. There was a huge high fence that confined us—2,500 women and 11,000 men. The men came yelling: 'Strike! No work!' and broke through the fence. They put out a big flag: 'Death or Freedom.' And now all those thousands and thousands of prisoners were there behind the broken fence, women and men together, and the camp authorities ordered tanks. The tanks smashed into the crowd, directly into living flesh, grinding people up. Five hundred were killed, 750 lost their minds that day.

"There was a public report. Colonel Dimura, one of the camp officials, told these figures; it was no secret. Everyone knew. After the report a group of generals came from Moscow to investigate. They made the prisoners choose their own representatives to talk for them. Ten men and two women were selected. I was one of the women. The other was a strong, simple peasant woman named Nussi. Nussi could never believe that out of 2,500 women prisoners in that place I was the only Jew. 'No!' she'd say with her mouth open. 'You're not a Jew, not you!' The two of us were together on everything.

"The generals sent a civilian to question us: 'Who organized the strike? Who acted to start things off? Give the names.' We didn't tell. Then he said: 'If you don't tell, you will be sent to the closed prison at Kurgan.' We knew about Kurgan, everyone did. To be sent there was a death sentence. There they kept only the most dangerous criminals. Nobody, criminal or political, had ever come out of Kurgan alive. If they wanted to get rid of a political they would send him to Kurgan and the regular prisoners there would tear him to pieces.

"Even the guards who brought us there were afraid. They threw us past the gates; they didn't dare go in themselves.

"In Kurgan they put Nussi and me into a cell with 12 terrible women. We were put there to die. They weren't like women at all; they were savages. All of them had been in prison since they were 12 years old. They never knew any other life. Soviet law allows political criminals to be put in prison only at the age of 18, but ordinary criminals can be imprisoned at 12. These had all been child offenders—thieves, delinquents, wild children collected out of the streets; some had murdered before the age of 15. In prison they continued to commit crimes. They were no longer sane—maybe they had never been. They were not like human beings. They had never seen political prisoners, only their own sort. They hardly knew any language. Their talk was all filth. They sniffed around us, watching us all the time. They were powerful, ready to destroy, full of hate, curses, fury.

"We were a year in Kurgan and we survived. How? By a miracle. I don't know how it began, but once—maybe to distract them, or myself—I found myself singing a song. It was a simple little children's song. They sat down around me and asked me to sing it again. And I did. Then I told them a story. They had never heard a story. I told them all the stories I could remember, and I sang all the songs I had ever known, and it tamed them. I even got them to give up their dirty words. 'Please, Lyuba, tell us a story!' 'Not unless you stop the naughty language and talk properly.' When we finished our term they cried because we had to go away.

"They sent me to Mordoviya.

"And now the camps became more glutted than ever. Train after train after train with prisoners, all Jews. Only Jews, Jews and Jews. They came by the hundreds. The whole camp was full of Jews. It was 1953, the year of the Doctors' Plot. Hundreds of Jews were trying to escape from the Soviet Union at that time. There were all sorts of undergrounds. There was a ferryman in the Caucasus who took people across the water at night, out of Russia. But they caught him and sent the whole boatload, and all the people waiting to go next, to the camps.

"I remember one day there was an old Jewish woman, one of the new arrivals, sobbing terribly. Tears were falling all over her. 'How could they do this to me? To *me!*' she said. 'All my life I was a good Communist. I gave my life and my soul to the party . . .' 'That's why,' I told her. She didn't understand me. But a few weeks afterward, she said, 'You were right. I was deluded.'

"In the camp she stopped being a Communist—this they did for her—and she became a Jew. This they did for her also. And I, who had never been a Communist, but had not been much of anything else either, also became a Jew. I saw how they were bringing in Jews without any pretext at all—only because they were Jews.

"So I became a Jew. It was clear how I stood in relation to my country. I knew I would never find a place in it again, because of being a Jew.

"The Soviet Government helped to turn us into Jews. They did everything to make us feel we were strangers in the country where we were born."

Lyuba sighed.

She said: "I'm glad I had this experience. It taught me, it transformed me. It's no use asking myself *how* I became a Jew. I just became one. I started to love my people. My brother, who never knew a word of Yiddish, when he died spoke his last words in Yiddish: *'Siz mir shlekht.'* How did it happen? We just became Jews. It happened.

"In 1956, the rehabilitation started. They admitted their own crimes. Did things change then? Were they better? I will come to that. I will answer from my own life. I will answer as a Jew.

"From April until October, representatives from the Government came to the camps to free the political prisoners. Hundreds of people went home. The day I was released, I sent a telegram to my family to tell them it was over: I was coming out.

"On the way back, in the train, there was a certain exprisoner I couldn't help noticing. He had a beautiful Jewish face; he was very intelligent and very nice, but he was dirty, unshaven, full of the smell of the camps. He hadn't even tried to clean up a little. He was going to his wife in Moscow, but he hadn't sent a telegram. In Moscow, he had been an engineer. He told me he had stayed kosher for the whole eight years he was in prison. Eight years! How he did it and didn't die of starvation. . . .

"I said I thought it odd he hadn't sent a cable: Didn't he realize his wife would get a terrible shock? He explained a little custom he had with his wife. Because they shared a flat with others, he didn't like to ring the bell when he came home from work—it disturbed the neighbors, who were asleep at that hour. So, instead, he used to come round the corner and give a little tap on the window, and then his wife would come running to the door to embrace him. They had done that every day since their marriage. That was what he meant to do now—tap on the window. 'Just the way I am,' he said. 'I want her to see how I looked in prison, the way things were.' 'But if you give your wife a surprise like that, you'll kill her!' I said. I asked him to let me know how things turned out. Afterward, in Moscow, I heard from him. He has tapped on the window, and his wife had run to the door. They were together again. Everything was like eight years before.

"But when I came to my own family, nothing was like before. My children were strangers to me; I was a stranger to them. Not just any stranger—a bad stranger. They were educated without me, and against me. In school they were told their mother was an enemy of the Soviet Government. When I went to prison, my younger son was a little boy of 5, my older son was 12, my daughter was 9. Now they were 15 and 19, and one was a man of 22. I didn't know them. When I was taken away, they never heard from me afterward—nor I anything from them."

"Where are they now?"

"In Moscow. My elder son is a lawyer; the younger one is an architect. My daughter is married to an engineer—she has three little ones. They are all married and have families."

I asked how the children felt about her leaving the Soviet Union.

Lyuba's mouth hardened. "They are pure Soviet persons. They are afraid to talk, they are afraid to say anything. The day I left Moscow to go to Israel, 200 people came to the airport to say good-by. They already considered me a free person. They trusted me, they could say anything. People kept calling out: 'Lyuba, tell Nixon, tell U Thant, tell Nixon!' Only my children weren't there. Only my children didn't come."

"Do they write you?"

"Not my sons. Before leaving home—I live in Haifa now—I had a letter from my daughter: 'Write me how life is in Israel, maybe I'll come to you.' Write her how it is!' Lyuba gave a scornful hiss.

"Nobody had to explain Israel to *me!* She'll have to find out by herself who she is. When her heart changes, then I'll write her these things. She's not interested; it was only something to say in a letter. Only her own family is her concern—she was educated in that style. To be quiet, to huddle into your own family, not to say anything."

"Who took care of your children while you were gone?

"My husband's family. Aunts, cousins, whoever."

"But you describe them as a religious family, a Jewish family. How is it they didn't form the children's thinking differently . . .?"

"You don't know, you can't understand. They are Soviet youth. The schools made them. You don't understand the atmosphere. When I came back from the camps in 1956, I could feel the difference in Moscow. Worse, worse. Anti-Semitism was thick, deep—it was everywhere. Whenever you turned, you heard it and saw it. Once—on the street, right under a policeman's nose—a man was shouting things against the Jews. I said to the policeman, 'Why don't you arrest that hooligan? If he were shouting things like that against the Government you'd grab him right off.' 'He's only a drunk,' he said, and turned his back. The whole city was full of talk against the Jews. It was like a fog: you breathed it.

"I had been in prison a decade. I had no job, no home, no children. I looked at my husband and I knew I had no husband. The camps had divorced us: we had been separated too long.

"Then began my three years as a wanderer through the streets of Moscow. I will tell how this came about.

'I tried to get a place to live and I tried to get a job. Both were impossible.

"The prisoners who were rehabilitated were told that in order to be allowed to work again they had to obtain a work record from their last employer. Without this work record you were not eligible for a job. My own last employer had been the American Embassy. I couldn't go back *there*—they had arrested me for being there in the first place. So I went instead to the offices of UPEDEKA—these are the initials that stand for the Administration for Service to the Diplomatic Corps. They had a section in charge of employment—the Department of Cadres, it was called.

"A man named Syergeyev was the head of this section, and he was kind to me. He tried and tried to help me get a work record. But every time I came back to him, he had bad news: 'No record possible for you. No job possible for you.' One day, in desperation, I asked Syergeyev, please, please, to tell me frankly what the trouble was, why he could do nothing for me. He gave me a straightforward look: 'Do you want to know really?' 'Yes.' 'The truth?' 'Yes.' 'It is because you are a Jew.'

"So I had no work and no money. I could not buy food, I had no clothes, and I ate and wore whatever was given me by friends and relatives.

"Even worse than this was that I had no place to stay. The rehabilitated prisoners had been promised lodging. But this was impossible: there was not enough housing to go around. The waiting lists were long, long, but even the list did not matter much, because there was no space. They said to me: 'If you will agree to go out of Moscow, you will be allowed to rent a room.'

"But how could I go out of Moscow? To rent a room from Whom? I had just come from the camps—I knew only my immediate circle. I did not know a single person outside of Moscow. And I had to stay in Moscow, anyhow, because of my struggle to get my work papers. And besides this, there was a further difficulty. Even if they had given me my documents, I would not have been al-

lowed to work; the law says that you cannot have a job unless you have a stamp on your internal passport signifying that you have lodging in the city. So I was not allowed to work because they would not give me my work record, and because I was a Jew, and because I had no lodging. All those reasons.

"At that time I had a sister and a brother still alive, both living in Moscow. I could easily have moved in with my sister or my brother, but this was not allowed. You don't understand why? In the Soviet Union, there is a law against moving in with other people. You cannot make a long visit without registering with the police. You cannot stay more than 24 hours in someone else's lodging without reporting to the police; you cannot stay longer than one night. You have to tell them with whom you are staying and for how many hours, and also you have to give them the address of your own lodging. I had no address of my own, so I was afraid to go to the police. I would stay two days with my sister, two days with my brother, always in fear of being found out. This friend took me in, that friend, another friend. I never knew at the start of any day where I would spend the night. And everyone who gave me hospitality overnight gave it at the risk of getting arrested for breaking the law.

"I was a fugitive inside my own city. They had forced me to become a wanderer and a fugitive. And even though I was not to blame, and everyone knew I was not to blame, I felt the guilt you feel, and the shame, when people offer you charity. Sometimes a friend would want to take me home for a meal and I would say, 'No, no, thank you very much, I have just eaten dinner in a restaurant.' And that day I would go hungry, because it is easier to be hungry than to be pitied.

"And during the day I would walk the streets and look up at windows and get glimpses of the inside of people's houses and think how so many had places of their own and beds of their own, and only I had no bed of my own and no work. And I burned with envy of all the ordinary lives behind all the windows of Moscow. Even in the camps I had a pillow filled with straw that was my own. In Moscow, after the rehabilitation, I did not have even that. Every day I walked toward nowhere. I was lonely, isolated. And always afraid.

"By now I knew only one thing: that I must get out of Russia. I saw that it was not a place for Jews. Wandering through Moscow, I used my eyes. I began to understand this new anti-Semitism that was everywhere in the streets. If you were not a Russian, if you were not a member of the Communist party, if you could not play—*play*—that you were a Soviet person, then you would never find your place.

"In those years, I didn't yet think about Israel—such a possibility never entered anyone's mind. My private dream was America. Even to think about getting out was a fantasy. But I thought about it continually. I was in a fever of wanting to escape.

"I lived this way for three years from 1956 to 1959. In 1959, they assigned me lodging at last, a little room. I had survived my life as a fugitive, but I came out of it half-broken. I was sick, I was exhausted. There was no possibility of my ever getting work in Moscow. So I took my little room and did what was permitted: I made a trade with it for another little room in the city of Sochi, on the Black Sea, to recuperate. In Sochi it was warm. I fell into a deep rest. The sun was shining, it was summer. There I met Nikolai Roitburd, a graphic artist. Like myself, he was originally from Kiev. I told him my story and he told me his.

"He had escaped from Babi Yar. The way it happened had to do with the Rumor. You don't know about the Rumor? The Germans announced a collection point for all the Jews in Kiev—they all had to come to Babi Yar, this open place near a ravine. And all the Jews came. They came willingly—63,000 Jews. Why willingly? Because of the Rumor :'America has agreed to pay three million rubles to ransom the Jews of Kiev!' The Jews ran to be ransomed at Babi Yar.

"Nikolai heard about it from two of his friends, who had heard it from some Ukrainians. It spread widely; the Ukrainians were spreading it. Everybody Nikolai knew was getting ready to go to America. One of his friends was logical: 'Look,' he said, 'so many people all in one day? It's impossible! How many planes can they have ready? Probably they'll take only the earliest bunch, and the rest will be out of luck. So come on, let's be first on line.'

"But Nikolai dawdled and dawdled—he was suspicious of the Rumor. The other two quarreled with him to get him to stir. As a result, they were the last ones to arrive. They came to the edge of a great waiting crowd, with Germans all around. Faintly, from far away, they heard shooting. 'Then,' Nikolai told me, 'I understood what "America" was.'

"He started to run, and his two friends took off after him. One was shot at once by a German. The other made it back to Kiev, where he was captured by a Ukrainian street cleaner—always the street cleaner!—who told him, 'A Jew like you belongs at Babi Yar,' and brought him back to be shot. But Nikolai ran away from Kiev, and hid under a floor with partisans for the rest of the war.

"Soon after I came to Sochi, Nikolai and I were married.

"And then, in 1960, there came an opportunity for work—for both Nikolai and myself. A brand-new national holiday was announced; it was called 'The Day of the Fishermen,' to honor the workers of the fishing industry. The opening ceremonies were to be in Murmansk, high up on the Arctic Sea. The whole city was to be decorated with signs and paintings, and an army of artists was called in for the job. Nikolai was among them.

"In Murmansk—because it was so far north, and cold, and remote—they made no great fuss about documents and work records. There was a shortage of workers and teachers: they needed everyone they could get. I went to the Palace of Culture for Builders—masons, carpenters, people who worked at putting up houses—and they gave me a ballet group to teach. It was a three-year program, so I was assured of work for at least this long.

"Oh, don't pay attention to that photograph!" I had picked up a snapshot, one of several Lyuba had taken out of her purse. "It's nothing; it's very bad; it was taken by a 12-year-old. I had so many better pictures, but I had to leave everything behind. This one came somehow."

The picture was, nevertheless, lovely, poignant. It showed Lyuba striding in black ballet slippers across a parqueted wooden floor in the Palace of Culture for Builders. The room is spacious, with large, curtained windows. There is a radiator under one of the windows, which reminds you of the stubborn Northern winter, and a practice bar all along the walls. Lyuba is wearing a dark dress with a high collar and long sleeves. She looks plump and stern; her face is remote and fiercely dreaming—she seems to gaze past her pupils at something infinitely sad. Behind her are five beautiful little girls, all about 9 or 10 years old, with their arms extended. Each child has a white ribbon in her hair. The photograph is like Keats' urn—a kinetic moment held fixed forever, the little girls eternally pointing their toes, Lyuba walking with her fiercely dreaming look in that room eternally.

I asked her how long they had stayed in Murmansk.

"Until 1963. But then Nikolai could bear the climate no longer. We had a tiny, frozen room, and his legs became sick. So we went back to Sochi. And again I had trouble getting employment. But because we had come from three years in the North, this carried with it a little, little privilege, and finally they gave me a class in the Palace of Culture in Sochi. After another three years, we returned to Moscow. Nikolai had work there, but I didn't.

In Moscow something new began. For us it was without precedent. It started this way: One day in 1966, a journalist from a Moscow newspaper mentioned to us that there were crowds of people near the Israeli Embassy. This was strange, amazing. What had happened was that Kosygin, in Paris, had said he would let Jews join their families in Israel if they wanted to. If they wanted to! We ran to the embassy in a minute, and it was from someone there that we learned about OVIR, the Organization for Visas and Registration. It was actually possible to get an application to leave! In another minute we were at the offices of OVIR. There we saw another great crowd. It was astonishing! We had believed we were the only ones with this mad idea, to try to escape.

"The person we dealt with at OVIR was a woman named Akulova. She poured contempt on us, bitterness, hate. We asked for an application to go to Israel. She said, 'Never mind, you have no chance anyway. The Soviet Union has no diplomatic relations with Israel.' I told her it was not her job to lecture us; we didn't want her opinions, we wanted the application form.

"No one in Russia talks to even the lowliest Government clerk like that, but I wasn't afraid. What could they do to me? I was already acquainted with Siberia. Somehow I had suddenly stopped being afraid.

"One time, an important official in an inner office wouldn't let any Jews come in. They were all waiting meekly outside. What kind of business was this? I went up to his door and banged on it. 'Hey, anti-Semite!' I yelled, 'open up for the Jews!' Siberia couldn't scare me. I told them: 'Israel or Siberia again.'

"At last, they gave us the application and we filled it out. But then we saw that it was necessary to have a written invitation from a relative in Israel. We flew home and wrote a letter to Tel Aviv. We didn't know names or addresses, we didn't know whom to ask for. But exactly 20 days later we received a letter from Israel, with an invitation from Nikolai's brother-in-law. They found him in record time.

"We began to wait for permission to leave. Every morning for three years I went to the office of OVIR and asked if the permission had come. Every morning they were spiteful, rotten. But I went on taunting them right back—'Israel or Siberia again!'"

Here I intervened. "But listen to this," I said. I unfolded a newspaper I had with me and read aloud from it: "The Soviet Government has denied that there is discrimination against Jews and has pointed out that procedures for obtaining emigration visas are the same for all Soviet citizens."

"I don't speak for anyone else, I speak for myself as a Jew," said Lyuba. "These inspectors—they do what they are told; they don't decide anything, they don't make policy on how to act. Their job is to make a wall between the Jewish applicants and the higher officials, and this they do by treating us like animals. I got to know them well, all their tactics. The whole world should know who they are, what their 'procedures' are!

"After a while, we began to know other people who were trying to get out, who were enduring these 'procedures.' We even discovered a sort of club room for applicants. One afternoon, we met a young man who took us to a flat. It looked like an ordinary flat, right in the middle of Moscow. But then he opened a door, and we found our-

selves in a little room that stupefied us—on the walls, huge Israeli photos. On one wall, Moshe Dayan! On one wall, Golda Meir! On one wall, a great, big up-to-date map of Israel! In the middle of Moscow! 'You're not afraid either,' we marveled. And we began to feel a solidarity.

"After that, waiting for permission became a way of life for us. It was all we lived for. We became more and more daring. We followed all the Israeli news—we heard it on the radio, from Kol Yisrael, five times a day. We never looked at a Moscow newspaper—rags: it was all fake. During the Six-Day War the woman at OVIR said, "Ha, look how those Arabs are beating up you Jew cowards.' I said, 'No, we Jews are winning.' 'How do you know that?' 'Directly from the Jews in Israel, on the overseas radio,' I told her.

'We were getting absolutely audacious. One time, we decided to celebrate Israel's Independence Day. We didn't have an Israeli flag, so Nikolai painted one, and we took it into a wood. There were 200 of us singing 'Hatikvah' in the wood. It was May, but it was still cool. We built open fires and cooked shashlik and danced and sang Hebrew songs at the top of our lungs. Two policemen came by, saw everything, and went away. Maybe they didn't want to tangle with 200 self-liberated Jews. And all the while, right under their noses, we were making an illegal film of the whole proceeding!

"The Six-Day War Changed everything. Suddenly, you saw young men and women openly wearing the Star of David around their necks. People began coming to OVIR flaunting their Stars of David. And once I saw a man walking all around a huge square in Moscow, holding the hand of a little girl about 6 years old. Her dress was pinned all over with big Stars of David. He walked around and around the square, not going anywhere, just for everyone to see what was on the little girl's dress. A policeman chased him away finally.

"We had stopped being afraid. We began fighting openly, we began to give our names and addresses. The silent time was over for us. I wrote letters to everybody, from U Thant to Kosygin. I wrote more than 20 letters to Kosygin. I told him I had started petitioning for emigration precisely after his statement that there would be no impediments for Jews who wanted to leave. I told him I was unemployed and already getting on in years and that my departure would make no difference to the Soviet Union. I entreated him to be kind and humane. I never received any answer.

"I and 10 other women wrote a letter addressed to the women of the whole world. We all gave our names and addresses. We said that the Ministry of Internal Affairs had ignored all our petitions. We said it was our right to go to the land of our forefathers.

"Nikolai and I and 23 others from Moscow signed a petition to U Thant, citing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says that everyone has the right to leave any country again, we gave our names and addresses.

"We began to sense a response from outside the Soviet Union. It was remarkable, we began to feel supported. Any time we heard our letters over the radio from England, from America, from Israel, we would become braver, we would start to fight even more openly. And sometimes it was surprising how fast our news flew out. One night, 39 people signed a petition. This took place at 8 p.m. in Moscow. At 10 p.m.—two hours later the same night—we heard about it on the BBC!

"On Friday, July 10, 1970, Akulova called me on the telephone. Oh, how different her voice was! How suddenly sweet! 'Bring 36 rubles and come for your visa on Monday.' The permission had arrived! The first thing I did was lock up my flat and get out. I was finished with it. I moved in with a friend. People were saying, 'Oh, poor Lyuba, she got crazy, she lost her mind, she closed up her house.'

"On Monday, I gave Akulova the 36 rubles and she gave me the documents. 'You have to get out in 10 days.' I sat down and sighed. An enormous, exhausted sign. 'Aha,' said Akulova, 'you fought so hard to go and now you're sorry? So why are you sighing?' " Lyuba set her face and mimicked Akulova. " 'So why are you sighing?' 'I'm sighing,' I told her, 'because I'm going now with my gray hair and not 20 years ago.'

"Nikolai asked if he could take his brushes with him, his cherished brushes that he had used for years. "They don't have brushes in Israel?' Akulova sneered. 'Yes, they have brushes in Israel.' So that was the end of that.

"In the Soviet Union it takes days and days to buy an airplane ticket. But if you pay for it with American dollars you can get a ticket immediately. Some of our friends sent us to the Netherlands Embassy. There they received us very cordially, saying 'How do you do?' out loud—and handing us pads and pencils if we wanted to tell them something important. It wasn't the first time I'd been in a room with a listening device. They gave us a letter guaranteeing American dollars for our fare.

"The last thing I did in Moscow was to give away my Star of David. This is now our tradition—you give over your Star of David to someone else who is waiting, and if he is let out he hands it on to still another person who is waiting. It becomes a chain of hope and thankfulness.

"A few days later, we were in Vienna, getting ready to board El Al. The Jewish Agency were like fathers and mothers to us. They set up tables with things to drink, a feast of food, mounds of cakes. It was a celebration, unbelievable, joyous. All sorts of Jewish tourists from different countries were there, children too, all applauding us, and hugging and crying. In Vienna I first knew I was free. I couldn't believe it, the fuss they made over us, the love they gave us.

"The second day we were in Israel, someone said, 'Lyuba, come!' Zoom! We were on a hillside outside Jerusalem. Golda Meir was planting a tree in honor of those who had died in the prisons of Russia. All of a sudden, I don't know how, I found myself standing—and in Jerusalem!—right next to the Prime Minister of Israel. I myself, so close I could see every seam of her face. And I thought: What a face! How strong! How clever!

"So we came home to our own people.

"In Haifa I want to teach dance. When my Hebrew gets better I hope again to have a group of little ones. But at the same time I know I don't altogether belong to my new life. My feelings are in Moscow. It's impossible to tell you my feelings. My heart *aches* when I think about my friends who are still there, still in it all, waiting and waiting for visas. They are being kept forcibly—by the law of the stronger. As for myself, I will never forget and I will never forgive. I feel I am responsible to the ones who are waiting to come out: I must be their tongue in the world outside. To me they seem like people who are sinking."

We stood up, Lyuba put on her hat; it was fuzzy and covered her ears, and made her look more Russian than ever. She was going on to the airport, to another city, to be a tongue for those left behind. Between two columns of draperies, the hotel room window showed a frozen New York twilight. It was a blue-colored city out there, a staircase city of zigzag towers. With her face to the blue towers, Lyuba said: "But why do you want to write so much about *me*? I am not all Jews I am only I!"

I tapped my newspaper. "The Soviets also say you are not all Jews. They say that Jews are ordinary citizens who do not feel oppressed in their country, and that the only ones who agitate to leave are the dissidents and troublemakers. Why is your position—the position of Jews who try to get out—different from that of other Jews?"

Lyuba pulled her hat down with a hard tug and turned to me. I recognized the fierce and dreaming look of Murmansk. "We are braver," she said.

MILITARY BRAINWASHING BY THE NUMBERS—RACE RELATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Laird has now made it official. All military personnel will be required to take at least 6 hours of race relations instruction every year.

The new basic training in racism is said to range from minority history to teaching skills.

Since the Army is now to become minority conscious, a top local problem is presented in giving all minorities equal exposure in only 6 weeks. After all, minorities must necessarily include in addition to Negroes—Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Indians; such other American cultural minorities as Chinese, Irish, Japanese, Germans, Italians, Cubans, Poles, Greeks, Jews, French, and on ad infinitum.

The interesting question posed is what will happen to a GI who flunks his race relations basic training. Will he be forced to repeat it, will he be declared unfit for overseas duty, or will he be disqualified for military duty and discharged?

Race relations—the new priority. Billions for disarmament and race relations but not one copper for national defense.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the front page of the Pentagram News for March 11, 1971, which is said to be published in the interest of personnel of the U.S. Army, Military District of Washington:

[From the Pentagram News, March 11, 1971]

DOD LAUNCHES RACE EDUCATION PROGRAM—AT LEAST SIX HOURS INSTRUCTION SET FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

(By Oziel Garza)

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird announced Friday the establishment of an educational program in race relations which will require all military personnel to take at least six hours of instruction every year.

Laird said he expects to have some 1,400 specially trained instructors teaching race relations courses throughout the armed forces within a year.

The Department of Defense hopes the new program will bring about "a more harmonious relationship among all the military personnel so that organizational efficiency and combat readiness will not be impaired by racial unrest, tension or conflict."

To carry out the new program a Defense Race Relations Education Board has been formed. The board will be headed by Roger T. Kelly, assistant secretary of defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

Also a Defense Race Relations Institute is expected to be established soon. Heading the institute will be Colonel Edward F. Krise, an "Army social worker" for more than 20 years.

In an interview Monday with the Pentagram News, Krise explained the Institute's function.

"The task is to develop a curriculum in education and race relations and to train instructors that will be deployed throughout the armed services to conduct this training," Krise said.

The institute will have the capacity for training 100 instructors per class. The training will last about six weeks and the classes will range from minority history and sociology to teaching skills.

"The important aspect of any kind of education is the modification of attitudes, the necessary change of emotional response, one to the other, and it is really through this discussion that the real kinds of changes will take place," Krise pointed out.

"We hope to be able to utilize this approach to enable our people to engage in a meaningful communication so that each can understand and appreciate the other," he explained.

"We are dealing with a matter of increasing misunderstanding among the races and ethnic groups. We are dealing with problems of communications and the appropriate medium for attacking the problems is the opportunity for everybody to participate in a meaningful educational experience.

"Classes will be mandatory because it's an issue that involves every member of the Department of Defense. Many times people who have the need are often the ones who don't take part. To make the educational program fair and equitable it will be necessary for everyone to attend the classes," Krise said.

Training programs will vary within the services. The Army will have a teaching team in each of the major installations.

The Institute is to provide a central training faculty for the services and develop a broad curriculum implementations by each service. It will also provide evaluation and research capabilities.

Krise hopes to have the Institute in full operation by this summer and deploy the instructors as early as this fall.

Students attending the Institute will be volunteers from all services selected to be trained as instructors on the basis of their backgrounds in teaching and group communication skills.

Pentagon officials hope the Race Relations Education Program will have an impact not only on the armed forces but also in the country as a whole. It is anticipated that results of the program will be felt in communities where armed forces are located and that there will be a carryover into the rest of the country as servicemen return to civilian life.

Prior to being selected to head the Defense Race Relations Institute, Krise, who has a doctorate in social welfare from the University of Chicago, was responsible for the Equal Opportunity Program for the Continental Army Command. He took part in a one-year research in cross-cultural communications at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. Krise started his professional career as a student case worker in the Chicago Welfare Department. He also served as executive secretary of the North Dakota Youth Council in the early 1950s and performed social work with the Indian minorities and later served in New Mexico.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR SUICIDE PREVENTION CENTERS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an article by Dr. Ari Kiev concerning suicide prevention centers and how they may better be utilized. Dr. Kiev is associated with the Cornell program in social psychiatry, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center in New York City. His article recently appeared in the American Journal of Psychiatry. I commend it to you, as follows:

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR SUICIDE PREVENTION CENTERS

In the past 15 years some 120 suicide prevention centers have been established throughout the country. The development of these centers has had considerable effect in generating an awareness of the problem of suicide, and yet there is no evidence to date that any of these centers—which in the main specialize in telephone referral rather than direct treatment—have reduced the suicide rate in the areas they cover. Evidence suggests that only a small percentage of all calls relate to suicide. Most of the calls are from low suicidal risks; high-risk persons are less likely to be in touch with such centers.

New methods must be developed for widening the treatment net and delivering care to high-risk groups that are now not being reached. Suicide prevention centers must clarify their objectives, analyze their day-to-day operations, and determine whom they are helping. Ideally, suicide prevention centers should be able to provide treatment for potentially suicidal patients. When patients are referred elsewhere for treatment, active efforts must be made to ensure that the patient reaches the treatment facility—a follow-up procedure that is too often neglected.

Suicide prevention centers should actively seek out high-risk populations by initiating contact with old age homes, city shelters, alcohol rehabilitation centers, and the residents of anomic areas with high rates of single-room occupancy. The establishment of personal ties between center personnel and high-risk individuals should have considerable preventive effect. General practitioners and psychiatrists might refer appropriate patients to the center for regular telephone contacts. There is an enormous number of interested people who could be utilized in the development of such extended suicide prevention work by telephone. The addition of picture screens to the telephone will make contact by telephone more personal and should provide further stimulus to developing telephone programs beyond their present uses.

The suicide rate among men is considerably higher than among women and indeed other population subgroups. Yet the attendance of men in psychiatric clinics and in psychiatric office practice is considerably lower than that of other groups. In our society men do not enter the sick role very readily. Active links should be established with industry, schools, and prisons to increase awareness among leaders and problem solvers of the early signs and symptoms of psychiatric illness.

Existing programs must be coordinated and computer technology used to establish case registers of high-risk individuals and to store and update treatment records. A central data bank with information about the specific programs at different facilities should reduce unnecessary duplication of services and facilitate periodic follow-up programs over an extended number of years during which patients may continue to be at risk. Better coordination can also lead to more efficient use of teaching personnel. Combining the special interests and skills of different programs ought to provide a comprehensive approach to the problem of suicidal behavior in a given community and reduce the need for each program to develop additional activities to round out its program at the expense of its area of expertise. Collaboration among agencies will help each improve on that part of the total treatment process it does best without being fragmented by taking on too great a diversity of programs. Liaison with hospital emergency rooms should be established to provide treatment for recent suicide attempters, who are often discharged with no provision for follow-up care.

There is an urgent need to differentiate the different forms of suicidal behavior in terms of seriousness of the intent, dangerousness of the attempt, methods used, primary psychiatric disorder, willingness to accept treatment and other crucial dimensions that influence the degree of individual suicidal risk. This differentiation will facilitate the development and critical evaluation of specific treatments for specific patient groups. New techniques must be developed for the impulsive psychopath, the isolated schizophrenic, the intractable depressive, and the disguised alcoholic. These groups account for large numbers of suicides but are recalcitrant to treatment or unwilling to utilize prevention agencies. Suicide prevention centers provide an ideal locus for therapeutic social clubs and patient-led groups, which may be better able to break through the isolation, stigmatization, and hopelessness of these patient groups.

OIL AND VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been disturbing reports that the protection of lucrative investment opportunities—particularly in offshore oil concessions—may be a factor in prolonging the war in Indochina.

The war in Vietnam has dragged on long enough. For a decade this Nation has sent her young men to die in Asia. The price for this tragic venture has incalculably high—53,500 American lives since January 1, 1961; more than 750,000 Vietnamese. South Vietnam is now ravaged—its villages destroyed, its crop lands poisoned, its social fabric torn by the wrench of a 20th century war fought on the fields of a pastoral nation.

Therefore, anything—anything at all—that would prolong this war must be of the greatest concern to all Americans.

Reports that the Thieu-Ky regime is about to grant concessions to American oil companies for exploration of oil off the coast of South Vietnam raise important political questions that must be answered. Therefore, I have called upon the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator FULBRIGHT, to hold open hearings into the role of oil companies and other business enterprises in influencing American foreign and military policy in Southeast Asia. It is essential that the American public know whether or not our foreign policy in Southeast Asia is being influenced by U.S. business interests.

I include in the RECORD an article from the March 15, 1971, edition of Forbes magazine entitled "Oil: Hidden Factor in the Vietnam Equation":

OIL: HIDDEN FACTOR IN THE VIETNAM EQUATION?

It has passed the rumor stage. Clues are beginning to pile up that there may be

huge quantities of crude oil in the waters of the Far East and Southeast Asia. Discoveries by Natomas, Atlantic Richfield, and Union Oil have triggered a frantic exploration race off Indonesia. An optimistic report by a United Nations team about possible oil deposits between Japan and Taiwan is fueling speculation that the entire Far East could contain oil deposits rivaling those of the Middle East.

Some of these deposits would almost certainly lie off South Vietnam. Nobody knows for sure because no drilling has taken place. But preliminary United Nations surveys have given the area good marks. And there are plenty of rumors. One is that a British company has found signs of oil on the prison island of Con Son, east of the southern tip of Vietnam.

The political implications, of course, are enormous. But if the oil is there, or even probably there, the queston of who rules in Saigon takes on a more than political significance. Already, U.S. antiwar groups are beginning to suggest that a desire to ensure friendly governments in the Indochina area could slow down President Nixon's withdrawal from the war. An organization called "Another Mother for Peace" has flooded the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with over 10,000 letters calling for public hearings.

Not surprisingly, the oil companies are less than anxious to discuss the topic. Walter Levy, the New York-based oil expert and consultant to many of the companies, says flatly: "I don't want to comment. It's become a political issue."

"We haven't made up our minds yet," says a spokesman for Mobil Oil, asked whether his company would bid for concessions. Another dodges the question: "Texaco is not participating in exploration in Vietnam."

Queried about his government's plans, Ngo Thanh Tung, an economist at the South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington, says: "Several companies have been sending their proposals, but none of them have yet been considered." But oilmen expect Saigon to ask for bids quite soon.

In a conference last year, Chase Manhattan Chairman David Rockefeller made a little-noticed speech that created a quiet stir among Asia-watchers. By 1980, Rockefeller said, the oil industry could pour $36 billion of new capital investment into the Asian Pacific. This kind of money could give the area the boost it needs to enter the industrial age. It could help make up for the loss of U.S. military expenditures by substituting oil wells for military bases. To give a sense of proportion, the total Free World investment Chase predicts for 1969-80 is $250 billion. But the Asian Pacific share will almost equal the total slated for Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. "The Asian Pacific," commented *Petroleum Engineer*, a trade journal, "looks like the next big international boom area."

If the oil is there, the boom will undoubtedly follow. The Asian area is the fastest-growing oil market in the world. Japan, which currently burns 3.4 million barrels per day, is forecast to consume over 10 million per day by 1980. While Southeast Asia consumes relatively little oil, consumption could rise at a brisk pace if industrialization plans catch hold. "Just think of all those people who are now burning charcoal and using ox-carts," sighs one oilman.

Where is all the oil coming from? Southeast Asia may contain enough offshore crude to fuel that growth. Right now its production doesn't come close. Indonesia, the largest producer, turns out only 900,000 barrels a day. Japan must therefore rely on the Middle East for 85% of its oil, but Japan is uneasy at its dependence on this volatile area. Compared with Middle East oil, moreover South Asian oil will be close to its markets, reducing transportation costs. Drilling and production costs are reasonable, because the offshore areas of Indonesia and Vietnam are relatively calm and very shallow. Perhaps most important, the oil found so far off Indonesia is exceptionally low in sulphur content, less than 1% compared with the 3%-plus content of Middle East crude. This would give it a major cost advantage in Japan, which is imposing strict pollution controls.

Much of the oil could find its way into the rest of the world market, where more oil will be needed within the next 15 years than has been produced in the history of the oil industry. The low sulphur content could make the oil very attractive to the west coast American market, where pollution is a big issue. The uncertainties of Middle East politics, the higher prices being imposed by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and the delay in finding a way to transport crude from the North Slope of Alaska to the 48 states add to the prospects. A veteran oilman puts it this way: "We don't have the oil in the U.S. to meet our future requirements. Either we are going to have our future committed to those crazy Arabs or we are going to develop Southeast Asia, the West Coast of Africa and the West Coast of Latin America as alternate sources—and, hopefully, build the Alaskan pipeline."

THE HARD QUESTIONS

In any case, mounting U.S. activity in the area raises hugh political questions that must be balanced against the economic benefits for Southeast Asia and the U.S.: 1) Might a discovery lead to pressure for slowing down the pace of U.S. troops withdrawals? 2) Might oil industry agreements with the present Thieu-Ky regime commit the U.S. even closer to this controversial government? 3) If the war in Indochina bogs down permanently, won't the oil industry run the risk of being made the scapegoat for whatever goes wrong? 4) Is a "friendly" regime in Saigon really vital to U.S. access to such oil? After all, many Arab countries are rabidly unfriendly to the West but sell their oil there. 5) What will the effect be on the political and military policies of Japan and China?

Oil seems forever fated to be a political mineral.

TO SAVE HIS SON'S LIFE

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, although most of us are involved primarily in keeping our own and our family's lives in order in this busy and hectic world, we need to take time to notice the hardships and heartaches of others and learn from their gallant efforts to cope with adversity.

Such an instance was graphically outlined in a recent article in the Darien News in my First District of Georgia, in which long-ailing 14-year-old Lamar Bumby is to be the recipient of a kidney transplant from his father, Julian Bumby.

Lamar's grandparents are Mr. and Mrs. D. D. Chancey of Ridgeville in McIntosh County, Ga.

I think my colleagues will agree that family misfortune can be lightened when family members strive to lighten the load for one another, just as the Bumbys are doing.

Lamar Bumby has my prayers and I hope the operation will bring him good health and happiness.

The article follows:

TO SAVE HIS SON'S LIFE

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The warm story of Julian Bumby, formerly of Ridgeville, serving as the donor of one of his kidneys to his 14-year-old son, Lamar, has created widespread sympathy and interest. The kidney transplant operation has been scheduled for March at the Shands Teaching Hospital and Clinic in Gainesville, Fla. Locally, gifts to aid the Bumby family during this time of hardship have climbed to $304.32. Mr. Bumby, a refrigeration repairman, will be unable to work for sometime following the expensive and delicate transplant of his kidney to his son. Gifts should be sent to Mrs. Nancy Denty at McIntosh Gas Company here where Mr. Bumby was a former manager.

Portions of an article by Stacey Bridges, Staff Writer for the Gainesville, Fla., Sun, which appeared on Feb. 16, follow:)

Julian Bumby has never been admitted to a hospital as far back as he remembers.

Yet he and wife Dorothy have been "living" at the University of Florida Hospital since December.

Next month Bumby will get his own bed.

That's when he'll give one of his kidneys to save his 14-year-old son's life.

Young Lamar is an old pro to hospital life, though, so he can tell his dad all about it.

Lamar has had kidney trouble since he was almost 5.

"The doctors told us then that Lamar had only about one-fourth of a kidney operating at that time," said his mom. That's when the Bumby family lived in California. "They told us we were taking as much of a chance when we put him to bed as we were letting him play. That's how close it's been and that's what we've had to live with all these years."

In 1962 the Bumbys moved to Georgia to be with the wife's family. About a year and a half ago they set up housekeeping in Wachulla, Fla.

But for the last nine years Lamar has been in and out of UF hospitals with kidney trouble.

Mrs. Bumby explained that in January, 1970, one of the doctors attending her son told the parents Lamar would have to have a kidney transplant by March.

"But he just kept hanging on without any complications," she said.

In November, the trouble started. . . . He returned in December and hasn't left since . . . That's when the Bumby's packed up and came to Gainesville. "They told us then he's got to have a new kidney," the dad said. "I tried to sell my appliance business. When we couldn't find a buyer, I just closed the place up and left."

Doctors began making tests on both of the parents to determine if they could be donors.

"We didn't know which one of us would be right or if either of us would match, so I left the baby (the 12-year-old son) with my sister-in-law in Ft. Myers," Mrs. Bumby said. The Bumby's also have a 22-year-old daughter in Jacksonville.

Then, in January, Bumby got the word his kidney was perfect for the transplant.

"Actually, I knew before the doctor told me," he laughed. "Just as soon as the people finished testing me, I asked them and they said it was 'almost certain' my kidney would do. I can't tell you how happy I felt."

. . . "I don't know which one of my kidneys they're going to use," Bumby said, and then smiled. "You see, I'm sort of an oddball. The doctor told me I'm one of only a few people who have a kidney with one tube and a kidney with two tubes. He told me they'd be using the one with only one tube, but I don't know which one that is."

As an ex-Navy man Bumby said the mili-

tary will pay 75 percent of the cost of Lamar's hospitalization and operations.

But the costs will still be staggering for the family.

"Last week Lamar and I figured the room cost alone had already run up to $2,200 and that doesn't include his operation or intensive care he's had since December," he said. (Lamar's non-functioning kidneys were removed Feb. 9).

. . . Mrs. Bumby said she's proud of the way her son has reacted to his illness.

"He's never rebelled," she smiled. "The most important thing for him has been just trying to take care of himself."

While Lamar has been at the med center, the Alachua County School System has provided a teacher to help him along with his ninth grade work.

She explained he will get credit for the year.

Lamar, who is pale from his indoor stay at the hospital said softly he's pretty good at math.

He's a science fiction nut, too, his mother pointed out.

"He's reading 'Journey to the Center of the Earth' and he likes all those monster magazines," she said.

But whether he wants to be a scientist, a mathematician or even a doctor, Lamar doesn't say.

"He hasn't ever even mentioned it to us," his parents said.

But they're hoping, with a new kidney, Lamar can be anything he wants.

FREE SPEECH AND FREE PRESS ABROGATED BY RACE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, most Americans still believe that the first amendment to the Constitution protects free speech and free press. We now learn that free speech and free press are protected so long as race is not involved. If race is injected then the first amendment right is qualified as if inapplicable.

In Washington and nearby Virginia, newspapers have now acquiesced to the Justice Department and Federal judges' prohibition against using racial designations in their newspaper advertising.

And have the newspapers invoked free press? No; they have not only refused to use their freedom to defend their freedom but the local Evening Star has even editorially opposed free speech in the U.S. Senate by attacking the filibuster.

This is a tragic occurrence of much further reaching significance than merely satisfying the lawsuits against the wealthy owners of the newspapers. Free speech and free press do not belong to the profit and loss ledger of the wealthy nor to the owners and managers of newspapers to surrender or forfeit.

Neither is the Attorney General of the United States nor the Justice Department authorized to be censors of free speech and free press so as to use their prestigious base of operations to intimidate free speech and free press. Most Americans have always regarded the Attorney General and the Justice Department as guardians of constitutional freedoms secured to the American people by that basic document. But now we are given to understand that a purported act of Congress can supersede and abrogate the first amendment if race is involved. Carried to a logical conclusion, we may next find the Justice Department removing such a designation as "Communists" from free speech and free press—if it has not already been done.

Free speech and free press belong to the people. For it is only through an uncontrolled and unregulated media that the people have a chance to inform themselves as to the truth which can help them remain free.

President Thomas Jefferson once said:

Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.

It is appropriate that all Americans, but especially the U.S. Attorney General, Federal judges, and members of the fourth estate, be reminded of what President Jefferson had to say concerning the vital need for a free press for a free people.

Quotes of President Jefferson on a free press and several newsclippings follow:

A COMPREHENSIVE COLLECTION OF THE VIEWS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON—FROM THE JEFFERSONIAN CYCLOPEDIA, EDITED BY JOHN P. FOLEY

6917. Press (Freedom of the), Abolished.—The press, the only tocsin of a nation, is completely silenced in France.—To THOMAS COOPER. iv, 452. FORD ED., viii, 177. (W., Nov. 1802).

6918. Press (Freedom of the), Abused.—The firmness with which the people have withstood the late abuses of the press, the discernment they have manifested between truth and falsehood, show that they may safely be trusted to hear everything true and false, and to form a correct judgment between them.—To JUDGE TYLER. iv, 549. (W., 1804).

———Press (Freedom of the), Bill of Rights and.—See BILL OF RIGHTS.

6919. Press (Freedom of the), Control of.—While we deny that Congress have a right to control the freedom of the press, we have ever asserted the right of the States, and their exclusive right, to do so. They have accordingly, all of them, made provisions for punishing slander. * * * In general, the State laws appear to have made the presses responsible for slander as far as is consistent with its useful freedom. In those States where they do not admit even the truth of allegations to protect the printer, they have gone too far.—To MRS. JOHN ADAMS. iv, 561. FORD ED., viii, 311. (M., 1804.)

6920. Press (Freedom of the), The Constitution and.—It is true as a general principle, and is also expressly declared by one of the amendments to the Constitution, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people; and * * * no power over the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, or freedom of the press being delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, all lawful powers respecting the same did of right remain, and were reserved to the States or the people. * * * Thus was manifested their determination to retain to themselves the right of judging how far the licentiousness of speech, and of the press, may be abridged without lessening their useful freedom, and how far those abuses which cannot be separated from their use should be tolerated, rather than the use be destroyed. And thus also they guarded against all abridgment by the United States of the freedom of religious opinions and exercises, and retained to themselves the right of protecting the same, as this State [Kentucky], by a law passed on the general demand of its citizens, had already protected them from all human restraint or interference. * * * In addition to this general principle and express declaration, another and more special provision has been made by one of the amendments to the Constitution, which expressly declares, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press", thereby guarding in the same sentence, and under the same words, the freedom of religion, of speech and of the press; insomuch, that whatever violates either, throws down the sanctuary which covers the others, and, that libels, falsehood, and defamation, equally with heresy and false religion, are withheld from the cognizance of Federal tribunals. * * * Therefore, the act of Congress of the United States passed on the 14th day of July, 1798, intituled, "An Act in addition to the act intituled 'An Act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States' ", which does abridge the freedom of the press, is not law, but is altogether void, and of no force.—KENTUCKY RESOLUTIONS. ix, 465. FORD ED., vii, 294. (1798.)

6921. ——— ———. I am for freedom of the press, and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force and not by reason the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents.—To ELBRIDGE GERRY. iv, 269. FORD ED., vii, 328. (Pa., 1799.)

6922. Press (Freedom of the), Government and.—No government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free, no one ever will.—To PRESIDENT WASHINGTON. iii, 467. FORD ED., vi, 108. (M. 1792.)

6923. ——— ———. Conscious that there was not a *truth* on earth which I feared should be known. I have lent myself willingly as the subject of a great experiment, which was to prove that an administration, conducting itself with integrity and common understanding, cannot be battered down, even by the falsehods of a licentious press, and consequently still less by the press, as restrained within the legal and wholesome limits of truth. This experiment was wanting for the world to demonstrate the falsehood of the pretext that freedom of the press is incompatible with orderly government. I have never, therefore, even contradicted the thousands of calumnies so industriously propagated against myself. But the fact being once established, that the press is impotent when it abandons itself to falsehood. I leave to others to restore it to its strength, by recalling it within the pale of truth. Within that, it is a noble institution, equally the friend of science and of civil liberty.—To THOMAS SEYMOUR. v, 43. FORD ED. ix, 30. (W., Feb. 1807.)

6924 Press (Freedom of the), Invasion of.—There are rights which it is useless to surrender to the government, and which governments have yet always, been found to invade. [Among] are the rights of thinking and publishing our thoughts by * * * writing.—To DAVID HUMPHREYS. iii, 13. FORD ED., v, 89. (P., 1789.)

6925. Press (Freedom of the), Libels.—Printing presses shall be subject to no other restraint than liableness to legal prosecution for false facts printed and published.—PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR VIRGINIA, viii, 452. FORD ED. iii, 332. (1783.)

6926. ——— ———. Printing presses shall be free except as to false facts published maliciously, either to injure the reputation of another, whether followed by pecuniary damages or not, or to expose him to the punishment of the law.—NOTES FOR A CONSTITUTION. FORD ED., vi, 521. (1794.)

6927. Press (Freedom of the), Liberty and.—Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.—To DR. JAMES CURRIE. FORD ED., iv, 132. (P., 1786.)

6928. ——— ———. The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties.—REPLY TO ADDRESS. viii, 129. (1808.)

6929. Press (Freedom of the), Mankind and.—The press is the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being.—To M. CORAY. vii, 324. (M., 1823.)

6930. Press (Freedom of the), Principle of government.—Freedom of the press I deem [one of the] essential principles of our government and, consequently, [one] which ought to shape its administration.—FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS. viii, 4. FORD ED., viii, 5. (1801.)

6931. ——— ———. There are certain principles in which the constitutions of our several States all agree, and which all cherish as vitally essential to the protection of the life, liberty, property and safety of the citizen. [One is] Freedom of the Press, subject only to liability for personal injuries.—To M. CORAY. vii, 323. (M., 1823.)

6932. Press (Freedom of the), Private injury.—Printing presses shall be free, except so far as, by commission of private injury, cause may be given of private action.—PROPOSED VA. CONSTITUTION. FORD ED., ii, 27. (June 1776.)

6933. Press (Freedom of the), Reform through.—This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning them at the tribunal of public opinion, produces reform peaceably, which must otherwise be done by revolution.—To M. CORAY. vii, 324. (M., 1823.)

6934. Press (Freedom of the), Safety in.—Where the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe.—To CHARLES YANCEY. vi, 517. FORD ED., x, 4. (M., 1816.)

6935. Press (Freedom of the), Security in.—The only security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted, when permitted freely to be expressed. The agitation it produces must be submitted to. It is necessary to keep the waters pure.—To MARQUIS LAFAYETTE. vii., 325. FORD ED., x, 280. (M., 1823.)

6936. Press (Freedom of the), Shackled.—Nor should we wonder at * * * [the] pressure [for a fixed constitution in 1788–9] when we consider the monstrous abuses of power under which * * * [the French] people were ground to powder; when we pass in review the shackles * * * on the freedom of the press by the Censure. AUTOBIOGRAPHY. i, 86. FORD ED., i, 118. (1821.) See EDITORS, NEWSPAPERS, and PUBLICITY.

[From the Evening Star, March 9, 1971]

ADS STILL SHOW RACE

The Washington Daily News is continuing its policy of accepting housing advertisements which contain racially discriminating wording, according to an investigation by a District housing group.

However, the study showed that The Star and the Washington Post had stopped accepting advertisements with explicit reference to "white" and "colored." It followed a survey last August in which all three papers were charged with permitting the practice.

While The Star and the Post no longer permit racial designations, the study said that they still permitted wordings which "have the same effect," such as "private" or "exclusive" rooms.

The study was conducted by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies and the Housing Opportunities Council.

PAPERS' REALTY ADS HELD TO BE BIASED

The Richmond News Leader and The Richmond Times-Dispatch have agreed to cease real estate advertising practices that the U.S. Justice Department "found to be racially discriminatory," Attorney General John N. Mitchell announced yesterday.

"While denying that their prior procedures violated the law, the newspapers voluntarily agreed to the out-of-court settlement," a Justice Department statement said.

The statement said both newspapers, which are published by Richmond Newspapers, Inc., advertising real estate by geographical area and that both carried a "general" section of advertising for dwellings outside the areas listed.

"The Justice Department contended that the 'general' column was used almost exclusively to list houses for sale in Negro residential areas and in areas changing from white to Negro," it continued.

D. Tennant Bryant, publisher of the newspapers, said in an interview that "we had no idea that we were in violation of the law. The 'general' heading and the geographical areas were drawn up by the Richmond Board of Realtors, and it had nothing to do with race.

"The Department of Justice pointed out to us that some of the homes in the 'general' section could have been listed by geographical area. We did not realize that this was happening. It started out one way and ended up another."

Bryant said the listings by geographical areas were accompanied by a map to aid newcomers to the city in finding homes.

The Justice Department announcement said that the newspapers "agreed to eliminate the 'general' column. In addition, the newspapers agreed to publish during the month of March a statement that the Fair Housing Act of 1968 contains prohibitions against discrimination in the sale of houses."

[From the Evening Star, March 3, 1971]

THE FILIBUSTER FILIBUSTER

The filibuster is still riding high, the third effort to corral it having failed yesterday by eight votes. The reformers mustered precisely the same number of affirmative votes they did on February 18, when the first tally was taken. Their hopes are paper-thin, though there is wishful talk of some alchemy that might materialize in the fourth vote, next Tuesday, to set Rule 22 on its ear.

That would be a gladdening development, for the unlimited debate provision is long overdue for overhaul. This is not to say it should be junked, because there is an indispensable buffer function in protracted discussion—in the power to delay. This power has been used to impede excellent legislation in the past, but it also has stalled some obnoxious proposals long enough for good sense to take effect.

Still, there must be sensible limits if the Senate is to avoid paralysis of the kind that set in last December when several filibusters were going at once. Vital business was still untended as the 91st Congress expired. The requirement of a two-thirds majority to shut off debate is too stringent, in view of Congress' monstrous and mounting workload, and its notorious inefficiency in handling that load. The proposal being considered, for permitting debate cutoff on a three-fifths vote, would be a major improvement. It would prevent some logjams while retaining a brake on ill-considered action.

Fifty-one senators, including the majority and minority leaders, favor this alteration. Hence the majority needed to effect it is committed, but cannot act because the filibuster alteration itself is being subjected to a filibuster. This appears incongruous, especially considering that only two months ago, in the pre-adjournment lock-up, senators were unabashedly deploring what a chaotic spectacle they were presenting.

They should act, before this year's pressures build up, to reduce the likelihood of a repeat performance. Some compromise should be possible before the terminal vote next Tuesday.

HEADLESS HORSEMAN CHAPTER OF DEMOLAY IN NEW YORK

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this week, 2,500 DeMolay chapters are conducting local observances of International DeMolay Week. This week is designed to acquaint the public throughout the free world with the purposes and activities of this character-building organization for young men between the ages of 14 and 21.

The purpose of the DeMolay is to build better citizens, and the order does just that by offering wholesome occupation for spare time, with worthwhile associates, in a character-building environment. One such example of the productive type of activity which the DeMolay sponsors was recently illustrated to me by my local "Headless Horseman" chapter in Westchester, N.Y.

The "Headless Horseman" chapter, under the direction of Bruce Kelly, of Irvington, who is the master counselor, has selected the theme "Environmental Action" for its observance of International DeMolay Week. In accordance with this theme the chapter has developed a flyer which contains "do-it-yourself" plans for a paper bundler. This bundler would make it easier to store newspapers and magazines neatly, and would facilitate easy bundling in sizes necessary for recycling. The flyer also contains detailed instructions for recycling in the villages of Hastings, Dobbs Ferry, Irvington, Tarrytown, and North Tarrytown. Models of the bundler have been constructed by the chapter members with materials donated by Weyerhauser Co., of Irvington, N.Y., and have been placed in most banks and post offices in the five villages. Five thousand copies of this flyer are presently being distributed by chapter members and the flyer is also available wherever the model bundlers are on display.

This flyer and construction of the model bundlers is extremely important and productive for it not only highlights a way to reduce the need for waste disposal but it also will encourage the reuse of salvagable materials, thereby conserving our precious natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel that the members of the "Headless Horseman" chapter of the DeMolay deserve the recognition of every Member of the House of Representatives for the excellent work which they have done in developing these make-it-yourself plans for paper recycling.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this project is only one example of the type of worthwhile activity done by the members of the DeMolay all year around. This same "Headless Horseman" chapter in addition to their regular chapter activities has recently staged various fundraising activities which allowed them to purchase a sizable quantity of toys and games which were

delivered personally, by the chapter members, to the children at the Shriners Crippled Children's Hospital in Philadelphia, Pa.

It is because of all of these worthwhile activities that such men as John Wayne, and my esteemed colleague, Congressman BOB MATHIAS, newscasters Walter Cronkite and Paul Harvey, and many other Senators, Congressmen, and Governors are proud to say that they are senior members of the Order of the DeMolay.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington report concerning the problems of the Nation's farm belt:

UNCERTAINTY OVER THE FARM BELT

The clouds of uncertainty are hanging over the Nation's farm belt. Even as spring planting time approaches, many farmers are still trying to fit together a crop and livestock plan for the coming season.

Few Americans realize, I suspect, the gamble the farmer takes each year with the weather, a possible slump in market demands, the cost-price squeeze, or the possibility of disease or damage to his crops. It is in this atmosphere of uncertainty that the farmer must make his plans for the year. This year, several new factors complicate his decision, among them:

THE CORN BLIGHT

This fungus disease, which ravaged some fields and left others, nearby, undamaged is expected to be back again this season. The farmer's vulnerability will be decided by (1) his obtaining blight-resistant seed, and (2) growing season weather conditions which will either retard or accelerate its spread.

An estimated 3 million bushels of resistant seed available this year will satisfy only about 20 percent of the national requirement. A considerable portion is being earmarked for the Southern states where the disease was most severe last summer. The remainder of available seed is either a mix of resistant and non-resistant strains, or non-resistant seed.

THE HOG MARKET CRASH

Hog prices tumbled from about $25 per hundredweight last August to about $15 by the year's end. The slump was precipitated by attractive hog prices in late 1969, and an over-response in production by the farmers. Almost simultaneous with the slump came spectacular increases in corn prices because of the prospect of a blight-shortened crop.

THE NEW FARM PROGRAM

This year, farmers are permitted to comply with acreage diversion requirements and still increase their ability to expand corn and other feed grain acreage. If they go after attractive corn prices, and the blight turns out to be negligible, we could be in for one of the largest crops ever. Some observers are estimating that the corn acreage will be increased by about 4 million acres this year.

Feed grain production this year is likely to have a greater impact on prices because surplus stocks of most major grains have been reduced. The current higher prices and the new farm program's flexibility will encourage expansion in feed grain acreages.

THE EXPORT SITUATION

Exports took about 22 percent of the total U.S. crop output last year. Indiana farmers export about 25 percent of their crops. The export picture is clouded, however, because (1) current higher price levels could dampen foreign demand, and (2) Congress' look toward more restrictive trade policies could produce a retaliatory cut in foreign demand.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

In 1970, net farm income edged lower under the pressures of increased production costs and declining commodity prices. Although total gross income rose by about 3 percent, production costs increased by 5 percent. As a result, net farm income declined to about $15.8 billion, as compared by $16.2 billion in 1969.

If the move is to expand crop acreage this season, farm production expenses will increase and credit needs and interest expenses are likely to increase.

With all of these factors in the picture, most farm economists are predicting little, if any, improvement in net farm income in 1971. Total meat supplies are likely to remain about the 1970 level because of the time required to cut back on production. While a strong demand, and high prices, are expected in the grain markets, greatly expanded feed grain production could weaken both demand and prices.

The watchword for feed grain and livestock farmers this year is uncertainty. High risks are normal. This year, however, may be a year of super-high risks.

SENATE—*Tuesday, March 16, 1971*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art infinite and eternal, we lift our prayer to Thee, beseeching Thee to pour out Thy spirit upon all peoples of the world. Remove the barriers which separate man from man and nation from nation. Guide by Thy higher wisdom all who confer for the peace of the world. Illumine their consultations by the mind and spirit of the Prince of Peace. May faith replace fear, justice triumph over greed, truth arise over falsehood, love prevail over hate, and Thy peace possess all men.

Bless this Nation and all who lead it. Impart Thy strength and wisdom to the President, to all legislators, to those who make and enforce the laws, to those on missions of mercy and good will, and to all in the Armed Forces. Instruct us in the knowledge of Thy truth and the ways of Thy kingdom until Thy ways become our ways, through Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TUNNEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 12, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY DURING 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 92–67)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. TUNNEY) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The report which I transmit to you covers the activities of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the calendar year 1970. It is noteworthy that this is the Agency's Tenth Annual Report; it marks a decade of diligent pursuit of arms control and disarmament.

I have set as my goal the attainment of a generation of peace. I believe that arms control presents both a necessary and a promising road towards a stable, secure world in which true peace can exist. There are many problems to be solved and the answers will not come easily, but with determination and perseverance, we can prevail.

For the first time, a realistic dialog is taking place between the Soviet Union and ourselves about the management of our strategic relations. The mutuality of interests which brought us to the table encourages our hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks will succeed. I am heartened by the work which has already been done, and I am hopeful that the constructive nature of the exchange will continue in Phase IV of SALT, which resumes in Vienna in March.

During the past year, another arms control measure was added to the growing number which have emerged from international negotiations. A treaty ban-