

June 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8605

examine and evaluate the impact of economic policies on urban areas.

Urban America is now working with a steering committee of mayors to bring together spokesmen for components of the coalition—business, education, civil rights groups, labor unions, and religious organizations. Meetings with each of these groups are aimed at developing an agenda for an increased national commitment—federal, state, and private—to the cities.

The Urban Economic Council will be made up of three nationally recognized economists. It will be asked to establish a two-way channel between national and local economic policies. On one hand, it will provide a detailed analysis of urban needs and propose the necessary administrative and budgetary measures to meet them. On the other hand, it will translate the potential effects of alternative national policies on local programs.

The Council will appraise the allocation of economic resources and priorities for federal expenditures, assigning the relative importance of urban programs to other national needs. It also will appraise the economic importance of the programs and expenditures of local governments to the national economy, and the potential impact of business fluctuations on cities.

The Council's first report, to be prepared by an established private, nonprofit agency, will provide quantitative estimates to 1975 of urban expenditures and urban requirements under a variety of possible situations. The study will trace historical trends of federal, state, and local expenditures on programs that are totally urban, such as mass transit; those that are totally non urban, such as defense; and those that have characteristics of both, such as highways.

Reports of the Council will be issued from the Urban Policy Center, which will coordinate the research and writing with assistance from consultants. The Policy Center, last of Urban America's components to be staffed, will focus attention on other major issues as well. It might, for example, seek ways to channel metropolitan development in coherent patterns; or propose policies to encourage urban growth in optimal locations; or ask publicly how it might be possible to achieve equitable distribution of population in metropolitan areas by race and income. Through seminars and papers, the Center will invite to such issues national discussion and debate.

HOUSING

Steadily, in recent years, the flow of federal encouragement to nonprofit sponsors of low- and moderate-income housing has increased. Today, nonprofit sponsors have a wide and flexible range of assistance programs to use in building, and they are using them: some 60 percent of all housing constructed under the Section 221d3 program of low-rate mortgage loans is the work of nonprofit sponsors. Some have become expert in the process, or have readily available expertise they can tap. Others, particularly first-time sponsors, are lost in the jungle of complications surrounding housing development.

The prime objective of the Nonprofit Housing Center is to help the latter group, and help it does: in the period covered by its latest bimonthly report, it responded to 170 letters asking information or technical assistance. A growing number were from communities interested in organizing private development funds or nonprofit housing corporations.

The Center was created in 1965 as the Local Development Services Division of Action under a Ford Foundation grant that was renewed last fall. In October, it entered into an agreement with the United Church of Christ, the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Church to encourage and

assist religious groups interested in housing sponsorship, with each denomination contributing \$25,000.

The Nonprofit Housing Center is the most fully operational of Urban America's components, with four regional offices in addition to its headquarters staff. Requests for its technical assistance come from a wide range of organizations in major metropolitan areas—and also from places such as Mercedes, Texas (population 15,000), where the Roman Catholic diocese is sponsoring a 100-unit rent supplement project. In the Watts area of Los Angeles, the Center is working with a group of nonprofit sponsors on a development plan and program for construction of new housing on a vacant 116-acre site.

In addition to local church and community groups, the Center's clientele extends from the National Association of Manufacturers to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by Dr. Martin Luther King. NAM's Center for Independent Action asked assistance in studying the feasibility of a privately financed rehabilitation program in Indianapolis, Indiana. For Dr. King's organization, the Nonprofit Housing Center is investigating the possibility of establishing a Southeastern Housing Development Corporation to sponsor low-income dwellings in an eight-state area. Preliminary discussions also are being held with the Appalachian Regional Commission on a multi-state housing program, and with the Office of Economic Opportunity on its efforts to form housing development corporations with direct involvement of the poor themselves in their operation.

To extend its assistance beyond what a single staff can provide on a project-by-project basis, the Center maintains a program of publications and conferences. It is about to begin a series of six regional meetings of potential nonprofit sponsors, with cooperation of the Federal Housing Administration. The sessions will deal with a variety of new housing tools, and will include case studies on local projects.

To expand the nation's stock of expertise, the Nonprofit Housing Center and the church-supported Urban Training Center of Chicago are investigating the possibility of holding one-week orientation sessions and intensive two-week seminars in federal housing programs. The Nonprofit Housing Center and the U.S. Office of Education also are exploring the prospect of developing a national training program for nonprofit housing sponsors and corporations, in cooperation with several universities across the country.

INFORMATION

The services that the city requires of its professionals increasingly are cross-disciplinary services. The model cities program, with its demands for the melding of social concern with physical planning and design, only formalizes a trend toward realization that one set of skills is not sufficient in dealing with the complexity of development problems. But collaboration among disciplines requires that each know the thinking, the mode of practice, the state of research in the others. There are at present few effective means of exchanging this information, except under the pressures of the problem at hand.

In an attempt to fill this need, the Urban Information Center will launch City, a bimonthly review of urban affairs. This annual report is, in a sense, the first issue of City, introducing its size, typography, tone, and range of content. The annual report is more heavily illustrated, however: City's plus-or-minus 24 pages per issue will consist mainly of relatively brief reports and summaries, organized by sections.

City will be the major headquarters publication of Urban America, reporting its activities in the context of urban events and

thought, and prime outlet for the information-gathering function that is the Center's basic task. The Center also will continue Urban America's series of special reports, which in the past year have included a *Chart Book* of graphically depicted statistics on the urban environment; *Five Speeches*, reproducing in permanent form major addresses from the September conference; *The Troubled Environment*, the paperback proceedings of an important 1965 symposium; and a series of guidebooks and analyses produced by the Nonprofit Housing Center.

Issued concurrently with this annual report are Wilfred Owen's colorful *Fable* on urban transportation; and John G. Heilmann's paper *The Necessary Revolution in Housing Finance* from the January forum of the Business and Development Center. In preparation are publications on topics ranging from open space, to the reorganization of urban governments, to the design and workings of fountains, to case histories of low- and moderate-income housing, to a colloquy on urban design that was part of the legislative history of model cities.

These publications, and City, are mainly directed to urban specialists. To increase and inform the interest of the general public, the Center acts as a reference service for the press, radio, and television. Regular contact is maintained with urban affairs editors and writers on newspapers throughout the nation. The reference function of the Center also serves as a resource for Urban America's 80 Local Group Associates, the citizens' and business organizations that are on the firing line of urban issues. Plans are now under way both to increase the number of these affiliates and the exchange of information among them through Urban America.

file

THE PROGRESSIVE MAGAZINE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, one of the finest journals of public opinion in the United States is the Progressive magazine. Founded in 1909 by the late Robert M. La Follette, it has continued to be unruined by the—at times—more popular majority view. It has continued to serve for almost 60 years as a source of independent, thoughtful and responsible comment on public issues facing our Nation.

I am proud to say that the Progressive, ably edited by Mr. Morris H. Rubin, is still published in Madison, Wis. Through the publication of its editorials and articles the Progressive magazine has certainly lived up to the tradition endorsed by the late Senator La Follette as stated at the beginning of each lead editorial: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

In the July issue appear articles worthy of being read by my colleagues. "War and Peace in the Middle East" is a brilliant editorial analysis of the Arab-Israeli conflict. I suggest that an article by my distinguished colleague, Senator Young of Ohio, entitled "The New Democracy in Vietnam," should be read by the entire Senate. A short editorial entitled "Morgan Moves Up" calls attention to the loss of Edward P. Morgan to the radio networks. Mr. Morgan leaves a void which will not be easily filled when he moves to National Education Television on a 2-year leave of absence. The Progressive correctly states that his 12 years of broadcasting for the AFL-CIO stand as "models of perception, clarity, and courage."

S 8606

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 21, 1967

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive magazine, July 1967]

WAR AND PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Hostilities in the Middle East had come to an end as this was written. Israel arms were brilliantly triumphant on every front. Greatly outnumbered and forced to fight simultaneously on three or four fronts, the Israelis destroyed much of the shiny new military hardware given the Arabs by the Soviets and, in the process, shattered the morale of the Arabs who, only a few days before, had been whipped into a frenzied mob clamoring for a holy war to exterminate Israel.

The speed and scope of the Israeli triumph stunned the whole world. Now comes the hard and heavy task of building a peace—a peace that may be more difficult to achieve as a result of the very magnitude of Israel's victory. Bitterness and hate are everywhere. Despair and devastation dominate the Arab countryside. None of the basic causes of conflict has been resolved by the success of Israel's arms.

This is the moment when the leaders and people of Israel must exercise extraordinary restraint, as some are. Some hot-headed Israelis, however, may continue to demand the spoils of victory, but the only meaningful fruit of military success for Israel is a peace settlement that makes possible the patient pursuit of reconciliation with the Arab world. As the late Albert Einstein once said: "Peace cannot be kept by force. It can only be achieved by understanding."

When hostilities broke out June 5, each side accused the other of firing the first shot. We tend to agree with Tom Wicker of the strongly pro-Israeli *New York Times* that while history may never be able to make an exact determination, "the presumptive evidence is that the Israelis launched the actual fighting."

This is not to brand Israel as the aggressor on the basis of the evidence available to us up to now. If she did fire the first shot, it was only after intense and deliberate provocation by Arab leaders—and several weeks of fruitless haggling by the Great Powers and frustrating paralysis in the United Nations. Encircled by a bitterly hostile Arab world vowing her destruction, confronted with hastily rigged military alliances between previously feuding Arab nations, faced with total Arab mobilization after the expulsion of the United Nations Emergency Force from Egypt, denied innocent passage to and from her vital port of Elath, convinced that her very survival was at stake, and left largely alone in her agony by the rest of the world—Israel showed great and commendable restraint until the guns went off.

In longer-range terms, none of the three actors in the current crisis—the Great Powers, Israel, and the Arab world—came into the court of world opinion with spotless hands. Each contributed some of the matches and the tinder that ignited the fire which threatened for a time to run out of control. Consider the roles each has played:

One. The Great Powers, expressing shock and dismay at first over the war hysteria and then over the war itself that swept through the Middle East, were guilty of massive hypocrisy. For it was they who had raced each other to provide the arms, without which a military confrontation would have been impossible. The Soviet Union had poured hundreds of millions of dollars worth of weapons into the trigger-happy hands of the Egyptians and the Syrians. France had sold a sizable arsenal to the understandably anxiety-ridden Israelis. Great Britain had deposited nearly a quarter of a billion dollars worth of military hardware in the

oil-rich country of Saudi Arabia. And the United States, true to its tradition of free enterprise, had supplied mountains of arms to both sides. Altogether, a recent *London Times* study showed, the nations of Europe and North America have poured almost \$3 billion in armaments into this highly inflammable region since World War II.

All the Great Powers, moreover, were guilty of failing, despite repeated warnings, to come to grips, either in the United Nations or through Four Power talks, with the basic issue: which almost everyone knew must one day explode in violent confrontation. The Soviets played an especially dangerous game in encouraging Nasser and other Arab adventurers. And the United States, obsessed as always with deepening escalation in Vietnam, ignored the danger signals flashing in the Middle East. Indeed, for nearly six months President Johnson left vacant the key post of Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East. When he finally filled the position by giving the job to his ambassador to the UAR, he left Cairo without an American ambassador for eleven weeks just at the time Nasser was brewing his new crisis.

Two. Israel, obliged by hostile encirclement to play a lonely game, has overplayed her hand on occasion. She refused, for example, for reasons that seem to us false pride, to permit a United Nations presence on her side of the border after the war of 1956, although Egypt too weak and defeated to resist, consented to such a presence until the current crisis exploded. Had Israel consented to a U.N. presence in 1956, the withdrawal of U.N. forces from Egypt, demanded and obtained by Nasser, would still have left a United Nations buffer force on the Israeli side of the border and possibly might have barred the way to hostilities.

Israel, moreover, has unwisely walked out of—or failed to attend—meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commissions established by the United Nations to resolve specific disputes. There have been occasions over the past decade, too, as the United Nations has determined, when Israel violently over-reacted to border incidents.

For example, the Israelis over-reacted to Arab provocations late last fall and this past spring shortly before the current explosion—and, in the judgment of some competent observers, may have set fire to the tinderbox the Arabs had provided. In a demilitarized zone of Jordan, Israel retaliated to an unusually severe terrorist attack on her border by burning forty Jordanian homes—although, to be sure, not until the inhabitants had been warned. In April this year Israeli aircraft shot down six Soviet-built Syrian MIGs over Jordanian and Syrian territory. Far more significant, perhaps, was the May declaration by the highest Israeli officials, including the usually mild-mannered and peace-committed Prime Minister Eshkol, that further border raids from Syria would result in the invasion of that country, the seizure of Damascus, and the overthrow of the Syrian government.

The jittery, unstable government of Syria—here have been a dozen changes in Syria's government in eleven years—immediately appealed to Egypt to honor her military alliance in the face of this grave threat from Israel. President Nasser, who had often proclaimed his implacable hostility to Israel and had long waited in the wings to reassert his claim to leadership of the Arab world, bounced onto the stage, ordered the United Nations peace-keeping forces out of his country, mobilized his own forces on the border, declared the Gulf of Aqaba closed to Israeli shipping, and, doubtless much to his own surprise at the swift pace of events, found himself acclaimed, in the Arab world, as the hero and savior who had parlayed a couple of Israeli mistakes into a brief political triumph over Israel—a triumph that was

soon, however, to be reversed by the spectacular military success of the Israelis.

A final grievance against Israel held by many western students of the region who deeply believe in her right to live as a free and independent nation is her long-standing failure to deal humanely and comprehensively with the vexing problem of the estimated 800,000 to 1,000,000 Arab refugees who were uprooted or who uprooted themselves when the Israelis took over their portion of Palestine two decades ago. Little or nothing has been achieved in all these years in working out a decent settlement of the claims of Palestinian Arabs who lost their lands and homes to Israel.

Three. The Arab World, led by Nasser's Egypt, rates the decisive share of the blame for the current crisis. The conflict over the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba was an important factor but not the governing consideration. The heart of the matter was and is the refusal of the Arab world to accept the very existence of Israel, which was created through the partition of Palestine in 1947-1948, with the blessing of both the Soviet Union and the United States. Shortly thereafter the new nation was recognized by and accepted as a member of the United Nations.

It is understandable that the Arabs passionately resent the transfer of the land that is now Israel to the Jews—a transfer made without Arab consent and over their bitter and violent objections. But time, tradition, and international agreement have sealed the settlement of 1947-1948, and the implacable, vengeance-motivated insistence of the Arab leadership that Israel must be destroyed, if persisted in, could only result in chaos and disaster for all the peoples of the Middle East. The strident competition among Arab leaders to spew the most hateful epithets on Israel—and their shrill call for a holy war—did much to inflame Arab public opinion to the boiling point.

"Arab children are born with psychological scars," an articulate, well-informed Egyptian told us recently. "They are indoctrinated from the first moment of understanding," he noted with approval, "with the conviction that their great mission in life is to redeem the portion of Palestine arbitrarily handed to the Zionists by the Great Powers—and to reopen that land to the Arab refugees now living in hunger and despair."

This strikes us as a criminal incitement to permanent warfare. Israel, on the map, represents an almost invisible island in the vast Arab world. The obliteration of Israel would solve none of the social, economic, and political problems that torment the Arabs today; indeed, the contrived concentration of Arab concern on the presence of tiny Israel provides Arab leaders with a device to shift public attention away from their own inability to solve their social and economic problems.

President Nasser has been described to us in somewhat contradictory terms by correspondents whose judgment we usually respect. One American newsman who saw him in action at close range during the past year or two called him an irresponsible adventurer who has acquired a Messianic complex. Another correspondent emphasized that Nasser is basically a shrewd, sophisticated leader who has sought to forge a more progressive program at home than the royalist reactionaries in some of the other areas of the Middle East.

The results, however, have not been impressive—in significant measure because the increase in population is outrunning the gains in technology. The great Aswan Dam, for example, which is rising on the Nile with massive Soviet assistance, will add two million acres of arable land to the present total of six million. But when the time comes that Egypt can hope to reap the gains

June 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8607

of this increase, the population will have increased to the point where per capita food production will actually drop below the level of January, 1960, when construction of the dam began.

Given this fact of domestic despair, given the further fact that Nasser's enemies in the Arab world were taunting him—although he was long a leader in hostility to Israel—with cries of "coward" and "paper tiger" in the face of his relatively moderate response to Israel's over-reaction to border incidents, given the additional fact that his ill-conceived campaign against the royals has been bogged down for months in Yemen, and given the final fact that the Soviets stood at his side with guns, planes, money, and a desire to improve their bargaining position with the United States in the war in Vietnam—given all these considerations, Nasser's recent moves assume a sort of twisted logic of their own: the desperate design by a leader in urgent need of a major diversion.

His insistence that the end of Israel was his real goal brought—for the moment—an end to domestic conflict in Egypt and his enthronement—again for only the moment—as the unchallenged leader of the Arab world. "We will never accept co-existence with Israel," he cried to the hysterical mobs. "Those who stand by Israel are our enemies and those who stand with us are our friends." A day or two later, before war broke out, Nasser described Egyptians as "hotter than burning coals in awaiting the battle with Israel." Hearing the clangorous call for a holy war against Israel, Nasser must have realized at this point, just before the guns went off, that he had mounted a tiger he could not ride.

The wave of criticism that beat down on U.N. Secretary-General U Thant for withdrawing the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) from the Egyptian side of the 117-mile frontier with Israel strikes us as largely unjustified. Our considerable confidence in him is unshaken.

U Thant did not "shoot from the hip" as some of his critics have contended. He consulted for hours with his advisers in the Secretariat, including Ralph Bunche, who advised the Secretary-General that he had no alternative but to comply with Egypt's demand.

It is true that Thant might have stalled for a day or two, but with results that would doubtless have been much the same, except that there might have been bloodshed if runaway mobs of emotionally-charged Egyptians had attacked the lightly-armed UNEF forces.

Moreover, two of the nations with the largest contingents in the UNEF, India and Yugoslavia, whose troops constituted nearly half the force, were unwilling to maintain them against Egypt's wishes and demanded the immediate withdrawal of their men, which they had every right to do.

The UNEF, it must be remembered, was placed on Egyptian soil in 1956 solely with Egypt's consent. Israel had refused at the time to permit a similar force on her side of the frontier. This, too, made U Thant's position extremely difficult and delicate, if not untenable, when Nasser demanded immediate withdrawal of the UNEF.

"It may be pointed out in passing," Mr. Thant said afterwards, "that over the years UNEF dealt with numerous infiltrators coming from the Israeli as well as from the United Arab Republic side of the line.

"It would hardly be logical," the Secretary-General continued, "to take the position that, because UNEF has maintained relative quiet along the line for more than ten years, due in large measure to the cooperation of the United Arab Republic authorities, the UAR government should now be told that it cannot unilaterally seek the removal of the force."

It has only lately been revealed, by a source James A. Wechsler described in *The New York Post* as one "whose integrity is beyond challenge," that in the tense hours proceeding his decision to pull the UNEF out of Egypt, Thant addressed an urgent secret plea to Israel to allow the transfer of the UNEF contingent to the Israeli side of the border. Israel rejected Thant's plea. We suspect that when all the facts are known, U Thant will be acclaimed for his even-handed statesmanship in pursuing peace, which is what his job is all about.

It is reassuring that some of those who first lashed out at U Thant, including some Israeli spokesmen, have now greatly moderated their position and understand the undeviating commitment of the Secretary-General to world peace and the integrity of the United Nations. U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg spoke for many thoughtful observers when he urged that "we should at all costs avoid wasteful recrimination" on this subject. Goldberg then went on to praise U Thant's pursuit of a peaceful solution.

This pursuit of peace in the Middle East will be extraordinarily difficult. No peaceful settlement can hope to endure, it seems to us, that does not include at least these principal ingredients:

One. The Arab world must accept the fact of Israel as a free, independent, sovereign nation. Israel is a child of international agreement and United Nations decision. Even the Soviet Union, which armed the Arabs for their recent adventures against Israel, does not dispute her legitimacy. Without Arab recognition of Israel's national personality, there can be no basis for a peace settlement to replace the rickety, long battered, and now smashed armistice of 1949. And recognition clearly must encompass Israel's untrammelled right to free and innocent passage of both the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

This recognition, understandably, will be a bitter pill for the Arabs to swallow, but history reminds us that countless "irreconcilable conflicts" have yielded to the healing powers of time and tolerance and reason—and a willingness to live and let live.

Two. The government of Israel, perhaps with the economic assistance of the Great Powers, must take prompt, decisive, and generous steps to indemnify the Arabs who lost their homes and their lands when Israel was created. This problem has been neglected far too long, despite repeated pleas to Israel by the United Nations for just compensation.

In November, 1962, Mrs. Golda Meir, then Israel's foreign minister, suggested that her country would be willing to negotiate a compensation settlement for the Arab refugees—but only as part of a package deal for a general peace agreement to replace the shattered armistice of 1949. That proposal should be urgently revived now.

The Progressive does not suggest that Israel take back all, or nearly all, of the refugees who fled or were expelled two decades ago. This would place an intolerable strain on this tiny country's precarious economy, and it would, moreover, create a critical security problem for Israel—with a million or so dissident, revenge-minded Arabs on her soil. Reasonable compensation to the refugees would enable them to resettle permanently on the friendly soil of their Arab cousins.

Three. This time, unlike 1956, both sides should be obliged to accept a substantial and effective United Nations' presence on their borders or in neutral, demilitarized zones—at least until tempers cool and passions subside. Given the harsh facts of life in the Middle East, Israel must discard the false notion that the presence of U.N. peace-keeping forces on her soil is somehow a reflection on the nation's virility and an affront to its sovereignty. What is also needed

are positive reaffirmations by the United Nations and the Great Powers of the territorial integrity of Israel and her Arab neighbors.

Four. The great powers must agree, for their own self-interest if for no loftier purpose, to end the arms race in the Middle East by refusing to sell or give arms to any country in the region. Instead, working through the United Nations, the wealthier and more powerful countries should join forces to provide significant economic assistance to all nations in the Middle East.

There is doubtless much more that needs doing, including the internationalization of Jerusalem, so holy to three great religions. But these four proposals, we are convinced, lie at the heart of the problem of taking the first patient steps toward transforming this region of constant conflict and wretched poverty into one of peace and hope.

[From the Progressive magazine, July 1967]

THE NEW "DEMOCRACY" IN VIETNAM

(By Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG¹)

In 1965, from September 28 to October 19, I visited Southeast Asia on a mission for the Senate Committee on Armed Services. During that time, I visited every Air Force base in Vietnam and also spent a number of days in Thailand.

Before I visited Vietnam, I had believed implicitly the statements of Secretary of State Dean Rusk that we were engaged in Vietnam because of Communist aggression from the North. I believed that even though I had known, because I had read the Geneva accords, that historically there never were any such countries as North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and that the Geneva agreements, which the United States approved but did not sign, specifically stated that the separation of Vietnam into North Vietnam and South Vietnam was not to be regarded as a boundary but as a temporary demarcation line. Nevertheless, I was taken in by the repeated statements of the Secretary of State about aggression from the North, until I talked at some length with General Westmoreland in Saigon.

In the course of our conversation, General Westmoreland told me that the bulk of the Vietcong who were fighting us in the Mekong Delta, south and west of Saigon, were men who had been born and reared in the Mekong Delta.

Following that, when I was in Thailand, I was informed by General Richard Stilwell, second in command of the American forces in Southeast Asia, that eighty per cent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in the Mekong Delta.

I said to him, "General, this, then, is a civil war in which we are involved."

He replied, "It is an insurrection."

If there remains any doubt as to the nature of the regime we are supporting in South Vietnam, recent developments should dispel them. Premier Ky, who was born in Hanoi, is definitely a Vietnamese "Tory," having fought on the side of the French during the war in Vietnam following World War II, when France sought to reestablish her lush Indochinese colonial empire. Our forefathers would have called him a Tory because he fought on the side of the colonial power.

Now, through his performance as Premier of South Vietnam—a position which he obtained not through elections but through a military coup engineered by ten generals, nine of whom were born in North Vietnam and had fought on the side of the French

¹ Stephen M. Young, U.S. Senator from Ohio, is a much decorated veteran. In World War I he served in field artillery; in World War II he was in combat service for thirty-seven months in North Africa and with the Fifth Army in Italy.

S 8608

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 21, 1967

colonial oppressors against their own nationals seeking independence—he proves daily that his interests lie closer to those who have oppressed the Vietnamese people for centuries than to any real desires and needs of the people he rules.

The United States has furthered this travesty on democracy by giving it an appearance of respectability. Whom are we trying to fool by advertising the regime we are defending as “free” or “democratic”? Whom can we convince that South Vietnam is on its way to becoming a representative democracy since the Constituent Assembly made public its constitution?

I suggest we examine this proposed constitution more closely. First of all, who are its authors? As the result of a discriminatory election law, not only members of the National Liberation Front but also neutralists, so-called, and militant Buddhists were prohibited last fall from running for election to the Constituent Assembly.

The fact is, the Constituent Assembly is composed primarily of representatives of the landowning and wealthy classes and close supporters of the military junta that now rules South Vietnam. To illustrate this fact, when a genuine agrarian reform law was proposed earlier this year only three out of 117 members of the Assembly voted in favor of it. A number of these “representatives” are themselves military men. They can hardly be expected to put up a strong opposition to the Ky dictatorship.

As for the new Constitution itself, the provisions which appear to guarantee basic human rights are granted with one hand and taken away with the other. For example, Article twelve, section two reads:

“Censorship will be abolished except for motion pictures and plays.”

Yet, section three of Article twelve states: “Press regulations will be subscribed by law.”

According to Article twelve, section one: “The state respects freedom of thought, speech, press, and publishing as long as it does not harm personal honor, national security, or good morals.”

Who will decide what constitutes a danger to personal honor, national security, or good morals? The answer is, of course, the same rulers who until now have shown little or no respect for fundamental civil liberties.

Article nine guarantees religious freedom to all citizens “as long as it does not violate the national interest and is not harmful to public safety and order or contrary to good morals.” This gives the government virtually *carte blanche* authority to restrict the free exercise of religion. Is this the sort of religious freedom we would consider adequate in our country? This provision in the South Vietnamese constitution makes a mockery of the phrase “freedom of religion.” Similarly, the rights to join labor unions and to strike, to organize political parties, and to meet and form associations are guaranteed “in accordance with conditions and procedures prescribed by law.” What sort of bill of rights is this? It sounds more like the fiat of a medieval monarch.

On one point, at least, the Constitution is straightforward: Article five prohibits “every activity designed to propagandize or carry out Communism.” As we have seen in the past, this type of prohibition could be extended to almost any form of political opposition to the government whether from Communists, neutralists, or militant Buddhists. More than likely it would apply to any political group whose thinking did not coincide with that of the ruling regime.

Interestingly, the one right which is guaranteed unconditionally is the right of private property in Article nineteen. The Constitution bears the stamp of the landowners who drew it up, and assures that their interests will remain secure. In effect, Article nine-

ten promises them that no thoroughgoing land reform could be carried out without complete compensation to those who have for centuries prospered at the expense of the landless peasants.

I definitely do not consider this to be a document which is even a step toward democracy or toward a republic in South Vietnam. Indeed, how can there be any progress while a war disrupts civilian life and while we support and perpetuate a military dictatorship in Saigon? What can the Vietnamese peasant expect from Western democracy when it is presented to him through our collaborators in Vietnam—the dictatorial Premier Ky, who was serving in the French Air Force in Vietnam during the years 1946 to 1954, seeking to help restore French colonial oppression of its Indochinese empire, and an oligarchic Constituent Assembly?

Administration leaders would do well to heed the advice of retired Marine Commandant, General David Shoup, one of the nation's great military leaders. General Shoup said:

“It must be a bit confusing, to, to read and hear about fighting for freedom. Supposedly, we have it, and I don't think anyone is going to take it away from us by playing cops and robbers in Southeast Asia. Even so, we urge others to fight for freedom. There may be a little confusion here. We insist they should sacrifice arms and legs and their lives for freedom. In the history of their ancestors they've never experienced what we expect them to understand and fight for. . . .”

“These masses of people and their ancestors have always lived where the few have everything. Everything that is produced by the burdensome labor of the many. And the many have nothing except for the barest subsistence and not always that. . . .”

“I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own that they design and want; that they fight and work for. And if unfortunately their revolution must be of the violent type because the ‘haves’ refuse to share with the ‘have-nots’ by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own, and not the American style, which they don't want, and above all don't want crammed down their throats by Americans.”

If real and honest elections were to be held I doubt whether those elected would choose to prolong the civil war that is now raging and has been raging since 1946 in Vietnam when the French commenced to reestablish their empire. If the real voice of South Vietnam could be heard, it would be asking for peace, not military victory.

[From the Progressive magazine, July 1967]

VIETNAM'S NEW “DEMOCRACY”

Even before the new “democracy” becomes operative in South Vietnam Premier Ky has given the world some indication of what he means by a “free government.” An Associated Press dispatch from Vietnam May 15 quoted Ky as threatening to close Vietnamese newspapers that “create dissension” among the people during the approaching presidential election.

“I want to point out to the press that from now until election day any newspaper article creating dissension between the people—military or civilian—will be censored.”

An even more startling concept of the “new freedom” turned up in an Associated Press dispatch from Vietnam May 14, in which Ky, who is himself a candidate for president, announced that he might respond “militarily” if a civilian whose policies he disagreed with won the election.

“If he is a Communist or if he is a neutralist, I am going to fight him militarily,” said the disciple of freedom in Vietnam.

[From the Progressive magazine, July 1967]

MORGAN MOVES UP

Not since Edward R. Murrow went off the air have the broadcasting industry and the listening public experienced so great a loss as they now do with the end of Edward P. Morgan's news commentary over the American Broadcasting Company network. For twelve years, with the sponsorship of the AFL-CIO, Morgan has provided millions of Americans each weekday night with analyses of the news that will stand as models of perception, clarity, and courage.

Morgan has taken a two-year leave of absence from ABC to join the Public Broadcast Laboratory of National Educational Television. He will undertake a weekly series of two- or three-hour programs to be seen over 100 non-commercial stations. The programs will be financed by a \$10 million Ford Foundation grant. Meanwhile, it is regrettable that the AFL-CIO has no present plans to continue its radio news program with another commentator of comparable caliber.

NET announced that in addition to being a reporter on its new series, Morgan will be “involved in investigative reports, incisive commentary, interviews, and in the development of the innovative and experimental techniques of bringing relevant information to the public. . . .” We expect that Morgan will develop programs for NET that will be provocative, illuminating, and superior to most “public affairs” programs on commercial television. If his programs expand the audiences of non-commercial television stations, and increase public demand for more such stations, Mr. Morgan's contribution to public enlightenment may be even greater in the future than in the past.

PAYMENTS MADE IN NATION'S FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. President, recently we have heard comments in the Senate on the Nation's farm program to the effect that these programs involve payments of more substantial size to some farmers than to others. It is argued that big payments go to big farmers who do not need them, while little farmers get only little payments.

For more than 30 years it has been basic national farm policy to provide a continuously adequate supply—but not a burdensome excess—of food and fiber products at stable prices fair to both producers and consumers, without undue public cost considering the vital objective of this policy.

If all the vast U.S. land resources are used in farm production, and the advancing technology we command is applied, our farmers can, and would, produce more than U.S. consumers want, or foreign markets will buy, at prices in line with the level of production costs which American farmers must pay.

It is certainly not in the national interests to waste land, labor, and production costs in turning out unneeded products which then cost still more to store. Moreover, excess supplies bring ruinous prices which threaten national prosperity—ruinous prices for all producers alike.

Nevertheless, the individual farmer cannot prevent excess production and ruinous prices in the market by letting his land and resources go unused, or partly used. By doing so alone, he only further reduces the income of his family

June 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8597

was general agreement that LSD is easily obtained, especially in large urban centers. (See testimony of Cohen and Jackson.) Every witness agreed, however, that there was a lack of reliable data on the extent of abuse. Beyond that no research was produced which shed any light on why students are turning to drugs. The implication is that research efforts have been confined to a description of the therapeutic use, to the exclusion of the "social side effects" which are attendant to these discoveries. The basic question asked throughout the hearings was whether the Federal government was organized in a way to enable it to meet and deal with scientific innovations and their social implications.

In an effort to obtain some reliable data Acting Chairman Kennedy asked the medical directors of 100 large universities to report the incidence of use as well as the adverse side effects. The summary of their reports is attached. You will note that the estimated use is less than one percent of the student population. We feel the reliability of these reports is reduced by the fact that they are made on personal college records with the consequence that the students have a tendency *not* to utilize college facilities. There is also the possibility that college administrators tend to minimize drug problems on their campuses. We feel, however, that these estimates are more valid than those made by the very antagonistic or protagonistic (whose estimates maybe self-serving).

With regard to the controls over bootleg manufacturing and distribution, the general tenor of the testimony leaned toward giving our present laws a chance to work (the Drug Abuse Amendments of 1965 just became applicable to LSD on May 17, 1966) before any move is made against individuals for possession. Many witnesses suggested that laws punishing possession would work to keep the college student away from the physician if he was having problems after taking LSD.

It appears that the FDA, under the leadership of Dr. Goddard, will move to control illicit manufacture and distribution. He testified that the present framework of the law gives him the necessary tools to bring this situation under control, and the Subcommittee will be overseeing the results of these efforts as the weeks pass.

Thank you for your inquiry. While we have no plans for further hearings specific to LSD, the Subcommittee's undertaking a broader view of Federal programs for the handicapped. We will continue to review the programs of all agencies as they seek to cope with the problems specific to LSD and to these broader considerations.

Sincerely,

JEROME SONOSKY,
Staff Director, General Counsel, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization.

You will note that in the next to the last paragraph of his letter Mr. Sonosky stated it appears the Food and Drug Administration, under Commissioner James L. Goddard's leadership, would move to control illicit manufacture and distribution. Mr. Sonosky further pointed out that Dr. Goddard testified the present framework of the law gave the Food and Drug Administration the necessary tools to bring the situation under control. Mr. Sonosky said that—

With regard to the controls over bootleg manufacturing and distribution, the general tenor of the testimony leaned toward giving our present laws a chance to work (the Drug Abuse Amendments of 1965 just became applicable to LSD on May 17, 1966) before any move is made against individuals for possession.

On the basis of Mr. Sonosky's letter nearly a year earlier, I wrote to Dr. God-

dard on May 22 this year and requested a progress report. I sent Dr. Goddard a copy of Mr. Sonosky's letter and requested Dr. Goddard to give me his comments and opinions based on the FDA's experience of the past year. I further requested any additional factual information which Dr. Goddard could provide on the illicit manufacture, distribution, and use of LSD, since Mr. Sonosky's letter nearly a year earlier had reported the "absence of facts" seemed to be one of the few areas of complete agreement developed during the hearings.

Following is the very detailed and comprehensive reply which I received, under date of June 8, 1967, from my inquiry to Dr. Goddard:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1967.

HON. CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: This is in answer to your letter of May 22, 1967, giving you a progress report on the drug, LSD.

1. LSD USE IN TERMS OF AVAILABLE STATISTICS

Unfortunately, we do not have reliable statistics on the amount of LSD used throughout the nation or in specific areas. While we have seen various figures quoted in the popular press in which the estimated national LSD abuse population ranges from one to four million, we know of no reliable information upon which such estimates can be based. The use of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs is not a violation of Federal statutes, but their possession and use violates many State laws. Our experience shows that, generally, the individual users of the hallucinogenic drugs make every effort to hide their use from enforcement officials. They normally came to the attention of the authorities only when they seek treatment for adverse reactions to the drugs, or when their use has resulted in suicides, homicides, traffic accidents, or other anti-social activities. In addition, the illicit distribution of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs is also an underground activity in which both the seller and the purchaser of the drugs take great effort to insure that their activities remain hidden from enforcement authorities, making collection of information extremely difficult.

We have not yet had time to design and implement a program whereby local and State authorities would report statistical data to us so that national figures on the magnitude of such abuse could be produced. We recognize that such a cooperative reporting program is needed to develop meaningful statistics on the extent of the misuse of these drugs.

While we do not have reliable statistical information on the general prevalence of the use of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs, we do have enforcement statistics bearing on the abuse problem.

From May 1, 1966, through April 30, 1967, the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control made 94 arrests for hallucinogenic violations. This represents over 36 percent of the total arrests made by the Bureau during this period. Eighty-eight of the arrests involved LSD and six involved other hallucinogens.

From May 1, 1966, to April 30, 1967, the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control opened 460 investigations which involved the illicit manufacture and/or distribution of the hallucinogenic drugs.

From May 11, 1966, through April 30, 1967, the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control seized hallucinogenic drugs in illicit channels of distribution equal to over 1.6 million dosage units having an estimated illicit value of over \$2,000,000.

2. TRENDS OF LSD USE

Even though we have no reliable statistics on abuse, we believe there has been a significant increase in the use of LSD over the past year.

We also believe that there is a trend toward more frequent and scheduled abuse of LSD and the other hallucinogenic drugs. Although there does not appear to be a standard pattern from the standpoint of frequency of use, our experience tends to indicate an increase in the regular use of the drugs, e.g., weekly or monthly, as opposed to a previous pattern of only occasional use. We occasionally hear of the daily use of LSD by misguided individuals attempting to remain under the influence of the drug for weeks at a time.

We believe that there is also a trend towards the concurrent use of several drugs or their use on a rotation basis. We have encountered the use of LSD combined with other drugs such as marijuana or amphetamines. We have also encountered LSD and other drugs such as dimethyltryptamine, mescaline, marijuana, and amphetamines being used in a haphazard rotation fashion to suit the circumstance of the user's mood.

We are encountering an increasing number of clandestine laboratories in which the hallucinogenic drugs are being produced, indicating that the increased use of the hallucinogenic drugs is creating an underground drug manufacturing "industry." These laboratories range in nature from the very crude to the more sophisticated. For example, we have recently encountered several varieties of LSD tablets which have been manufactured in clandestine laboratories. The LSD tablets are being manufactured under bootleg conditions to satisfy the desire of users for a product they can purchase with some assurance that the drug has not been adulterated or "cut" during its movement through the illicit channels of distribution.

On March 31, 1967, a 1948 International truck with cab and insulated van was stopped by the Colorado Highway Patrol when it failed to stop at a truck-weighing station near the Utah border. This truck matched the description of a truck which was observed in Craig, Colorado, in the vicinity of a drug store that was burglarized. The Sheriff of Moffat County, Colorado, was notified of the arrest of the truck's occupants. The Sheriff obtained a search warrant for the truck to look for fruits of the drug store burglary. During the search of the cab of the truck, the Sheriff found a plastic bag containing a powdered substance. The Sheriff requested assistance from Agents of the Denver Field Office of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. The powdered substance found in the cab of the truck, upon analysis, was found to contain 800 milligrams of LSD. In the body of the truck were found 550 LSD tablets; dimethyltryptamine (DMT); diethyltryptamine (DET); mescaline; the precursor for mescaline; and 20 pounds of powder which was identified as material one step removed in the synthesis of dimethyltryptamine. The contents of the truck consisted of various laboratory equipment, glassware, chemicals, and literature containing information regarding the chemical synthesis and pharmacological properties of stimulant, depressant, and hallucinogenic drugs. Some of the equipment in this mobile laboratory was permanently attached to the vehicle. Agents of the Denver Field Office, in effecting the executive seizure of the production equipment, also seized the truck. It is currently stored at a General Services Administration facility in Denver, Colorado. The occupants of the truck were arrested for violation of the Drug Abuse Control Amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

3. EFFECTIVENESS OF CONTROLS

BDAC is mobilizing the support of State and local law enforcement agencies to help

S 8598

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 21, 1967

combat the problems of drug abuse. We are using our Law Enforcement Institutes to help orient police officers to these problems, as well as the *BDAC Bulletin*, copies of which are enclosed.

The control measures we are using are both direct and indirect. The direct methods, the enforcement activities, have been described above. The powerful but indirect and long range educational activities will take greater time to make their effect known, but we feel they are just as important as the criminal investigative procedures. Some of these educational measures are:

(1) The college deans program, which is a contract between FDA and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. A national conference was held for 70 deans last November and these educators then returned to their seven NASPA regions to plan regional conferences which have just been completed. Approximately 1,500 college deans were reached through this program, and we feel that they are now better equipped to handle the problem of drug abuse on campus.

(2) Talks, addresses and speeches are routinely delivered by BDAC personnel, including those field agents whose cover would not be compromised by appearing in public. These are given to diverse groups, such as parents, students, educators, and teachers.

(3) We are now preparing a movie to be released this summer which we feel will carry the educational message to the students directly on a very wide scale. This movie will be called the "Mind Benders" and is being produced by Vision Associates out of New York.

(4) Pharmacy leadership conferences are periodically conducted and letters to pharmacists and pharmacy groups have been sent out alerting them to the problems of drug abuse and encouraging them to increase their efforts in this area.

(5) We are now preparing an extensive brochure on LSD for widespread distribution and feel that it will be an effective educational tool. It will cover psychology, pharmacology, the law, and provide a great deal of information while highlighting the hazards and dangers of abuse of the hallucinogenic drugs.

(6) We are also developing our own research program into the social psychological aspects of LSD abuse, especially among young people. We are vitally concerned with what seems to make these borderline or "hippie" groups tick and the role LSD plays in their culture. An understanding of their makeup will allow us to tailor educational efforts directly to them, increasing the effectiveness of our educational programs and providing a better understanding of such groups for our agents and other enforcement personnel.

4. NEW LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Legislative measures currently in progress, or completed, are the following:

Some states have currently enacted, or are considering, their own bills for controlling traffic in LSD, among which are New York, California, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, and New Jersey. FDA offers assistance when requested in deliberations on such legislation and has proposed a Model State Drug Abuse Control Act similar to the Federal legislation, which states may use to pattern their bills after, if they so desire. A copy and a summary of this model control act are enclosed.

5. NEED FOR NEW LAWS

May I assure you that the FDA is watching the LSD situation very closely and continually studying the need for possible changes in the level of controls, sanctions, and penalties against both hallucinogenic traffic and individual users. At the present time, however, we do not feel we should recommend any changes in this area until we are able to determine the effect of the recent meas-

ures and programs set up under existing legislation.

Thank you for your interest in the problem of drug abuse control. If we may provide you with additional information, please let us know and we shall be pleased to forward it to you.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. PUMPIAN,
Director, Office of Legislative and Governmental Services.

As you can see, there is still a woeful lack of reliable information on the extent and use of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs.

I believe, Mr. President, that the evidence set forth in these two letters clearly calls for two steps to be taken:

First, the Food and Drug Administration should begin at once to compile detailed information on just how much LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs are being used, particularly on college campuses and in other places where young people congregate.

Secondly, the Government Operations Committee of the Senate should renew its inquiry into the use of LSD and companion drugs.

As I understand it, these drugs are not habit forming in the sense that heroin is. But there is a growing body of evidence that indicates they may be psychologically habit forming—that is, that habitual users lean on them as they would a psychological crutch. Therein lies a potential danger.

I have been told that as many as 4 million young Americans are using LSD either on a sporadic or regular basis. But there is no confirmation of this, no real evidence of the numbers involved and the amounts involved—either in drugs or dollars.

And there is no national assessment of the damage these drugs may already have done.

When I asked for factual information on the use of LSD and similar drugs a year ago, I was told that a nationwide survey would have to be made and I was under the definite impression that such a survey would be undertaken. A year later we were told again a survey will have to be made to assemble the required data.

I am highly pleased that, in response to my inquiry to the Food and Drug Administration, I received an open and frank letter from the agency detailing what information is available and admitting honestly that not enough evidence has been gathered to date.

It is time, Mr. President, that we stop talking about the need for a survey and start doing such a survey. Without exact information we very easily could be stamped into taking action we might later regret. Conversely, without such precise information the Congress might remain inactive while use of such drugs became a national health hazard. In either event, we cannot act wisely without such information.

Some idea of the magnitude of the problem is indicated in the FDA letter to me. For example, from May 1, 1966, to April 30, 1967, 94 arrests were made in connection with hallucinogenic drug violations. During the same period, FDA opened 460 inquiries into the illicit manufacture and/or distribution of such

drugs. During that year approximately 1.4 million dosages of the drugs, with a value estimated at \$2 million, were confiscated.

An underground drug manufacturing "industry" is springing up as the result of increased use of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs, the FDA believes.

The evidence indicates there is widespread, illegal manufacture of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs in the United States. In some instances, the drugs were manufactured in modern, well-equipped laboratories, while in other cases the laboratories were jerry built and poorly equipped.

FDA reported instances of mobile laboratories being found. One such mobile unit was stopped near the Colorado-Utah border because of a reported truck theft. The county sheriff found a bag of white powder inside the truck and called FDA in Denver. It was found the truck was a laboratory producing LSD for distribution in the Rocky Mountain area.

This type of cooperation between local law enforcement agencies and FDA is a hopeful sign. I believe that until we do get solid information upon which to base action, FDA is doing everything within its power to enforce laws already on the books.

At this point, I do not know whether new legislation is needed or not. There appear to be strong State laws and FDA appears to be doing a good job of enforcing the laws already on the books.

What we really need is a lot more information. We need to know all there is to be known about LSD, its potential hazards and its potential for helping the mentally ill. We need to know whether the drug has become a real danger or whether the threat has been overdramatized because of our lack of solid knowledge. We need to know how widespread the use really is, the approximate amount being manufactured and sold illicitly, the extent of use among college and other youth groups, and the future impact on our social system.

CLERGYMEN SUPPORT ISRAEL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, more than 50 clergymen, representing Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Mormon faiths met recently in Las Vegas and agreed unanimously on a resolution on behalf of the State of Israel.

In a letter which accompanied the resolution, Rabbi Aaron S. Gold, of Temple Beth Shalom, expressed the fervent hope that our Government will act with courage in supporting freedom and justice for Israel.

This can be done only by guaranteeing Israel rights of access to the Suez Canal, the Gulf of Aqaba, the Mediterranean Sea, and the Straits of Tiran as a member of the world community of nations.

Certainly, in its heroic efforts to survive as a nation, Israel merits the admiration and support of all of us for its courage and tenacity.

The resolution to which I referred, Mr. President, was read at two mass rallies in Las Vegas, attended by more than 1,500 Christians and Jews. It was greeted with standing ovations.

June 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

I urge all Senators to read this resolution of support for Israel which has the unanimous support of the more than 50 clergymen who declared that they "cannot be neutral where an issue of freedom and justice is involved." I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CLERGYMEN'S RESOLUTION ON BEHALF OF ISRAEL

At a meeting held on Friday afternoon, June 9, 1967, at Temple Beth Shalom, and attended by over 50 clergymen, representing Roman Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, Protestant and Greek Orthodox faiths, it was moved and unanimously agreed upon to offer the following resolution on behalf of the State of Israel, to be presented to the proper agencies of the United States Government and the United Nations:

1. We, as clergymen, cannot be neutral where an issue of freedom and justice is involved. We, therefore, raise our voices to state unequivocally that we believe the cause of Israel is just and right.

2. We favor direct peace negotiations and not an armistice between Israel and her Arab neighboring states, and that these negotiations are to be based on the fact that Israel is a sovereign state, meeting with Arab sovereign states, all participants having full rights and responsibilities in the international community. We further favor a permanent peace settlement as an outgrowth of these negotiations.

3. We favor that the old city of Jerusalem remain under the sovereign jurisdiction of Israel, thus insuring free access to all faiths, at all times, to the holy places located there.

4. We are in favor of Israel's borders becoming viable and defensible.

5. We hold that the following waterways should be international waterways: The Mediterranean Sea, The Suez Canal, The Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran, and we favor free and unmolested passage through them to all nations, including Israel.

Father James Adams, St. John's Greek Orthodox Church; Rev. Marion Bennett, Zion Methodist Church; Dr. Aaron S. Gold, Rabbi, Temple Beth Shalom; Rev. Douglas Harrell, First Methodist Church and President, Clark County Ministerial Association; Rev. Joseph Kohn, Cantor, Temple Beth Shalom; Father Tally H. Jarrett, Christ Episcopal Church; Father Patrick Toomey, St. Viator's Catholic Church; Mr. Reed Whipple, President, Stake of Church of Jesus Christ of Later Day Saints, Resolution Committee.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Enrolled House Joint Memorial 7 adopted by the 54th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

(Sponsored by Representatives Elder, Beddingfield, Gwinn, Hanneman, Kennedy, Leiken, McKenzie, Martin, Richards, Skelton, Wilson, Senators Husband, Stadler.)

Whereas establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area under the administration of the United States Forest

Service would end a controversy over the proper treatment of this area that has continued for nearly a decade; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would avoid condemnation of private property and the absorption of tax-paying lands by the Federal Government, which would deprive local government and schools of part of their support; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would permit continuation of revenues received by the United States Forest Service from the sale of timber therein, which would be discontinued if such area were under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area at an early date would permit the United States Forest Service and the State of Oregon to proceed with plans for additional campsites and other tourist facilities now delayed because of the uncertain future of this area; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would stabilize conditions in the Florence-Reedsport-Coos Bay area by removing uncertainty as to the future ownership of lands in and near the dunes; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation placing under the United States Forest Service the area to be known as the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, located south of the Siuslaw River and north of Tenmile Creek. The Congress is memorialized further to insure the unqualified continuation of domestic and industrial water supplies within such area.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to the presiding officer of each chamber of the Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

FEDERAL COURT UPSETS WELFARE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on June 15 I introduced a bill (S. 1949) which calls for a Federal statute to require discontinuance of state laws imposing residency requirements up to one year before applicants for welfare assistance to the blind are considered.

In a decision handed down by a three-judge Federal court in Hartford, Conn., on June 19 it has now been ruled that residency requirements—such as my bill would outlaw for the blind—are unconstitutional. The decision applied to a closely related area, that of aid to dependent children. If the State of Connecticut should appeal to the Supreme Court and the decision is upheld, it is likely that the objective of this bill will be attained through such court action. Whether or not that occurs, the weight of the decision is very strong as indicating the basic correctness of the view embodied in the bill. State residency restrictions are hampering, unnecessary, and inequitable as well as being, in the view of the Federal judges, unconstitutional.

In the majority opinion of Judges N. Joseph Blumenfeld and J. Joseph Smith, "the right of interstate travel also encompasses the right to be free of discouragement of interstate movement." As I said in my statement last Thursday, the purpose of my bill was based on the same outlook, i.e., "to remove unnecessary hardship for those blind persons who find it necessary or desirable to move from one State to another."

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the views of the court in the Hartford case may serve as convincing argument to my colleagues for the consideration and passage of my bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a dispatch reporting the case, appearing in the New York Times for June 20, may be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CONNECTICUT WELFARE LAW HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL—ONE-YEAR RESIDENCY STATUTE OVERTURNED IN U.S. COURT—39 OTHER STATES AFFECTED

HARTFORD, June 19.—A Federal court ruled today that a one-year residency requirement for payments under Connecticut's aid to dependent children law is unconstitutional.

The majority opinion of the three-judge panel said the law was unconstitutional because the requirement violated the right of interstate travel.

The case arose after the Connecticut Welfare Commissioner, Bernard Shapiro, denied benefits to Vivian Marie Thompson last Nov. 1, because she had not lived in this state for a year. Miss Thompson has two children. She had been receiving assistance in Massachusetts before moving here about a year ago.

PURPOSE OF AID CITED

In its 2-1 decision, the court said "the intent of the law was to exclude from benefits those who came into the state for the primary purpose of seeking welfare assistance and it should be so construed and interpreted." The minority opinion was written by Judge T. Emmett Clarke.

The majority opinion, written by Judges N. Joseph Blumenfeld and J. Joseph Smith said "the right of interstate travel also encompasses the right to be free of discouragement of interstate movement. Denying . . . even a gratuitous benefit because of her exercise of her constitutional right effectively impedes the exercise of that right," the majority opinion said. Judge Clarke, in his dissent, said that 40 states, including Connecticut, have one-year residency requirements in their welfare laws.

ONE-MILLION DOLLARS IN AID INVOLVED

Francis McGregor, counsel for the State Welfare Department in the Thompson case, said he had not yet received a copy of the court's decision, but he believed that the welfare laws of the other 39 states would probably be affected by the decision.

Ten states, including New York, New Jersey and Rhode Island, do not have residence requirements in their welfare laws, Mr. McGregor said.

Mr. McGregor, who is an assistant state attorney general, said that during the course of the trial Commissioner Shapiro testified that more than \$1-million in welfare funds in Connecticut would be affected by the court's decision.

He said "it is possible" the state may appeal the case to the United States Supreme Court. The welfare commissioner Shapiro is on vacation.

The majority opinion held that Connecticut states quite frankly that the purpose of the law is to protect it from "those who come needing relief."

Brian Hollander, Miss Thompson's lawyer, said that under the decision "no state would have a residence law in the area of welfare."

STRATEGIC INSTRUMENT MAY BE SHIPPED TO POLAND

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, just how far our Government is going in its ill-conceived bridge building to Eastern Eu-

S 8600

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 21, 1967

rope through the suicidal formula of selling and shipping supplies to the enemy has been demonstrated anew by the Department of Commerce in a recent letter which responds to my questioning an export authorized on February 1, 1967. The article approved for export is a Worden type gravimeter valued at \$10,200, a pittance compared with the value it could conceivably contribute to Soviet missile experts who would undoubtedly have access to the instrument.

Because this exchange of correspondence strikingly illustrates the ineffective manner in which our export control program is being administered, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 6, 1967.

Mr. LAWRENCE C. MCQUADE,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Domestic and International Business, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MCQUADE: This is in regard to the Department of Commerce release containing a list of export licenses approved for February 1, 1967.

One of the items contained in that release indicates that an export license has been granted authorizing the shipment of a gravity meter valued at \$10,200 and parts to Poland. I would appreciate receiving complete detailed information concerning the granting of this license. This should include:

- (1) The date application was made.
- (2) Complete information as to the type of installation or institution which will utilize the instrument. The city or cities in Poland to which shipment is to be made.
- (3) Detailed information concerning the accuracy of registration; that is milligals.
- (4) Inasmuch as geodetic instruments are a source of data of value to guided missile trajectory determinations, I would appreciate knowing whether the gravity meter exported in this instance would qualify for such application.

If, in fact, this instrument is of military application, I would appreciate your advising me as to the rationale of the Department of Commerce in granting the license for export.

Sincerely yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE,

Washington, D.C., June 3, 1967.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Your letter of June 6, 1967, to Mr. McQuade requested certain information about an export license granted for shipment of one gravity meter and parts valued at \$10,200 to the USSR.

The information is as follows:

1. The application was received October 6, 1966.
2. The Worden type gravity meter was to be shipped to the Institute of Geodesy and Cartography located in Warsaw, for use in Poland in connection with a geodetic mapping project sponsored by the International Association of Geodesy.
3. The reading accuracy of the Worden meter is 0.01 milligals.
4. As you state, geodetic instruments are a source of data of value to guided missile trajectory determinations, particularly when supplemented by earth satellite derived gravity data. The major military gravity requirements today, however, are concerned

with the effects of gravity on seaborne inertial navigation and seaborne fire control systems. The subject meter, however, is not a seaborne type; it is used only on land. The necessary geodetic information for land-based military systems also can be determined by Russian instruments already in Poland or by Canadian gravity meters comparable to the Worden meter.

Subsequent to the issuance of this license, and based on information supplied by intelligence sources, the applicant was requested in February 16, 1967 to return the license to the Office of Export Control. Currently, the license is pending further consideration. The meter has not been shipped to Poland.

Sincerely yours,

RAUER H. MEYER,
Director, Office of Export Control.

Mr. M. JNDT. Mr. President, it is heartening to learn that the Department is now belatedly reconsidering its mistake. What I cannot understand is how the application can even be given any further consideration in light of the admission that intelligence information conflicts with the decision to allow shipment. As I understand it, assembly of an instrument of this caliber is such a difficult and exacting science that fewer than a score of sufficiently competent technicians can be found in all the world and that all these artisans are now employed by one or two companies here in the United States. I am very skeptical that equivalent instruments are produced in the U.S.S.R. or Poland. If they are, why would they be buying one from us?

I am deeply concerned that in all too many instances vital military and strategic goods are leaking through the sieve of our so-called export control program. Something must be done to mend our ways, particularly in these times when the arms and supplies of Communist nations feed the flames of war all over the world.

If this administration really wants to shorten the war in Vietnam and to restore an enduring peace in the Mideast, it should summarily and definitely suspend, while the war continues and our American casualties continue to pyramid, all shipments of American supplies to the Communist countries who are giving aid and comfort to our enemy.

SCHOOL BOARD RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the challenge to our educational system provided by the disadvantaged child is a tremendous one.

There is the financial challenge—where will we find the resources to provide every child with a first-rate education? There is the challenge of personnel—how do we develop a community of teachers equipped to meet the special educational needs of the disadvantaged child? There is the programing challenge—what instructional techniques and material can most effectively develop the intellectual potential of all children?

And finally, there is the challenge of outlook—when will local school boards understand they must provide compensatory programs to insure the quality of educational opportunity for all?

Mr. Bernard Lang, vice president of

the board of education in Farmingdale, N.Y. thoughtfully addressed himself to this last challenge in a paper delivered recently to the National School Boards Association's 27th annual conference in Portland, Oreg. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Lang's paper be printed in the RECORD.

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

A CHALLENGE TO SCHOOL BOARD

RESPONSIBILITY

(By Bernard Lang)

The disadvantaged child in our community presents a challenge to us which expressed in terms of his need is a plea to school boards and to teachers: "Listen to me . . . Look at me . . . Pay attention to me . . . Care about me!" *Care about me!* Do we really care?

Every school system in this country has always been educating disadvantaged children in a general sense. The educational, social and human imperatives inherent in the need to eradicate racial discrimination and the onslaught against the effects of poverty added a new dimension to what we had been doing. We were challenged to take a fresh look—and with this new vision to change our approach towards the education of the disadvantaged youth of our communities.

At the outset I must emphasize my agreement with those who believe that compensatory education is no substitute for integrated schools. The term "disadvantaged" however is not synonymous with ethnic identity. Those who are doubly disadvantaged because of racial discrimination present a special problem which can only be ameliorated by compensatory education.

The disadvantaged children who are or should be the concern of school boards include the racial and ethnic minorities, include those whose families meet the federal government's very limited definition of disadvantage—but also must include *all* children whose self concept, social skills and attitude towards school and society consign them to a cycle of defeat, resignation and dulling conformity. The child who comes from a broken home or the culturally deprived product of our intellectual wasteland may be disadvantaged regardless of level of family income.

All of these are the children who challenge us. How do we react?

Special programs for the gifted children in our communities usually elicit enthusiastic support from local boards of education. These programs are often status symbols. In encouraging our more able learners positive results are readily apparent. Programs for gifted children have the additional appeal of relatively lower cost. Intuitively we know that even if our curriculum is not meeting their needs the children involved cannot be hurt too much. The gifted, advantaged child will usually learn and progress almost despite some of our educational programs.

School boards have a more difficult problem with disadvantaged youth programs. These programs are invariably expensive. Positive results are not always apparent. The programs do not always improve the image of the board in the eyes of the majority of the taxpayers. And too often discouraging results can be the outcome of large expenditures of money and effort. Yet I am convinced that the accomplishments of boards of education must be evaluated by the degree of their support of and sponsorship of programs of compensatory education for disadvantaged children.

School boards must demonstrate that the principles and concepts underlying the spe-