

the vessels which transport fish from the fishing grounds to the processing plants.

The present regulations, particularly those covering load lines, freight for hire, dispensing fuel and manning schedules, present serious problems in the operation of these vessels which are unique in the type of service they perform.

We have discussed these problems with members of your staff. They are well informed on the details of this situation.

We request that you introduce legislation which will update the Coast Guard Regulations as they pertain to these tenders. This procedure seems to us to be the logical solution to these problems.

Sincerely yours,

W. V. YONKER,  
Executive Vice President.

*File NE*

### STABLE AND DURABLE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

There are at the present time 62 cosponsors of the resolution. Its purpose is to express the sense of the Senate as to the desirability of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read, along with the names of the cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution, together with the cosponsors, will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### S. RES. 143

Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROKEMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. COTTON, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. SPONG, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. ALLOTT), submitted the following resolution:

Whereas the United States has a vital and historic national interest in a stable and durable peace in the Middle East; and

Whereas the President of the United States has stated the principles upon which our Nation is committed to peace in the area and that every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live and to have this right respected by its neighbors; and

Whereas the peace and security of the nations of the Middle East have been endangered by a wasteful and destructive arms race, threatened by belligerency and have just been shattered by hostilities endangering the peace of the entire world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

1. The security and national interests of the United States require that there be a stable and durable peace in the Middle East; and

2. Such a peace calls for discussions among the parties concerned, using such third party or United Nations assistance as they may wish, looking toward—

(a) recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will give security against terror, destruction and war, and the consequent withdrawal and disengagement of armed personnel;

(b) a just and equitable solution to the refugee problem;

(c) free maritime passage through international waterways, including the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, and

(d) limits on a wasteful and destructive arms race; and

3: In a climate of peace, the United States will do its full share to—

(a) help with a solution for the refugees;

(b) support regional cooperation; and

(c) see that the peaceful promise of nuclear energy is applied for the critical problem of desalting water: And be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to pursue these objectives, as reflecting the sense of the Senate, within and outside the United Nations and with all nations similarly minded, as being in the highest national interest of the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be held at the desk for possible additional cosponsors until the close of the session tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to object to the holding of the resolution for the addition of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what the resolution is. This is no reflection on the Senator from Missouri in any way.

It is a procedure which has been objected to before, and I have been asked to object to it at this time.

Will the resolution be referred to committee?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was requested that it be referred to the proper committee, which I believe would be the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to the committee considering it. However, I have been asked to object to this procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of Mr. TYDINGS, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 1981 and S. 1982, bills to improve the judicial machinery for the courts of the District of Columbia, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the following Senators be added as cosponsors of legislation I have introduced: S. 824, Senator MCGEE; S. 1366, Senator YARBOROUGH; S. 1360 and S. 1361, Senator GRUENING; S. 1503, Senator JAVITS; S. 1565, Senator KENNEDY of New York; S. 1765, Senator CLARK;

and S. 1941, Senator KENNEDY of New York.

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

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DISTRICT REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations has scheduled public hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 3, to reorganize the government of the District of Columbia, for July 25, 26, and 27 in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

In view of the interest in this proposal, the hearings will be held before the full committee. I have designated the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, to serve as co-chairman of the committee for the purpose of processing this plan and conducting the proposed hearings.

Inquiries should be directed to room 162, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone No. 225-2308.

#### CORRECTIONS OF THE RECORD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on page S8918 of yesterday's RECORD, in the third column, line 6 of the poem which I quoted, the word "his" should be "our."

I ask that the word be corrected in the permanent RECORD.

In the June 26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page S8831, column 1, in the lower one-third of the page, in the second line of my speech, the word "enlightened" should be "enlightening."

I ask that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that the word was "enlightening."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The corrections will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page S9001 of yesterday's RECORD, in the second column, fourth line down from the top, it has Mr. DIRKSEN saying:

Would there be any chance of its being carried over until we return after the Independence Day recess?

That statement was made by me and I ask that the correction be made in the permanent RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on June 8, 1967, when I introduced S. 1929, the title of the bill was incorrectly stated at three places in the RECORD. On pages S7876, S7879 and S7880 the bill was incorrectly titled as a bill for an Office of Legislative Evaluation in the General Accounting Office. The bill should have been designated as a bill to establish a Commission on Legislative Evaluation. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made.

#### THE JOHNSON-KOSYGIN SUMMIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the characteristics of the summit meeting between President Johnson and Prime Minister Kosygin was the warm

and sympathetic reception by the people—not only of Glassboro, N.J., but throughout the country.

I believe this demonstrates popular approval for President Johnson's summit peace efforts.

The American people are not so gullible as to think that immediate agreements on explosive world issues would emerge from the summit meeting.

Yet they were encouraged—and justifiably—to believe that such a meeting would make a solid contribution to greater understanding between two nations which have differed on many issues in the past.

The meeting did produce a lessening of tensions. It did produce an atmosphere of understanding. It did make "accidents" less likely. It did bring the participants closer together on missile control and nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

There is a definite history of agreements for peace between the Soviet Union and the United States, agreements which preceded the summit meeting: the Outer Space Treaty, the opening of a new United States-Soviet direct air link, increased East-West trade.

The summit is another large step in the work of building bridges between East and West. We shall not regret it. The President is to be applauded for his tireless efforts. The people know the value of those efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following comments on the popular and positive reaction to President Johnson's peace initiatives:

An editorial entitled "The Summit," published in Newsday for June 24, 1967; an article entitled "Spirit of Glassboro Really One of People," written by Isabelle Shelton, and published in the Washington Star of June 26, 1967; an editorial entitled "Glassboro," published in the Washington Post of June 27, 1967; an article entitled "Washington: A Steadier Administration," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of June 28, 1967; and an article entitled "Johnson-Kosygin Talks: Possibly A Step Forward," written by Joseph Kraft, and published in the Los Angeles Times of June 28, 1967.

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

[From Newsday, June 24, 1967]

#### THE SUMMIT

"Oh, East is East, and West is West, and Never the twain shall meet,  
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat.  
But there is neither East nor West,  
Border, nor Breed, nor Birth,  
When two strong men stand face to face,  
though they come from the ends of the earth!"

—RUDYARD KIPLING, "The Ballad of East and West."

Kipling's rhythmic view of the East-West split in the year 1889 still holds true today. Two strong men, President Johnson and Soviet Premier Kosygin, met yesterday at the Glassboro summit and perhaps their meeting could yet cause the twain to meet.

President Johnson has made the betterment of East-West relations a leading element of his foreign policy. He has sought

to broaden trade with Russia and the satellite nations. He has asked Congress to extend credits to allow the Russians to buy machine tools for their new Fiat automobile plant. He has tried to head off an anti-missile race and has sought agreement on a nonproliferation treaty. During the current crisis in the Middle East, he has called for a reasonable settlement of the long-standing Arab-Israeli grievances that could one day produce an East-West confrontation.

Unfortunately, Russia has not followed a reasonable course. The war in Vietnam is a potential threat to the peace of the entire world, but the Russians have done nothing to move Hanoi to the peace table. Instead, they have poured supplies and arms into North Vietnam, encouraging Hanoi to continue the war.

In this hemisphere, Russian aid has enabled Fidel Castro to survive despite wholesale mismanagement. It was with Russian help that Castro first turned his island into a base of subversion that still threatens all of Latin America.

Yesterday's Johnson-Kosygin meeting probably would not have taken place if Russian efforts to gain power in the Mideast had not backfired. Yet Russia has persisted in its folly of encouraging Arab belligerence. In his UN speech, Kosygin offered only propaganda, invective and a "peace proposal" that would guarantee continuing hostilities between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

There were several hopeful signs at yesterday's summit meeting. There was a hint in President Johnson's remarks of Russian interest in a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The fact that the world leaders are to meet again tomorrow is, in itself, a good omen. But why must the quest for peace be so bitterly slow? There could be peace today if the Russians wanted it and it could be a peace that would be fair to all. But there is no peace, and Russian policies in the Mideast, in Vietnam and in Latin America have shown little promise of peace.

In the final analysis, the major concern of both the U.S. and Russia must be to prevent the outbreak of World War III. Both powers must make new efforts to head off a new missile race and spread of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the possession of a hydrogen bomb by Red China presents new dangers to world peace and especially to Russia and to China's neighbors in Asia.

The fact remains, in assessing yesterday's summit meeting, that peace depends more upon the Russians than it does upon the U.S. Hopefully, in his talks with the President, Kosygin will indicate a willingness on the part of the Russians to modify their policies in the Mideast, Vietnam and Latin America. Until Kosygin does so, the U.S. must look to its allies to continue our worldwide holding actions against Russian expansionism. Cooperation with Russia is possible, but until it comes, the U.S. must stand fast.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,  
June 26, 1967]

#### THE CROWD OUTSIDE: "SPIRIT OF GLASSBORO" REALLY ONE OF PEOPLE

(By Isabelle Shelton)

GLASSBORO, N.J.—A "Spirit of Glassboro" was reflected in the hearts and faces of the crowds that waited for the leaders of the world's two strongest powers to finish their discussion even if it was not reflected in the results of the summit meeting.

There had been a carnival atmosphere yesterday—balloons, ice cream trucks, front yard hot dog stands. While families turned out with children, dogs and picnic lunches.

When the bulk of the crown of several thousand stood its ground late in the day in a pelting rain, shouting "We Want Alec" and "We Want Johnson," a yearning for peace seemed tangible enough to touch.

For one brief moment, it was possible to believe, as New Jersey Gov. Richard J. Hughes said, that "there must be lots of Glassboros in the world—in China and Europe and Vietnam and Russia—filled with people who are working and praying and trusting that their children and their children's children will be able to grow up in a peaceful world."

Soviet Premier Kosygin apparently got the crowd's message as yesterday's session was ending, just as he and President Johnson were about to enter a limousine that was to take them to waiting helicopters and back into their separate worlds.

Johnson, usually supersensitive to crowds, was ignoring them, no doubt out of courtesy to Kosygin.

It was the Russian who wheeled, just as Johnson was about to enter the car that would take them to their helicopters, and walked across the lawn of the meeting house to wave and speak fondly to the soaked, steaming crowd massed below.

For a man not used to American-style politics, Kosygin learned fast. He raised his arms above his head, clasped his hands and grinned broadly, in the best prize fighter style. You would have thought he'd been winning ward and county elections all his life.

#### ANTI-RUSSIAN SIGNS GONE

The few anti-Russian signs (carried by protesting Ukrainians) that had been there earlier were gone. The only sign visible at the moment was in Russian, and it said, according to a Russian reporter, "something good about peace."

The President followed Kosygin in brief waves and words to the crowd. And then they were gone.

None of the dire things that state and local police had suddenly begun to worry Saturday afternoon and evening came to pass.

The crowd, not much if at all bigger than the 5,000 or so Friday, continued its love affair with Kosygin to the end.

Hostile pickets such as met President Johnson Friday night in Los Angeles didn't show up. Police and state officials knew after Friday's summit meeting that the people of Glassboro and vicinity didn't feel that way.

But after reading the reports from California Saturday, they began to worry that organized groups of "peaceniks" or other dissenters of the right of left might come massing in from nearby large cities, if only for the television exposure.

#### FENCING UNNEEDED

The long lines of snow fencing, on which New Jersey state highway department crews worked all night Saturday, weren't needed. The more than doubled state and local police force (from Friday's 700 to 2,000) probably wasn't either—although it no doubt contributed order to the traffic situation.

The giant cleanup effort was launched at dawn today to remove tons of paper cups, soda bottles and assorted trash left by the spectators.

Seven state troopers were stationed in "Hollybush" during the night to guard against souvenir hunters, and workmen today began converting hollybush back into a home for college President and Mrs. Thomas E. Robinson.

Glassboro—where the biggest event in the past was a two-state baseball tournament—probably will never be quite the same again.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 27,  
1967]

#### GLASSBORO

Meetings of heads of state arouse great hopes and involve great risks. The meetings which President Johnson and Premier Kosygin held at Glassboro are no exception. They inspired the hope that some great, dramatic and spectacular resolution of Soviet-American tensions might emerge; and

vehicle propulsion, sulfur dioxide pollution and low-sulfur or sulfur-free substitutes. This program would raise authorized research funds from \$12 million in fiscal 1967 to \$18 million proposed for fiscal 1968. It proposes the program include direct activities by the federal government and contracts or grants-in-aid to private industry, universities and other groups.

7. The total financial resources proposed in the Muskie bill calls for an increase from the presently authorized \$74 million in fiscal 1968 to \$80 million for that year and such sums as may be determined by Congress for the following four fiscal years.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council last February called for stronger enforcement of the Clean Air Act. The AFL-CIO agreed with the President's proposal to establish federal air-shed commissions and empower the Secretary of HEW "to set air quality criteria over all sources of industrial pollutants released into the atmosphere, not merely those by automobile as provided by the present act."

By these means, it is possible to move in with federal, state and local programs to control poisoned air emitted from stationary sources, factories, power stations, oil refineries and the like.

The AFL-CIO policy statement had this to say on the problem of automobile combustion and air pollution:

"Expanded use of electric-powered vehicles would sharply reduce the largest and most rapidly-growing source of air pollution. Any federal program to develop an economically feasible electric-powered vehicle should provide public domain ownership of all federal patents and a searching assessment by a national commission, with labor representation, of the social and economic impact of a largescale changeover to the electric automobile."

In a recent statement to a special Senate joint committee considering legislation to authorize a federal research and development program for electric-powered vehicles, AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew J. Bie-miller said:

"... present control technology and that likely in the near future is not adequate to reduce the continually mounting load of contaminants emitted to the atmosphere from the automobile in its various forms. The sheer increase in numbers of cars, trucks and buses, even if equipped with all control devices required under the Clean Air Act, will inexorably add to the aggregate environmental burden of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and other harmful chemicals released into the air."

The electric car is not new. It was used years ago and some probably are operating in the form of commercial vehicles in most large cities.

The problem is to find an energy source, either a battery or fuel cell which operates on chemicals, which will enable faster pick-up and higher speeds and allow the driver to cover 100 miles or more before recharging the battery at a station or exchanging it.

While industry is grudgingly accepting the disagreeable inevitability that there will be some kind of control over air pollution, it wants a major voice in setting the terms.

Industry wants federal activities restricted to research and development, and it seeks federal tax writeoffs as well as state and local financial incentives for air pollution control equipment. Such tax breaks and incentives are strongly opposed by organized labor.

Recently, the chairman of the board of Humble Oil Refining Company said to a meeting in Houston, Texas, that if industry did not voluntarily clean up its own mess "... in the near future our actions in this area will be spelled out by congressional legislation."

Uniform federal standards, equitably applied, would enable industries to become socially responsible and also to maintain their respective positions in the marketplace. This is what is provided for in the proposed Clean Air Act of 1967 now before Congress. Without such standards, industries would be enticed to relocate in a more lenient regulatory climate where, among other incentives, a relaxed attitude toward air pollution could be maintained by the state or local enforcement agency.

The battle lines are now being manned in the halls of Congress. But where the fight will be finally won or lost is in the cities, towns and villages of this nation, when the citizens have decided that they have had enough and, as President Johnson has said, "... through their elected representatives, demand the right to air that they and their children can breathe without fear."

*file: w3*  
PERSECUTION OF ISLAM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the recent Mideast war, Nasser and the other Arab leaders have thrown themselves completely on the mercy of continued Soviet assistance. Their dependency on the Soviet Union, accordingly, is even greater today than it was before the recent crisis broke.

Yet only one result seems certain for the United Arab Republic and those who follow its lead. That result is domination by the Soviet Union, and the destruction of the Arab culture and the faith of Islam.

Nor is the word "destruction" an exaggeration employed for literary effect.

In 1920, there were an estimated 40 million Moslems in the Soviet Union. Several years ago the number was estimated to have fallen off to 8 million. At the present rate of decline, it will not be too long before the Muslim religion is only a memory in the Soviet Union.

The persecution of the Muslim religion in the Soviet Union was the subject of a study put out in mimeographed form a few years ago by the American Committee for Liberation. This study is so pertinent to the Mideast crisis and Arab dependency on Soviet aid that I wish to comment on it briefly before placing it in the RECORD.

All religion has suffered untold persecution under communism, Islam has been no exception. Moslems have been persecuted for their faith in the same manner as Christians, Jews, Buddhists, and others. In some respects, indeed, the fate of Islam has been worse than that of other religions.

In Tashkent, for example, there were 341 mosques in 1911 and today there are 16. In Bukhara there were 360 mosques in 1906, today there are four. There is only one theological seminary for the whole of central Asia.

In a study of the Soviet regime's treatment of Islamic institutions and its policies with respect to the Islamic peoples of the U.S.S.R., the American Committee for Liberation pointed out the following:

All government media are employed in anti-religious propaganda—the press, the radio, the official "Society for the Diffusion of Scientific and Political Knowledge" with its lectures, movies, conferences, and discussion groups ... As in all other parts of

the Soviet Union, the daily press carries frequent anti-Islamic articles. Religious customs such as prayer and fasting are derided and denounced as reactionary ... Islamic clergy appears to be under more severe limitations than the Christian clergy. Its members may not solemnize marriages; they are constantly under the surveillance of the secret police.

In the matter of religious education, the situation clearly points out the hardship suffered by the followers of Islam.

Before the revolution of 1917, besides the thousands of primary schools, there were more than 1,000 Islamic secondary theological schools in the Russian Empire. These all disappeared in the early years of the revolution. A handful have been reopened in the 50 years since, but these have been for show purposes primarily. Unlike the Soviet Christians, who are permitted a very limited publication program, Moslems have no publications of their own. Only one printing of the Koran has taken place since 1917, and the review entitled "Moslem Religion," which was announced by Radio Moscow in 1957 has yet to appear.

The Arab leaders must not forget, and we must not forget, that religion has been the traditional enemy of all modern tyrannies. Mussolini stated that "Religion is a species of mental disease." Karl Marx called it the "Opium of the people" and Hitler denounced Christianity not only because Jesus was a Jew, but because it was cowardly to speak of giving love for hate.

The Arab leaders who propose an alliance with Communism are engaged in a betrayal of their faith and of the millions of Moslems behind the Iron Curtain who have suffered for so long in an effort to practice their religion.

It is important that they weigh the dangers of the step they seem about to take. It is a step from which there is no turning back.

I wish to share with Senators this important report about the state of Islam in the Soviet Union. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

RED STAR OVER ISLAM

(A study of the Soviet regime's treatment of Islamic institutions and its policies with respect to adherence to their traditional faith by the Islamic peoples of the U.S.S.R., by the American Committee for Liberation, New York, N.Y.)

BACKGROUND

Bearing in itself most of the stigmata of a religion, Communism is opposed to every other religion; it is a principle of the Marxist faith that every other religion must be eliminated. One might quote Marx and all the latter-day Communist prophets to prove this basic statement, but a few statements will suffice here.

Lenin said, "Every socialist must be an atheist ... in the face of the ignorance and darkness which religion is, the Party cannot remain indifferent. The fight against it (religion) is not a private matter. It is the business of the whole Party."<sup>1</sup>

As recently as in 1950, Jakovenko, writing specially for readers in Central Asia, asserted:

<sup>1</sup> Lenin, *About Religion*, pp. 6, 7

wind, or rain comes to the rescue, the cool upper air stays put and prevents the dirty air at ground level from circulating up and out. Los Angeles is the prime example of a metropolis with a chronic inversion situation. But they can take place anywhere. When they happen suddenly and remain for several days where there is a great deal of emission of pollutants, people who are well get sick, the sick get sicker and some of the sick and some of the older people die.

The burden of principal pollutants is expected to double by the year 2000. Over the great metropolitan areas of the West Coast, the Great Lakes and other regions, inversions are expected to become more and more lethal, together with the kind of "ordinary" air humans breathe between inversions, which merely takes longer to infect individuals with chronic respiratory diseases and possibly lung cancer, but produces few headlines.

In the long-range view of the situation, the steady increase in the release of pollutants to the atmosphere, in addition to what is already there from natural and man-made causes, can work what may very well become a permanent change of the world's climatic cycles. It is a well-known phenomenon that temperatures in large metropolitan areas are consistently warmer than in the countryside and fogs are more frequent. This is an example of local modification.

The bulk of the air resource is in a relatively shallow envelope six miles in depth (the troposphere). There are global, regional and local air movements within the troposphere which make up nature's ventilation system, modified by topography, climate and latitude.

If the mass of air pollutants continues to build up, the global capacity of the wind systems to disperse pollutants may be seriously impaired.

Thus modern man in the United States and other industrialized nations has created a menace. It lurks in the very air he breathes and takes an increasing toll in lives, health and the economy. It is seriously disturbing the delicate balance that has existed in the environment, of which man is becoming a ruthlessly disrupting factor. He worships at the shrine of personal cleanliness, creature comforts and new techniques while surrounding himself with an environment of ugliness, filth and poison.

What has been done in recent years to clean up America's polluted air?

The federal government did not move into the picture until 1955, when legislation was enacted creating a federal program.

The Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was authorized to conduct research on the problem and provide technical assistance to state and local governments.

The 1960 amendments to the basic federal act provided for a special study of motor vehicle pollution. The federal program under this law brought more scientific knowledge to bear on causes and effects. The public attention was becoming more aware that polluted air was a national problem, was damaging to the public health and welfare, and that control of many of the larger sources of poison was feasible.

Although knowledge about the causes, effects, scope and control techniques was steadily advancing, there was little done by local, state or federal levels of government to clean up the air. The federal program was research-oriented. Outside of Los Angeles and the state of California, there were few local or state programs. Those in existence were basically ineffective.

The federal Clean Air Act of 1963, however, broadened the scope of the federal program. It authorized federal grants-in-aid directly to state and local air pollution control agencies to establish or improve their programs and empowered the federal government to

take necessary action to abate interstate air pollution situations.

The Clean Air Act also expanded research, technical assistance and training activities of the U.S. Public Health Service. It directed the Service to do research and development on motor vehicle and sulfur oxide pollution from coal and oil burning in power generation and other industries, and to develop criteria on air pollution effects on human health and property.

The 1965 amendments to the Clean Air Act authorized the Secretary of HEW to establish standards to control emissions into the air from new motor vehicles and to investigate and develop methods of controlling new air pollution problems.

In 1966, further amendments enlarged the grants-in-aid program to states and localities to assist in maintaining control programs. The Congress also established a three-year authorization of \$46 million for fiscal 1967 and \$66 million and \$74 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, respectively.

Between 1955-63, federal funds, expended on air pollution control programs had risen slowly from \$2 million to about \$11 million a year. But in the 1963-66 period, the total rose to \$35 million a year.

#### WHAT HAVE THE STATES DONE?

Fifteen years ago, the first state law dealing with air pollution was passed. Until 1963, when the Clean Air Act was passed, only 13 more states had enacted such laws. Since then, 11 more states have acted, so there are now 25 out of the 50 states with anti-air pollution statutes on the books.

In 1961, the budgets for state air pollution control programs totaled only \$2 million, of which California alone accounted for 57 percent. There were 148 full-time and 29 part-time personnel working in the control programs of all the states.

By 1966, the states were budgeting an aggregate \$9.2 million, \$2 million of which was in the form of federal grants-in-aid. There were 406 full-time and 81 part-time personnel working in these programs.

While there was an improvement of state resources applied to the problem, the situation is still far from satisfactory in this respect. Moreover, there is wide variation among the states in the kind of agency assigned program responsibility, in standards and regulations, in enforcement and compliance procedures and punishment of willful offenders by fines, jail or both.

While the Clean Air Act encourages the formation of interstate compacts to aid in the control of air pollution, very few states have acted. New York and New Jersey were inspired to act after last year's serious smog over the New York City metropolitan area. Illinois and Indiana are negotiating a compact and so are West Virginia and Ohio.

The New York-New Jersey compact, which is furthest along, seeks legislative authority to set air quality standards and to make and enforce regulations. An innovation in this proposed compact would provide for both local and federal representation.

#### WHAT HAVE THE CITIES DONE?

Since the late 1800s, there have been many local smoke abatement ordinances passed by hundreds of communities, dealing with this aspect of air pollution as a nuisance. Beginning with Los Angeles, recent years have seen a greater community effort to attack poisoned air, not merely smoke.

In November 1965, according to the U.S. Public Health Service, there were about 130 city, county and multi-jurisdictional air pollution regulatory agencies in operation and located in 35 states serving 63 million people.

The total 1966 budget for all these local administrative areas was about \$14.3 million, of which \$3.6 million was in federal grants-in-aid. This represented a sizable rise over the \$2.6 million budgeted in 1962.

The largest single local agency budget was

that of Los Angeles County—\$3.7 million. Control agencies in California made up 38 percent of total 1965 local air pollution control budgets in the nation. The seven largest agencies made up 58 percent of the total local air pollution control budget for the nation.

While the towns and cities are now doing more about the problem than a decade ago, much of the larger urban areas still lack programs. There are manpower problems, both in funds available to hire personnel at adequate salaries and trained manpower. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that at least a fourfold expansion of programs is required to do a reasonably good job in terms of money and staff.

Moreover, there is a lack of definition of the full range of pollutants to be monitored and controlled. There is less than adequate support by local officials for a sustained all-out air cleanup effort. As with the states, regulations are too permissive, enforcement is weak or lacking and long-range planning is neglected.

#### CITIES WITH MOST SEVERE AIR POLLUTION PROBLEMS

Five areas having most severe problems: Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles-Long Beach, New York, Philadelphia.

Five areas ranking second in severity: Boston, Detroit, Newark, Pittsburgh, St. Louis.

Ten areas ranking third in severity: Akron, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Indianapolis, Jersey City, Louisville, Milwaukee, Washington, Wilmington.

(Source: The National Center for Air Pollution Control, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

Thus the federal government, the states and the cities are making a tentative beginning to face up to the air pollution crisis in the United States.

President Johnson's air pollution message of 1967 contained legislative recommendations for strengthening the federal air pollution control program by means of the Air Quality Act of 1967, which was introduced by Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine) and 20 co-sponsors of both parties.

This legislation would expand the federal air pollution control program to carry out the following:

1. Designate interstate industries which are nationally significant contributors to air pollution and establish industry-wide emission levels, allowing the state to equal or exceed federal levels, but stepping in with a federal enforcement program where a state fails to do this.

2. Establish Regional Air Quality Commissions which cut across state lines and enforce pollution control in so-called regional airsheds, where air characteristics and flow are generally consistent in pattern over a multi-state area.

The Secretary of HEW would not have to wait for states to move, but could designate interstate regions where control programs were needed and, after consultation with the states and localities involved, appoint a Commission composed of two persons from each state and a federal representative named by the Secretary.

The Commission would be responsible for setting safe air quality and emission levels and could enforce them by means of present statutory authority under the Clean Air Act.

3. State inspection of 1968 and later model vehicles with carburetor and exhaust control devices, by means of assistance from federal matching grants.

4. Improved enforcement procedures.

5. Mandatory registration of all fuel additives with the Secretary of HEW.

6. A broadened research program into emittants from motor vehicles, including diesel engines, alternative methods of motor

"Leninism, Marxism, as a unique scientific concept of the world and religious ideology are incompatible, irreconcilable. Religion hinders its faithful from being active, enlightened builders of Communism. This is why it is indispensable to carry on energetic battle against religious prejudices."<sup>2</sup>

The prominent Soviet specialist on Islam Klimovitch points this up for Islam: "Islam is an anti-scientific and reactionary ideology opposed to Marxism and Leninism."

Klimovitch's statement was issued in 1952. In the same year the Party organ in Uzbekistan gave the final touch: "It is impossible to build Communism until we have definitely destroyed Islam."

#### COMMUNISM IN ISLAM

The destruction of Islam has been one of the purposes of the Soviet government, pursued with varying intensity since 1917. Islam in the USSR has perhaps been more consistently subjected to attack than any other religion. There are several reasons for this. First is the general Communist hostility to religion. Communist ideology has no answers to non-economic questions, and hence the Party cannot tolerate any other, independent ideology, like Islam.

But in the case of Islam there is another reason for its suppression. This is its close relationship to the idea of nationality. Any student of Soviet internal politics knows how relentlessly other than Russian nationalities have been suppressed over the past forty years. This applies, though in a somewhat lower degree, to the Jews as well as to the Islamic peoples. Recalling the persistent attempts, just after the revolution, to form autonomous all-Islamic states in the great areas around the east end of the Black Sea and north of the Caspian Sea—efforts which it had to suppress with massacres, the government had another reason for wiping out the chief common link among the different tribes. Islam as a sign of nationality, as well as Islam as a religion, had to be destroyed.

This was not clearly announced at the start of the Soviet regime.

After the February revolution, when conditions became favourable for a political election, the Islamic peoples joined to undertake the organization of their government structure. In May, 1917, an "All-Russian Congress of Moslems" took place in Moscow. At the Congress, a decision was adopted to organize independent states of the Islamic nations of the former empire as autonomous and independent republics. This project was placed under the general control of the "Central Moslem Council," which had been elected at the meeting.

The first to receive their autonomy were the Moslems of the Volga-Ural region under the name of "State of Idel-Ural." When the Bolsheviks came to power in Moscow in November, 1917, the formerly imperial Islamic territories—the Volga-Ural region, Central Asia and the Caucasus—already had their autonomous and independent governments. In order to establish their own, Soviet system and their own rule in these Islamic territories, the Bolsheviks waged war not only against the armed forces of the White Russians which had entrenched themselves in the outlying districts and in Siberia, but also against the national republics of the Islamic peoples. The Soviets coupled their bayonets with compromise tactics by condemning Tsarist imperialism and by promising to recognize the national rights of the Islamic peoples. Within a month two official declarations were addressed to the Islamic peoples. These documents were preceded by the famous Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia,<sup>3</sup> which emphasized "the equality and sovereignty of all the peoples

of Russia." It abolished all national and all national-religious restrictions. On November 22, 1917, Lenin and Stalin, then Commissar of Nationalities, issued this solemn assurance: "We are filled with the desire and the determination to respect the national rights and religious feelings of the Moslems. We shall respect the rights of the Moslems to live in their own way. To protect these rights of the Moslem peoples, we will apply the full power of revolutionary law."<sup>4</sup> This pledge was repeated a fortnight later in an "appeal of the Soviet of People's Commissars to all the toiling Moslems of Russia and the East." The appeal contained these lines: "From this time on, all your beliefs and customs, your national and cultural institutions are declared to be free and inviolable. Establish your national life according to your own pattern and wishes. This is your right."<sup>5</sup> The rest of the present report shows how the Soviet government kept its promises.

Politically, the Soviet government had no more intention of permitting the autonomy of Islamic states than of leaving the religion untouched. In a resistance-crushing struggle which lasted six years, the Soviet troops finally occupied all the Islamic territories. The Soviet-installed governments, responsible directly to Moscow, put an end to all hope for Moslem self-government.

As regards religion, Communist action was almost as swift. In 1919 both Lenin and Stalin began open attacks on Islam, using all the means at their disposal—legislation, administrative action, threats of force and coercion itself, as well as the ubiquitous propaganda. The law of separation of church and state, promulgated in 1918, deprived Islam and all other religions of the right to act as a juridical person. Shortly thereafter a series of decrees, directed particularly against Islam, instituted action for the progressive crushing of that faith.

One object of attack was the Sheriyat, the code of laws based on the Koran under which adherents of Islam everywhere had lived for centuries. At first, the Soviet did not wholly suppress the Sheriyat but devised constantly increasing limitations on its application. These strictures limited the competence of Sheriyat courts and tightened Soviet control over them. In 1922, a decree ordered the retrial in a Soviet court of any case first decided in a Sheriyat court, if one of the disputing parties petitioned for such a retrial. A year later it was decreed that the state budget could not longer bear the burden of footing the cost of Sheriyat courts. Thus the financial responsibility was put on the shoulders of local citizens. By 1926 the last Sheriyat court in Turkestan had disappeared, and in 1927 the Central Executive Committee of the USSR ordered the separation of all Islamic courts from the Soviet state and forbade the creation of new ones. One essential element in Islamic life in the USSR was thus efficiently crushed.<sup>6</sup> Today, Sheriyat is considered antiquated and is declining everywhere.

Another Soviet line of attack was against education. In 1922, first in Turkestan and then subsequently throughout Central Asia, the right of religious institutions to own endowed property and to use the revenue derive from it was cancelled in favour of the Commissariat of Education. The management of this property was put in the hands of local Communist authorities. Thus all religious schools and other institutions came directly under state control. Under the Tsar adherents of Islam had carried the burden of educating their children, unaided by the state. In Turkestan the "maktabs" provided elementary schooling for 70,000 children, while about 10,000 older youths received their education in the "Islam sciences" in

375 "Madrassa," or preparatory schools for Islamic clergy. Though the Soviet government temporarily had to abandon the large-scale educational system it had set up to replace the Islamic schools, it continued its pressure to eliminate them. These tactics arose from the decree separating schools from churches. Deprived of the support hitherto derive from endowed properties, the Islamic schools were forced out of existence.

Pressure against Islam, as well as against other religions, was relaxed during the era of the New Economic Policy (1922-28), but resumed with greater force afterward. From 1929 on, the Soviets attacked all religions viciously, particularly Islam. The Communist authorities closed the "Nazariat" at Ufa, a religious administration for Islamic affairs which for 150 years had been the ecclesiastical centre for Islamic peoples of European and Asiatic Russia. Following the closure of all Islamic schools, the government began closing the mosques. All publication of religious literature was stopped; the Koran was declared counter-revolutionary, and its distribution was prohibited. As was the case with Christians, clergy was arrested in the thousands under various pretences and deported to Siberian labour camps. It became dangerous for any citizen to attend service in some mosque he might find open. The whole of Islamic religious life was paralyzed. The government forbade the use of Arabic script, ordering first the use of Latin script for the Turkic languages, and then later the use of the Russian script. Soviet Moslems are not permitted to use the Arabic script.

Increasing government pressure, exercised largely through the League of the Militant Godless against nationality and family tradition, has only increased the loyalty of the Islamic peoples to their faith. In the areas of Islam the revolts against collectivization in 1929 to 1931 were often incited and led by the Islamic clergy, calling for a holy war against Communism.<sup>7</sup>

A mass deportation of Islamic intelligentsia was carried out in the Mid-Thirties. As in other deported groups, only a few survived life in forced labour camps. The pilgrimage to Mecca was stopped. By this time the great majority of mosques and other Islamic buildings had been closed and transformed into Communist clubs, cinemas, or storehouses. By the end of the Thirties, more than 25,000 mosques had been closed. In the Crimea, for instance, not a single mosque remained open.

Up to 1941, there was no relaxation of the anti-Islam propaganda, which had the full power of the Soviet government behind it. The scope of the Soviet anti-religious effort through lectures, cinema, the radio, and the printed word is well-known. The general campaign was directed impartially against all religions—Christianity, Jewish religion or Islam. In addition to the general atheistic effort, however, thousands of pamphlets and hundreds of books were designed to subvert Islam. Four-hundred anti-Islamic books were published between 1928 and 1941.<sup>8</sup>

Another subversive method used against Islam was infiltration. Specially trained agents were sent to Islamic regions, stirring up doubt and dissension. "Scientific" lecturers ridiculed the religious practices of Islam, the Koran and the "myth" about Mohammed.

The purges of 1937 to 1939 further weakened the leadership of the Islam. The few remaining higher Islamic church authorities were liquidated. For example, Mufti Kasbot Terdzhemeni was shot in 1936 on charges that he was a Japanese spy. One source reports a total of 43,000 Islamic clergy killed, and 17,500 mosques closed or destroyed.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> I.E.

<sup>5</sup> E.T.R., p. 71

<sup>6</sup> M.S., pp. 148, 149

<sup>7</sup> G., p. 72

<sup>8</sup> I.E.

<sup>9</sup> G., p. 199

<sup>2</sup> Pravda Vostoka, June 29, 1950

<sup>3</sup> S.T., p. 7



Islam in the USSR remained alive only by going underground.

The entry of the Soviet Union into World War II brought notable changes in the official Soviet attitude toward religious organizations. The pervasive Militant Godless movement was abolished, anti-religious propaganda almost stopped. The Orthodox obtained the restoration of the patriarchate, in return for their support of the government in the war. Stalin needed the Moslems as well, and in 1942 some government-financed mosques and religious schools were reopened in Kazan, Ufa, Tashkent, Bukhara, Baku, and other localities. The still-surviving clergymen were brought back from concentration camps. One terrible exception in this era of comparative goodwill was the Communist reprisal against those Islamic groups which, encouraged by the German advance into the USSR, had declared their territories "independent" republics: In the course of this action during the period of 1943-1945, various Islamic peoples of the Northern Caucasus, particularly the Chechen-Ingush, Balkars and Karachais, were entirely deported from their ancient lands, and their republics—the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Kabardino-Balkarian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the Karachai Autonomous Region—were liquidated. The Crimean Tatars, who have disappeared completely by now, were subjected to the same liquidation and deportation. The Soviet population statistics for 1959 included no figures on the Crimean Moslems. In 1957 the Supreme Soviet of the USSR admitted these atrocities and ordered the return to their homes of those deportees who were still alive. Most of the exiles were dead, and the few who did return found their land occupied by Slavs, who had been living on it since 1946. The main reason for this gesture of restitution apparently was a wish to improve Soviet relations with other Islamic countries.

As World War II ended, pressure on the Islamic inhabitants of the Soviet Union increased once more. The government's anti-religious propaganda was now organized and promoted by the Society for the Diffusion of Scientific and Political Knowledge. The "chief Moslem administrations," which had been organized during the war, were in effect incorporated into the Soviet government machine. Islamic clergy was pressured into participation in the Moscow-organized World Council in Defence of Peace. Some were sent to Islamic areas abroad with instructions to tell people there of the "freedom of religion" in the USSR. They well knew what would befall their families at home if they failed to carry out their missions. Here the Moslems had in effect to choose between martyrdom and the chance of keeping alive their persecuted faith.

The death of Stalin and the emergence of Khrushchev with his "new" policies brought no change in the attitude of the Soviet government toward Islam. In 1954 Khrushchev publicly demanded increased anti-religious activity, an order which of course was directed at Islam faithful along with other believers. Special anti-religious efforts showed a new spate of atheistic literature on the Islamic populations in their various national languages. Feature articles on "Islam, an Anti-Scientific, Reactionary Ideology" appeared, for instance in Turkestan. Press appeals to the population to abjure Islam and to attend anti-Islamic lectures were common. These lectures were organized on a wide scale. Trained speakers entered schools, factories and collective farms. Attendance was compulsory, and illness, real or feigned, was the only way the Islamic population could avoid hearing the public affront to their faith. Lecturers learned to announce some innocuous topic and then, when no one present would find it wise to retire, launch into anti-Islam propaganda.

#### MOSLEMS IN THE U.S.S.R. TODAY

According to the 1959 census report, there are 25,000,000 Moslems in the Soviet Union.<sup>10</sup> Ethnically, the Soviet Islamic peoples have nothing in common with the Russian people. The latter are a Slavic race, whereas the former were predominantly of Turkic, as well as of Iranian and Caucasian origin. Geographically, the Islamic peoples live in such areas as the Volga-Ural, Western Siberia, Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Crimea. Until conquered by the Russians, the Islamic peoples had their independent governments in these areas under various names. The conquest of the Islamic nations began with Tsar Ivan the Terrible during the second half of the sixteenth century. Ivan the Terrible first seized the Tatar khanates of Kazan and Astrakhan, in the Volga-Ural region, thence penetrating Turkestan and the Caucasus.

Four "Spiritual Moslem Administrations" of the Islamic peoples of the USSR have survived to the present day. They are as follows:

1) The Spiritual Administration of the Islamic peoples of the European part of USSR and of Siberia. Ufa, the capital of the Bashkirian Republic, is its centre. Such peoples as the Tatars and the Bashkirs, who live between the Ural Mountains and the central and lower reaches of the Volga come under this spiritual administration. This is where the Tatar and the Bashkirian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics are situated. The head of the Spiritual Administration is Mufti Khialetdinov, a Tatar. According to the 1959 census, there are 5,000,000 Tatars and 1,000,000 Bashkirs. The Tatars and the Bashkirs are of Turkic origin.

2) The Spiritual Administration of the Moslems in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Tashkent the capital of the Uzbek Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, is its centre. The head of the Spiritual Administration is Mufti Babakhanov, an Uzbek. Under his Spiritual Administration are the peoples of Turkestan: the Uzbeks (6,000,000), Kazakhs (3,500,000), Turkmen (1,000,000), the Kirghiz (1,000,000), Karakalpaks (173,000), and the Tadzhiks (500,000). With the exception of the Tadzhiks, who ethnically compromise an Iranian group, all other nationalities mentioned above are of Turkic origin. There are five Soviet socialist republics within the territory of Turkestan: The Uzbek, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen and Tadzhik republics; and one autonomous republic, Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

3) The Spiritual Administration of the Moslems of Transcaucasia. Baku is the centre. The Islamic inhabitants of Azerbaïdzhan fall within its jurisdiction. The Azerbaïdzhanis, who are of Turkic origin, were reported by the 1959 census to number about 3,000,000.

4) The Moslem Spiritual Administration of Dagestan and the Northern Caucasus. Buinaksk is the centre. The territory of this Spiritual Administration includes: The Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Kabardino-Balkarian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Karachai-Cherkess Autonomous Region, the Dagestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Adygei Autonomous Region. The Islamic portion of Georgia's population (Abkhazla and Adzharia) also falls under this Spiritual Administration.

Liaison between these administrations and the government is provided by the "Bureau for Cults," directly connected with the Council of Ministers of the USSR. This is an organization parallel with the Bureau for Orthodox Affairs and covers all religious bodies except the Orthodox Church. The Islamic peoples, although the second largest religious group in the USSR, have no bureau of their own.

The number of mosques open for religious services is difficult to discover. This is partly because the term "mosque" is often used to indicate simple shrines or even rooms in private homes used for prayer. Further, the figures given by different authorities vary greatly. In 1956, a Soviet source stated that there were 8,000 mosques in the USSR, but at the same time the four Muftis gave the figure as 1,800. Vincent Montell, in his book *Les Mussulmans Sovietiques*, considers this number too large and describes the situation in certain cities to give an idea of the actual state of affairs.<sup>11</sup> Thus in Tashkent, which in 1911 had 341 mosques, today there are 16. In Bukhara there were 360 mosques in 1906; today there are four. Some of the mosques now open have been repaired and opened by the government, evidently as showpieces. When it became known that Nasser, visiting the USSR, would bring gifts to certain mosques, the Soviet government hastily reopened some famous places of worship. As might have been expected, great crowds attended services in these mosques, and one of the results of the situation was a new wave of religious feeling in the Islamic areas. As an aftermath of the Nasser visit, the government purged all Islamic officials of the Party who had had contact with the Arab leader. It has been reported that new mosques, along with Christian churches, have been constructed in some of the new industrial cities of the Soviet Union. If this is the case, these mosques represent isolated instances of construction.

As regards Islamic schools, there is only one theological seminary for the whole of Central Asia. It admits a hundred students for a five-year course after completion of their secondary education. The situation in Islamic theological education roughly parallels the situation in Orthodox theological education, but the Orthodox have eight seminaries and two academies. One remarkable exception is to be noted here: The problem of the Tashkent school, which uses the Uzbek language, is printed in Arabic characters.

Since the Soviet penal code prohibits "the teaching of any type of religious doctrine in schools, to minors," the number of other Islamic schools now functioning is reduced to a minimum. The apparent existence of a certain number of such schools was revealed, however, by the Communist newspaper *Turkmenkaya Iskra* (Turkmen Spark) in 1957. The newspaper laid the low level of anti-religious propaganda to the fact that "some young men, educated in Soviet schools, go on to study in Islamic religious schools." The use of the plural indicates that there is more than one such school. The location of the schools is unknown.

Soviet tactics in the battle against Islam are a combination of political action and direct anti-religious propaganda. The forced collectivization of industry and of agriculture is accompanied by an intense process of Russification. The forcible use of the Russian alphabet has been noted. The constant process of Russifying the native languages is going on, as words condemned as "Arabic" or "imperialistic" are eliminated from the dictionaries and replaced by Russian words.

Another move in the Russification programme has been the importation of Russians and other foreign elements into predominantly Moslem areas. Khrushchev's agitation for the cultivation of virgin lands has brought more than 1,200,000 young Russians and other Slavs into Kazakhstan alone. While in the Islamic republics the heads of executive offices are usually natives, secondary positions in Party organizations, government apparatus and in industry are held by Slavs, who actually run the government.

The cultural and religious impact of such policies is evident. Following the slogan "na-

<sup>10</sup> *Pravda*, February 4, 1959

<sup>11</sup> M.S., p. 153

tional in form, socialist in content, all phases of Islamic life are being flooded with non-national and non-religious ideology. A major portion of Islamic intelligentsia having been eliminated by deportation, there is all too little national cultural and religious talent left to resist this drive.

Denaturalization in this case is almost synonymous with a separation of Islamic peoples from their religion. A recent bulletin of the Soviet Academy of Sciences emphasizes this: "This combination of the national with the religious is no accident, and it should be recognized as one of the important vestiges of nationalism concealed under a religious camouflage." (*Ethnographic Journal of the Academy of Sciences*).

All government media are employed in anti-religious propaganda—the press, the radio, the official "Society for the Diffusion of Scientific and Political Knowledge" with its lectures, movies, conferences, and discussion groups, and the increasingly effective literature.

As in all other parts of the Soviet Union, the daily press carries frequent anti-Islamic articles. They follow the general line that Islam is reactionary, that, like other religions, it degrades and poisons people's minds hinders their full participation in the building of Communism. Religious customs such as prayer and fasting are derided and denounced as reactionary and "very harmful to the rebuilding of life on earth." "Islam is a reactionary idea directed against the workers." It is "an anti-scientific and reactionary ideology opposed to Marxism-Leninism."

Certain Islamic customs are constantly singled out for attack. Thus each year at the time of Ramadan, the month of fasting, the press carries violent diatribes against this, "the most harmful of Islamic rites," "humiliating to human dignity and harmful to health." The personal and collective denunciation of those who observe the fast puts a great psychological pressure on the Islamic peoples. It must be emphasized at this point that the Soviet government does not vilify fasting because it wants to reform the custom, but because through its abolishment it wants to liquidate Islam itself.

Recent years—1956 to 1959—have seen a sharp increase in the activity of the Society for the Diffusion of Scientific and Political Knowledge throughout the Soviet Union. Islamic territory has been no exception to this trend. Thus the Tashkent newspaper *Pravda Vostoka* (Truth of the East) reported on February 10, 1959, that "more than 1900 agitators are conducting political (including anti-religious) propaganda among the masses." The newspaper *Qizil Uzbekistan* (Red Uzbekistan) stated on March 28, 1958, that 177,000 propaganda lectures had been held in Uzbekistan during the last two years.<sup>12</sup> The visiting lecture brigades cover their territory thoroughly: not only are all factories, offices, schools and homes visited and propagandized, but even peasants in their fields are lectured on the evils of Islam.

As elsewhere in the USSR, schools are systematically used for anti-religious propaganda, not only among pupils but, through them, in their families. Islam, of course, is not taught in the schools, and a recent issue of *Soviet Ethnology* demands that parents cease educating their children in Islamic principles at home. Special literature is published on the inculcation of atheism upon children. For example, a book entitled *Atheist Education of Children* was issued in the Turkmen language in 1956. Unlike the Orthodox clergy, Islamic clergy is forbidden to visit homes for the purpose of giving children religious instruction. The same issue of *Soviet Ethnology* advocates the preparation of special groups of anti-religious agitators, trained

for work in those areas. It is reported that an atheist university has been opened in Ashkhabad, Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic.

Anti-religious museums continue to exist in considerable numbers in Islamic areas. Many of the larger cities now have an anti-religious museum located in a former mosque or some other building closely identified with Islamic culture. Permanent exhibits have staffs of lecturers attached, and some of these speakers accompany mobile anti-religious exhibits to the smaller communities.

Islamic clergy appears to be under more severe limitations than the Christian clergy. Its members may not solemnize marriages; they are constantly under the surveillance of the secret police, whose agents are always present to report on the content of any sermon in a mosque. In 1956, TASS, the official Soviet news agency, reported that the Mullah of the Moscow mosque, Akhmedin Mustafin, had appealed over the radio to the Islamic peoples not to observe the fast of Uraza-blaram. In this instance, he could have acted only under compulsion.

One writer reports that when reading the Friday prayers in the mosque, the imam must begin by praising the Soviet government and must close with "Allah has created the Soviet government; therefore, whoever acts against the Soviet state, acts against Allah." This appears to be a "Sovietization" of the formula used in Islamic countries for asking divine benediction on the head of the state. Religious leaders among the Islamic peoples in the USSR are often "requested" to read prepared speeches over the radio, carrying strong appeals to the Islamic populations of other countries. Thus the head of the Moslem Religious Administration of Central Asia and Kazakhstan gave a speech in Arabic in 1957, praising the Communist regime and stressing the freedom of religion in the Soviet Union. No notice of this speech appeared in the newspapers of the Islamic peoples, but it was mentioned in a brief paragraph by TASS. Since few of the Islamic inhabitants of the Soviet Union understand Arabic, they would not know what one of their Muftis had said.

The Islamic clergy, together with the clergy of all other faiths, has been brought into the extensive activities of the World Council in Defense of Peace. Here it has had to hew to the Soviet propaganda line, together with Christians and Jews. That all clergymen are responsible to a Moscow-appointed spiritual head of their region rather than to one chosen by the Islamic faithful themselves indicates the careful state control over the whole of Islamic life in the USSR today.

The significance to all believers in Islam of a pilgrimage to Mecca is well known.<sup>13</sup> Before the revolution as many as 40,000 Islamic faithful from Turkestan alone made the journey each year. After the revolution and until 1946, pilgrimages were forbidden. It must be pointed out, however, that during this period travel abroad was impossible for all other ordinary Soviet citizens. Although pilgrimages have been permitted in principle since then, it is difficult for anybody other than a member of the Communist Party or a trusty of the Soviet government to obtain the necessary exit visa. A visa is issued only after the applicant has been checked by the state security police. It appears that such "pilgrims" are obliged to conduct propaganda in support of Soviet foreign policy and to aid other subversive activities in the Islamic countries through which they pass.<sup>14</sup> In fact, pilgrimages to Mecca are a state project in the Soviet Union. In 1954 only 21 "pilgrims" were permitted to go to Mecca incontrovertible evidence of the needle's eye through which the "pilgrims" must pass.

<sup>13</sup> S.T., p. 21

<sup>14</sup> F.M., p. 4

Such limited freedom as has been granted to Islamic citizens of the Soviet Union seems to have been given largely for the effect it will have on other Islamic countries. A foreign delegation from an Islamic country went to worship in a splendid mosque but was not told that a few months ago it had been an anti-religious museum. Nothing could better illustrate the contradiction between Soviet propaganda to Arab nations abroad and its intense anti-Islamic activity at home. On the one hand, the Soviet government uses the Islamic leaders to support its foreign policy, particularly in the Arab world; on the other hand, these same leaders and their faithful are constantly under attack at home as "obscurantists—superstitious and harmful to Soviet economy."

In the matter of religious education, the situation is most inadequate for Islam. Besides the thousands of primary schools ("maktabs"), there were more than 1,000 secondary theological schools ("medrase") in the Russian empire. These all disappeared in the early years of the revolution. As part of its "moderate" policy toward religion after World War II, the Soviet government opened one Islamic theological school in Bukhara in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.<sup>15</sup> Until 1920 an Islamic theological school in Bukhara had 17,000 students whereas the present school (Mir-Arab) has 100. The programme uses the Arabic script and is in the Uzbek language. It lists language courses in Russian, Uzbek and Persian, and the course "The Soviet Constitution," in addition to the classical theological subjects. Choice of the candidates for this school is in the hands of the Department of Religious and Cultural Affairs of the Council of Ministers. Several authorities point this out as evidence for their statement that the Bukhara school has two purposes: (1) to train mullahs who will cooperate with the Soviet government, and (2) to prepare Communist agents for work in other Arab countries. That these purposes may be often realized in one and the same person is evident from conversations held in Mecca in 1956. "Pilgrims" from the USSR admitted that they had been instructed to report everywhere abroad that Islam enjoyed real freedom in the Soviet Union.

It is reported that another Islamic academy forms part of the Central Asiatic University in Tashkent. This school, however, appears to be even more Soviet-controlled than the Bukhara institution, and its value to religion is probably nil.

Unlike the Christians, who are permitted a very limited publication programme, Moslems have no publications of their own. Very limited editions of the Bible have appeared in Russia, but, so far as is known, there has been only one printing of the Koran. Publication in Arabic letters would be of little use, since, except for the 100 students in Bukhara, Arabic is not taught anywhere in the USSR. The review entitled *Moslem Religion*, which was announced by Radio Moscow in 1957, has yet to appear. Thus, up to the present, Islamic peoples of the Soviet Union have been unable to publish any literature of their own.

#### OUTLOOK

After 40 years of intense persecution of Islam by the Soviet Government with all the forces at its command, what remains of Islam in the USSR? Some quotes from recent Soviet writers are indicative. Khasurov, Secretary of the Tashkent Komsomol (Communist youth organization), stated recently: "Lately the Komsomol organizations have diminished their anti-religious programme among young people. It is no secret that a certain group of young people is still under the influence of religion. This group visits

<sup>12</sup> S.T., p. 24

<sup>15</sup> E.T.R., p. 76

the mosques and performs the rites."<sup>16</sup> Shelepin, former Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, complains that "it is a well-known fact that religion does the cause of Communist education much harm." Young people of Islamic faith have been particularly reluctant to join the Komsomol, and statistics show a very small percentage of Moslems in its membership. *Komsomolskaya Pravda* states on December 22, 1955, that in Turkmenistan "many people still attend the mosques and celebrate religious holidays—not only men and women of the older generation but even school children and young people from the collective farms."

From 1954 to 1956 a special team from the Soviet Academy of Sciences conducted a secret survey of the religious situation in two regions of Turkestan. *Soviet Ethnography*, in publishing parts of the survey report, admitted: "There are many believers among women, men and young people, who fulfill all Islamic rights, of marriage, burial, circumcision, fasting." The journal reiterated its demand that parents cease educating their children in the religion of Islam.

Writing in the same publication in 1957, G. D. Snesarev, an "eminent Soviet scholar," spoke of the extraordinary vitality of Islamic religious beliefs. He would not have agreed with this statement by Professor Richard Pipes of Harvard University: "There can be no doubt that religion has lost its hold on the new generation and that Islam as a way of life is as much a thing of the past as Christianity is in the West" (*The New Leader*, New York, December 29, 1958). Snesarev declared that although orthodox Islam has been weakened and the number of persons observing the fasts and other religious occasions, as well as the number of persons with a knowledge of Arabic, is diminishing, "a religious movement is being born before our very eyes in the regions where Islam was once widespread. This movement strives to adapt the religion to modern conditions; it accepts every compromise and tries to modernize Moslem dogmas." Snesarev felt that the strong bonds of the family and of the clan were the chief reason for this persistence of Islam and went so far as to propose the destruction of the entire traditional Islamic society. Montell in his detailed study of the Islamic peoples in the Soviet Union analyzed the situation by classifying society according to age, sex, and degree of culture. Here are his conclusions.

The old people, in general, remain believers, but it is a question of how profound is their knowledge of Islam. "With them the past is dying out, unless at home they have some influence on their descendants."

The majority of the youth is de-Islamized, but there are, of course, the exceptions, like the 100 theology students in Bukhara, who still say their prayers. With all respect to their grandparents, the religion they receive from them is "only the reflection of a reflection."

As a rule, women still are believers. A question about the depth of their religious faith is raised by Montell, particularly in view of the inadequate amount of education permitted to women.

The majority of the population, while outwardly accepting all the repressive measures of the government, continues to follow all the old national and religious ways in private, but Montell wonders how much of this observance is national tradition and how much real religious faith.

The Marxist-educated intelligentsia in general is opposed to all religion, including Islam. Still, great veneration for Islamic traditions exists among its members, who apparently fulfill some of the Islamic rites. This attitude may again be interpreted as being partly motivated by a natural cultural

resistance to the continuing Soviet effort at denationalization. Montell reports that the majority of the remaining Islamic clergy has made some sort of concordat with the Soviet system—an adaptation which is true of the Christian clergy as well. An old Mufti in Tashkent, when asked how he could reconcile the principles of Marxism with the precepts of the Koran, replied that in the USSR "every citizen is free to choose his own way—ours passes by the mosque." But Montell remarks that the Mufti's is a very old mosque, untouched by the winds of reform which are blowing in other parts of the Islamic world. Living in isolation, Islamic peoples in the USSR are not reached by modern Islamic trend of thought. "But," says Montell, "these Moslem clerics are anything but traitors to their faith. It is not for us to judge. Like the clergy of other faiths, they have made choices of whose difficulty outsiders can have no idea, in the desire to preserve what is possible of the faith of their fathers."

The unrelenting Soviet effort to destroy one religious group in its entirety continues. It will have to go on for still a long time before Islam is wiped out. Klimovitch admitted in 1956 that "Islam is one of those religious survivals of which still remain among a portion of the population in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, the Caucasus, Tatar, Bashkiri, and several other regions of the RSFSR."<sup>17</sup> Of course no statistics are available, but the constant appeals of Soviet writers for intensified campaigns against these "survivals" are some indication of the task which the Soviet anti-religionists are facing.

Observers in the Soviet Union report that all Christian churches are crowded; the same is true of mosques. The overcrowding may be due, however, to the scarcity of places of worship. There is only one mosque in Moscow, for instance, and it is always overfilled. On special Islamic religious holidays the streets around the mosque are so crowded that traffic is completely stopped. In separate conversations on religion with two Moslems in Moscow—in both cases it was the Moslem who began the discussion—the chief points raised were reasons for belief in God and in the immortality of the soul. "Are there many unbelievers among you?" "Only one in a thousand," was the reply "and he only half-way."

It is evident that 40 years of intense, psychologically planned effort to eliminate Islam from the USSR have not been without effect. The sweeping changes in social life, the attacks against Islam as outmoded, unscientific and harmful to the state, all the possible forms of moral and physical pressure on believers, have evidently reduced the number of the Islamic faithful, with the major decrease among youth. The almost complete suppression of Islamic theological education raises the question of whether, after a few more decades, any Islamic clergy will remain. The real extent of the modernized-Islam movement described by Snesarev is unknown, and its future is an open question. An open question, also, is the ultimate survival of Islam in the USSR.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Sources and code:  
*Les Mussulmans Sovietiques* (Montell, Vincent), Paris 1957, M.S.  
*Russia and her Colonies* (Kolarz, Walter), New York 1953, R.  
*Genocide in the USSR*, Munich 1958, G.  
*The East Turkic Review*, Munich 1958, E.T.R.  
*The Soviets in Turkestan*, Beirut 1958, S.T.  
*The Fate of Moslems under Soviet Rule*, New York 1958, F.M.  
 Unpublished documents.  
 Interviews, 1957-1959, I.E.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE

The American Committee for Liberation makes available on request a number of publications dealing with its work as well as with the activities of Radio Liberty and the Institute for the Study of the USSR. Among these are:

"*Peaceful Co-Existence!*" *What It Means to Khrushchev*, 17 pp.: A study by a former professor at a leading Soviet University based on the statements of Khrushchev, the writings of Lenin and Stalin as well as current Soviet pronouncements on the problem of "peaceful co-existence." It analyzes the Communists' understanding of "peaceful co-existence" as a tactical maneuver directed at gaining time to prepare for the future decisive battle against "capitalism."

*The War Against Religion In The USSR—From Lenin to Khrushchev*, 20 pp.: A study of the Soviet regime's policies respecting religion and religious institutions and activities, written by an American who spent a number of years in Soviet Russia shortly after the Revolution of 1917 and who recently visited the Soviet Union again. The booklet details the actions of the Soviet regime in the face of the persistence of religious faith and adherence to religious institutions on the part of millions of Soviet citizens.

*Communicating With the People Behind the Iron Curtain*, 16 pp.: In April, 1957 Howland H. Sargeant, the President of the American Committee for Liberation, spoke on this topic at The New School in New York. This booklet, giving excerpts of his remarks, provides a valuable insight into the philosophy of broadcasting to Iron Curtain countries, particularly as it applies to Radio Liberty.

*Foreign Trade As an Instrument of Soviet Policy*, 10 pp.: The Soviet Affairs Analysis Service, a department of the Institute for the Study of the USSR concerned with current developments in the Soviet Union has prepared this study based on the theme that trade is becoming one of the most important weapons in the Soviet arsenal.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 5, 1964]

#### ISLAM FADES IN UZBEKISTAN

TASHKENT, U.S.S.R.—The crumbling or converted mosque is a symbol in Uzbekistan, which with 10 million people is the most populous of the four Soviet republics of central Asia.

Before the 1917 revolution this corner of the Russian empire was almost entirely Moslem. Today Islam has been virtually obliterated as an important influence on the lives of the Uzbek people.

Women were in the background in Moslem times. Now they represent a vital component of Uzbekistan's labor force.

The official Communist Party line is that most people have abandoned religion because of social and economic progress, plus expansion of public education.

"But a certain section of the population continues to profess Islam and freely perform all religious rites," says official literature.

#### MOSQUES CONVERTED

The laws of the republic ostensibly provide for freedom of religion and freedom of anti-religious propaganda. But it is easy to see which has had the most powerful impact. You find decaying and locked-up mosques. Others have been converted into apartment houses, libraries, shopping centers, movies, and public monuments.

The term "monument" is sometimes a euphemism. One mosque in Bukhara, described as a monument by the local guide, turns out to be a pool hall.

The authorities say 250 mosques operate in Soviet Central Asia. However, some are only makeshift or part-time ones.

<sup>16</sup> M.S., pp. 181, 182

<sup>17</sup> G., p. 202



While there is no authoritative figure on the number of practicing Moslems in Uzbekistan, one is told there are some 20 million in the U.S.S.R.

Ismail Mahdun Sattiev, deputy mufti for the central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, met visiting reporters in a reception room on the grounds of Tashkent's main mosque, Bara-Khan, built in the 15th century.

**KORAN PUBLISHED**

"There is propaganda against us, but we are convinced our faith is good and we are doing our business," he said.

Antireligious government propaganda attacks "mainly superstitions," he said, but it doesn't touch "the fundamentals of our religion."

Periodically new editions of the Koran are published here. In 1956 there was a printing of 4,000 copies and in 1960 one of 5,000.

While most of Uzbekistan's religious training schools have been closed or converted into museums, one still operates in Bukhara. It has 35 to 40 students.

Vice-Premier Sarvar Azimov of Uzbekistan says that when a mosque is closed it is usually at the request of the congregation.

Once women were not permitted to appear in public places without the veil. The new-generation Uzbek girl is well dressed and educated and has little time for quaint customs.

**WOMEN AT WORK**

Women account for one-third of all the labor employed in industry and 40 percent of all specialists with higher education.

A government brochure, offering an insight into the sort of values that prevail, says many women operators of cotton-picking machines "have become known far and wide in Uzbekistan."

Some of history's giants have figured in Uzbekistan's past: Alexander of Macedon, Genghis Khan, and his Mongol hordes, and Timur, commonly known as Tamerlane.

**THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS THE REA CREDIT BILL**

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal on June 3, 1967, published an excellent editorial supporting the proposal to establish a Federal Electric Bank to help provide needed public and private capital to meet the needs of rural electric cooperatives.

The editorial shows an unusual understanding of the economic issues involved and of the important role which rural electric cooperative play in the development of our rural areas. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

**FINANCING THE CO-OPS**

Since the first rural electric cooperatives set up shop more than 30 years ago, this remarkable system has lit up a sparsely settled landscape that nobody else wanted to serve. But as urban development spilled into the countryside, the territory served by portions of some of these co-op systems became far more attractive and profitable.

For years now this situation has generated sparks from critics, including commercial power companies. They note that the co-ops are still being subsidized by bargain 2%, 35 year loans from the rural electrification administration.

Faced with increasing heat from congress, the rural electric systems have proposed formation of a whole new credit system for the co-ops, using both federal and private money. A bill in congress would create a rural electric bank. The government would

contribute \$750 million to it in the next seven years. The bank also would sell securities to private investors to raise the rest of its capital. A similar bank would be established to serve rural telephone co-operatives, which also now borrow from the REA.

Systems with fewer than two customers per mile, or which own less than 40% equity in their plants, could continue to borrow at the 2% REA subsidy rate. Others in better financial shape would have to get their capital from the banks at rates reflecting their cost of borrowing money, both federal and private.

The changing times seem to call for some such shift, but not the outright dumping of co-ops on the private money market. Much of the territory they serve still is anything but lush. On a national average, rural electric systems say they serve only 3.5 customers per mile of line compared with 34 per mile for commercial companies.

The goal in all of this must be gradually to retire government funds from the banks, to shift support to private investors and eventually to wean the co-operatives from federal borrowing altogether.

**LYNN STALBAUM CITES ISSUES INVOLVING PUBLIC INTEREST**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Lynn Stalbaum, of Racine, Wis., a product of one of our Wisconsin farms who has gone on to distinguished service in the State legislature and the U.S. Congress, gave an excellent address to the 29th annual meeting of the St. Croix Electric Cooperative on June 8.

Mr. Stalbaum reviewed the great contribution which locally owned rural electric cooperatives have made to our State, and he also dealt with problems involving automobile and tire safety, corporate mergers, and the current investigation into prescription drugs.

This is a thoughtful speech on issues involving the public interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF HON. LYNN STALBAUM, AT THE 29TH ANNUAL MEETING OF ST. CROIX COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, BALDWIN, WIS., JUNE 8, 1967

As has been indicated to you in the introduction, I am a Wisconsin farm boy, but must hasten to add that I grew up on the farm without the benefit of electricity. It was not until 1937 that electricity reached our farmstead, one-fourth mile off the main road.

It would be pleasant for me to stand here today and tell you that the ultimate source of power was through an REA-financed cooperative, but such is not the case. It was by a private utility. *The fact remains that until REA came onto the scene and threatened to move into farm areas such as the one where I grew up in Southeastern Wisconsin, the private power companies had done absolutely nothing to encourage electrical development in the rural areas.*

If memory serves me correctly, and 30 years or more is a long time to remember, the original bill which they wanted to submit to us to run power to our place back in the early 1930's was \$1,300. Bear in mind this was just for the power lines to bring the electricity to our farm. It did not in any way cover the cost of the wiring and fixture installation nor the monthly charge for electrical service. And those of you who have grown up and have lived through the depression days of the 1930's, I am sure, will

realize that \$1,300 was about one year's gross income from the average Wisconsin dairy herd during those days.

After the threat of REA developed they agreed to provide our farm with service for a minimum charge of seven dollars a month for three years, which also applied against the electricity we used. We in turn had to agree to buy at least one of three major appliances. Seven dollars times thirty-six months is about \$250.00—a long way from their original \$1,300 figure.

I congratulate you tonight because you have overwhelmingly proven that individual farmers and other rural residents can successfully operate their own electric system. When St. Croix Electric Co-op was organized back in 1938, I am sure there were many prophets of gloom and doom who said that this rural area could never be electrified. You have shown that they were wrong.

Although the record of your achievements in rural electrification is an illustrious one, it is well to keep in mind that the rural electric co-ops were and still are experiments, experiments to test whether individuals can control their own economic welfare in a democratic and equitable manner. This testing has gone on, is going on—and will continue to go on.

An annual meeting, such as this, proves that the United States continues to offer individuals the opportunity to work together to meet a common need. Much has been written and said of late about the decreasing importance of the individual in today's increasingly complex world of bigness.

As you exercise your one-member, one-vote rights here today, you prove again—among other things—that each individual member of this cooperative is important—whether he buys 250 or 2,500 kilowatt hours of electricity a month.

Unfortunately, as merger upon merger concentrates more and more economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer people, hardly a day goes by without a report of some blatant abuse of power by the powerful—or as I characterize it—the arrogance of bigness. Let me tell you about some of these.

In an effort to silence auto safety critic Ralph Nader, General Motors hired a detective to pry into every facet of Mr. Nader's life, looking for some derogatory incident with which he could be discredited. What had Mr. Nader done to warrant such treatment? He had said that the Corval was not a safe car. And so—rather than argue with him—they attempted to destroy him. His right to express himself on a serious problem was not to be considered. Nor apparently were they concerned about those who might be killed or maimed from using their unsafe product.

When Wisconsin's own Senator Gaylord Nelson and a subcommittee he heads, opened hearings on drug prices last month, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association labeled the inquiry as "another inquisition".

What Senator Nelson's group is really seeking is the answer to a question which vitally concerns the health and pocketbook of every individual—namely, why does a patient have to pay a significantly higher price for a drug which has been prescribed by its brand name than he would have paid if the drug had been prescribed by its generic or scientific name?

Dr. Richard Burack of the Harvard Medical School has pointed out that if a doctor prescribes a drug by the brand name of a pharmaceutical firm, his patient may pay ten times more than if the drug had been ordered by its generic or scientific name.

The drug industry, Dr. Burack points out, spends at least \$600 million a year in advertising and sales campaigns directed at doctors. Since there are approximately 200,000 prescribing doctors in the U.S., the drug companies are spending 3,000 advertising

dollars per year on each doctor. The effort pays off—for the drug industry, 90 percent of the prescriptions written each year specify brand names and the druggist—by law—is not permitted to use less expensive substitutes.

Senator Nelson's Committee also learned that city and county drug-buying agencies feel the price squeeze almost as much as do individual consumers. According to surveys made by his Committee, the city of Atlanta, for instance, paid \$22.60 for 1,000 units of Dexedrine—almost 40 times more than New York City paid for the same quantity of this drug. 100 units of an antibiotic cost San Francisco \$25; New York bought it for \$8.73. Why is the differential so great? Because New York City accepts competitive bids from both generic and brand-name manufacturers.

Obviously, the Congressional hearings on drug prices are focusing the national spotlight on some facts which the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association would prefer to keep in the shadows. But by attempting to label it an "inquisition" Big Business—in this case, the Big Drug Business—is exhibiting another example of the arrogance of bigness.

There are those who argue that Big Business is good because mergers result in more efficient operation which, in turn, benefits the individual by lowering the cost of goods and services. This "trickle-down" theory is fine (and I don't quarrel with it) as long as the cost saving benefits of big business are allowed to "trickle down" to the individual, rather than being siphoned off at the top.

An informed public—which really means a citizenry which is made up of informed individuals—is our best defense against the arrogance of bigness. But our sources of information are constantly being threatened by Big Business attempts to pressure and influence—either directly or indirectly—the news media. Recent hearings held before the Federal Communications Commission revealed the blatant attempts by Big Business—in this case, the big International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation—to "manage" the news for its own benefit.

Briefly, here's what happened: Last December, the Commission, after only two days of hearings, voted four to three to approve ITT's (application to merge with the American Broadcasting Company, which is the country's third largest radio and TV network. The Commission majority accepted at face value the promises of executives of both companies that ITT's worldwide interests—some of them involving foreign governments—would not be permitted to influence ABC's handling of the news. The FCC majority also overrode a Department of Justice opinion that the proposed merger raised questions of the "possibilities of adverse effects" on competition.

Wisconsin's Senator Gaylord Nelson and others protested the FCC action. As a result of his efforts and those of the Department of Justice, further hearings were held.

At these hearings, news reporters subpoenaed by the Justice Department told of the relentless pressure and badgering to which they had been subjected by ITT in the weeks after the merger case was reopened. A United Press International reporter termed one of the calls to his editors as "an obvious economic threat" in view of ABC's role as a big customer of UPI's radio and television news reports.

Eileen Shanahan of *The New York Times* testified that her coverage of the proposed merger had prompted five or six telephone calls or visits from ITT officials. One of them, the senior ITT vice president for public relations, made what Miss Shanahan described as "accusatory and nasty" comments about her coverage and asked if she didn't feel she had a responsibility to the shareholders who might lose money as a result of what she wrote.

The obvious point which this ITT vice president completely ignored is that, as a newspaper reporter, Miss Shanahan has a responsibility to the general public to report the facts. The function of the news media in a free and democratic society is not to protect the financial interests of stockholders of giant corporations.

Again as in the drug situation the story has a Wisconsin twist—again it involves Senator Nelson. The story was put out by these companies that Gaylord Nelson, working with Commissioner Nicholas Johnson in the FCC was preparing legislation to force every newspaper to divest itself of any radio or television holdings it had. As Senator Nelson personally told me there were two things wrong with the story. First, he had never met any Mr. Nicholas Johnson in the FCC and second he had never considered introducing such a bill. Yet this story was given to Wisconsin reporters, among others, presumably to intimidate our good Senator. To quote him: "The whole thing was nothing but a plain lie by them."

#### CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, many of us are concerned about the erosion of governmental authority and responsibility at the State and local level and the parallel increase in the influence of the Federal Government. This development disrupts the principle of balance that undergirds American federalism. Yet, it must be acknowledged that one of the basic reasons the States and localities are having difficulty in sustaining their rightful place in our federal system is the fact that private groups, local governments and especially the States have failed to collaborate and come up with meaningful, imaginative ways and means of adapting local governments to the population, technological, and environmental changes of this century.

The crisis that many local governments now confront is not merely the crisis of urban areas alone. Rural communities are also effected—especially those whose population and financial resources are on the decline. Unless local government in rural and urban America can be revitalized, our economic and political system will have little chance to solve urgent public problems effectively. All levels of government as well as key segments of the private sector of our society must come to grips with this vital question.

In this respect, I invite attention to a brief but imaginative brochure just issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States entitled "Modernizing Local Government." This excellent survey traces the origins of the difficulties now confronting local government, underscores the difficulties in achieving necessary reforms, and advances alternative courses of positive action to streamline the structure of local government.

The differing problems of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas are treated separately and suggested State constitutional amendments and enabling legislation are developed to eliminate any forestalling of community and area-wide action programs by outmoded State constitutions and statutes. It should be noted that many of the modernization

approaches recommended in this brochure have also been advanced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on which the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and I represent the Senate.

The national chamber is to be congratulated on their foresight in developing this program and policy and hope that State and local chamber leaders will initiate vigorous action to carry it out.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the booklet and invite particular attention to the policy statement on "Modernizing Local Governments of General Jurisdiction."

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

MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
(By the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.)

#### FOREWORD

A competitive market economy and a federal system of balanced national state and local government, combined with a tradition of social justice, have been the principal architects of America's achievements. Together, these institutions have provided an environment encouraging individual initiative and personal and group action. Together they have been the cornerstone of America's success in producing goods for the greatest numbers, expanding personal freedoms and promoting human dignity.

These institutions are today being seriously challenged. Complex problems caused by growing population, dramatic technological changes and rapid urbanization are placing intensive demands on them. Unless these problems can be solved within the framework of the competitive market economy and a balanced federal system of government, these institutions could be significantly altered and the environment needed for individual initiative and personal and group action could be damaged.

It is increasingly evident that a major obstacle to solving today's problems is insufficient action at the community level. And a prime reason for this is local government that lacks the kind of structure which permits flexibility to meet public needs. Many communities have failed to adapt their local governments to the population, technological and urban changes of this century. Citizens have been apathetic. The result has been to discourage local action, to replace local leadership and private enterprise solutions with increasing dependence on government at the national level. It is this growing reliance on the federal government that could alter our economic and political institutions, and weaken local initiative and action.

Businessmen everywhere increasingly recognize the need for more effective ways of solving community problems. They know that private enterprise action on local problems is necessary. Businessmen realize that they can involve themselves without violating their responsibility to make profits and expand job opportunities.

As businessmen involve themselves with community problems, they are becoming more aware of the need to modernize local government. Consequently, they are in increasing numbers committing themselves to help create flexible local governments that can be major instruments in community problem solving.

This publication is dedicated to that commitment.

Authorization for inter-local contracting and joint enterprises among local governments;

Authorization for voluntary interchange of functions between municipalities and counties;

Authorization for the creation of metropolitan area study commissions;

Authorization for the creation of metropolitan area planning bodies;

Establishment of a state government department of community affairs to bring together functions that aid communities in meeting local government problems;

Development of inter-local cooperation acts which include authorization to plan, perform and finance functions and services across state lines;

Assistance in resolving differences among local government jurisdictions.

Complete information on all suggested state constitutional amendments and state legislation is available.

#### NATIONAL LEVEL SUPPORT FOR LOCAL AREA GOVERNMENT MODERNIZATION

The National Chamber federation has coordinated with the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Municipal League, the International City Managers' Association, the Council of State Governments, the National School Boards Association, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to produce this brochure. Materials and help on local government modernization are available from each of them.

Along with the National Chamber, these other national organizations emphasize that decisions and actions to modernize local government are matters properly within the province of state and local area citizens and their leaders. They trust that this brochure may provide some helpful guidelines. They urge their local and state affiliates to work together to help develop and gain area-wide support for modernization actions which are needed in their respective areas.

The National Chamber hopes that chamber leaders and individual businessmen will initiate local area action through local chambers of commerce and initiate needed state action through state chambers of commerce.

#### HOW TO DO IT

Area community leaders, through the coordinating efforts of local chambers of commerce, may want to consider taking the following steps:<sup>2</sup>

1. Discuss needs for modernizing government with a small number of leaders of private groups and local governments.

Begin to identify community and area needs that can be satisfied only by modernized government.

Identify other people and groups who have an interest in modernizing government.

2. Form a steering committee of such people who are (a) leaders and (b) willing to work to develop and guide an area-wide modernization program.

3. The steering committee can:

Further identify community and area needs that can be satisfied only by modernized government;

Identify broadly the governmental limitations that impede the fulfillment of these needs;

Determine committees needed to study governmental limitations and to develop means for achieving effective local area government;

Establish a timetable for completing the studies;

<sup>2</sup> These steps coincide with those outlined in the National Chamber's publication, *A Leader's Guide for Organizing a Total Community Development Program*.

Plan an area-wide public meeting for representatives of area groups.

4. At area-wide meetings leaders would consider steering committee's work and:

Discuss and reach tentative agreement on realistic goals for communities and the area;

Discuss and further identify needs which modernized government can help meet;

Further discuss limitations of local area governments for which study is needed and for which remedial courses of action must be developed;

Discuss study committees suggested by the steering committee;

Approve a general timetable for completion of studies;

Authorize the steering committee to coordinate the program and to name appropriate study committees.

5. Study committees should then organize and:

Identify local, area, state and national research groups and individuals that can be called upon as consultants;

Examine needs;

Detail modernizing actions or alternatives to fulfill needs; propose actions and how to carry them out;

Report the above to the steering committee.

6. Steering committee can then:

Examine proposals;

Suggest priorities for action;

Advise administrative heads of local government units of action taken and request public meetings or hearings on proposals to gain public consensus;

Distribute copies of proposals to local groups and to news media and state and national legislative representatives for review and comment.

7. Organization leaders and general public discuss proposals, seek consensus and begin, through the coordinating efforts of the steering committee, community and area-wide action to implement agreed-on proposals.

#### NATIONAL CHAMBER POLICY STATEMENT ON "MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF GENERAL JURISDICTION"

Local government is the responsive "working level" of our governmental system and the counties, cities, and other general political entities that comprise it should each have a large enough area and population to operate efficiently and economically. While permitting the most effective citizens' response through democratic processes, local governments should have authority to work cooperatively with their neighboring governments or to consolidate to meet area-wide public service needs. They should be empowered to raise adequate revenues in an equitable way. Finally, in carrying out their responsibilities by balancing public needs and available resources, local government elected officials should be directly accountable to the voters.

All possible action to reach these objectives, under existing state authorizations, is encouraged. Where state authorization for action is needed, state constitutional amendments and state legislation should be adopted to:

1. Set up broad guidelines and standards to safeguard the statewide stake in efficient, soundly managed local government;

2. Strengthen local governments' taxing and borrowing powers and powers to change their structure and to undertake new functions;

3. Encourage local governments to coordinate on area-wide planning, assume governmental functions performed by special districts or authorities, contract with each other for the performance of functions, and consolidate into an area-wide government if area citizens desire;

4. Provide for state technical assistance to local governments on problems and oppor-

tunities for which the state had special expertise when such assistance is not reasonably and expeditiously available through ordinary business channels;

5. Provide state financial assistance to local governments as dictated by the public interest, including but not limited to shared revenues, grants-in-aid, and other incentives for improving local services and facilities;

6. Provide that the policy-making body of a city or county be elected by the people; that a single chief executive be either appointed by the policy-making body or elected by the people; and that all other officials be appointive and directly responsible to the appointing official.

The foregoing principles relate to local school districts, as well as other local government units. The role of local school districts is also further dealt with in other policy declarations.

*Bill NE*

#### ARAB-ISRAEL SETTLEMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever the importance of a high state of military readiness, the quality of leadership and of daring, have been demonstrated in the pages of history, it was done less than a month ago on the bleak sands and deserts surrounding Israel. Now that, because of her valor, Israel has acquired a position of strength from which she can negotiate, I believe all the countries concerned should concentrate on a constructive, sensible, long-range solution that will stabilize the area once and for all. I wish to compliment too, our President and our administration for their mature restraint and wisdom throughout the crisis. I only hope the same qualities will be brought to bear by all parties to the settlement.

Most important, Israel must be permitted to live and thrive in peace and security and be fully accepted as an independent nation by her neighbors. I believe this, not only for the sake of Israel, but because Israel has become a model of dynamic civilization and of cultural and economic development which might well be followed by other nations which have recently achieved independence. Personally I wish there were more states in the world as industrious, free-thinking, and civilized as Israel.

It seems to me that the border dispute resulting from the war can only be resolved if Israel herself recognizes that boundaries are likely to be more stable if established through negotiation and mutually agreed upon rather than by force alone. Since Israel is now in a far stronger bargaining position than she was before the conflict, there is a good opportunity to establish more viable borders than were set and reset after the wars of 1947 and 1956. We also must face up to the problem that as a national policy, our Government adheres to the views that neither boundaries nor governments can be changed by external force alone.

I recommend these steps be taken to resolve the remaining problems that divide Israel and the Arab countries:

#### 1. FACE-TO-FACE PEACE PARLAYS

Through the United Nations, we should insist that the Arabs sit down and negotiate on a face-to-face basis with the Israel representatives—thereby securing acknowledgment of Israel's sov-

June 28, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9065

## WHERE IT BEGINS

In a nation with the highest standard of living, the broadest educational opportunities, the most sophisticated technology people have ever known, we have:

Cities choked with traffic  
Millions of substandard dwellings  
Rising crime and delinquency rates  
Widespread social unrest  
An environment becoming steadily more polluted

Vast deteriorating commercial areas. These problems—and others—seem to defy traditional approaches. The business of finding solutions is taxing the imagination and resourcefulness of Americans. It is imposing great demands on our institutions—social, economic and political.

The challenge is heightened by the price of failure.

The nation's future depends on solving these growing twentieth century problems. The question is not "whether" but "how." *Clearly, if solutions are not found within the framework of balanced private enterprise and federal-state-local government arrangements, other ways will be sought.* People will not, for long, tolerate inaction or failure.

But today, private enterprise and state and local governments are severely handicapped in developing imaginative solutions to pressing public problems. Outmoded local government structures straitjacket public flexibility and stifle private initiative. Some metropolitan areas are made up of from fifty to several hundred political subdivisions. Many counties and cities elbow each other abrasively. Adequate tax sources are lacking. Effective administration has not been developed. Too often, states do not provide the technical and financial help that local governments need and cannot obtain from any other source. State help is especially needed by cities suffering from growing pains—growing pains heightened by the influx of thousands of undereducated, unskilled migrants and by the exodus of middle- and high-income leadership to the suburbs. Likewise, help is needed—and not always offered—in rural communities bypassed by prosperity.

Unless local government is revitalized, our political and economic systems, as we now know them, will have little chance to solve public problems effectively. Governments of yesterday must be remodeled to fit not only today's, but also tomorrow's needs.

## PREPARING FOR ACTION

Action to improve government is not easily generated. Action often involves legal procedures requiring patience and skill to follow through. Action must often overcome the fear of change itself. Public apathy is often an obstacle. A public which is irate over traffic congestion may be placid about governmental inefficiency or incapacity on other fronts.

Public interest in streamlining government will normally be only as strong as the public's desire to satisfy community and area needs that cannot be met without better government. A first step to improve government, therefore, is to identify community and area needs and to identify governmental changes necessary to satisfy them.

To do this, more and more communities and areas are entering into programs of "Total Community Development."<sup>1</sup> Total community development, as outlined by the National Chamber, encourages area and community economic, social and political groups to coordinate action for community improvement, including the modernization of government. Total community development, so defined, can help:

Determine economic, social and political goals toward which the community and area should strive;

Identify and understand community and area problems—including poor government—standing in the way of these goals;

Determine priorities in attacking these problems;

Obtain public support and cooperation in solving these problems and in achieving community and area goals.

This "total" approach involves a systematic analysis of problems in which study teams of informed persons seek out all available methods of solving problems.

Local chambers of commerce are particularly well fitted to coordinate these efforts because of their broad interest in community affairs, their access to community leaders and the considerable human and physical resources local chambers can apply to problem solving.

Coordination is the key to success. Total community development, in the majority of places, must involve broad community participation to succeed. Social and political groups, in addition to local chambers of commerce, can and should play a central role.

Recent studies of local governments suggest several criteria that can be used by individual communities or groups of communities in an area to measure the effectiveness of their political machinery. These criteria can be put in the form of questions:

1. Are local governments large enough in area and population to act effectively on community problems and opportunities?
2. Are they willing and able to raise sufficient revenue equitably?
3. Are they willing and able to adjust boundaries to meet changing conditions?
4. Are they organized to handle effectively a variety of functions?
5. Are they accessible to and controllable by the people they serve?
6. Are they able to attract qualified public servants?

"No" answers to these questions can mean serious governmental problems. In that case, action is needed.

## COURSES OF ACTION TO MODERNIZE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Community, state and national organizations and institutions have done considerable research and developed suggested courses of action to modernize local government. Some of these courses of action are listed below. They tend primarily to permit greater structural and financial flexibility and higher levels of technical competence in administering local governments. Each course of action has its strengths and weaknesses. Each must meet the test of political reality in a given community. Sources for complete information on all courses of action are listed on page 23. Sources for reports on local area and state experience are listed on page 22.

The following modernization approaches presume that state laws and constitutions permit such courses of action at the local area level.

*For metropolitan, suburban, or rural areas*

Metropolitan, suburban and rural area communities may elect to:

Adopt municipal and county forms of government best suited for a given community and area (strong mayor or council-manager).

Establish a voluntary association of elected officials of local governments to promote coordinated action to solve area-wide problems where there are mutual economic development interests.

Transfer functions between municipalities and counties to achieve the most efficient and effective performance of specific functions.

Contract with other local governments for the performance of functions, services and joint enterprises where such contracting will

better meet community and area public needs.

Use extraterritorial powers to guide development outside municipal boundaries and to promote sound area-wide governmental structure and services.

Annex unincorporated areas to avoid proliferation of new and uneconomic units of government in urban areas.

Authorize counties to undertake those urban activities that can be performed more effectively and efficiently on a county-wide basis.

Establish an equitable tax system by (a) repairing administration of the property tax, and (b) placing more emphasis on non-property tax sources which coincide to the extent possible with the boundaries of the trading and economic area, and that can be piggy-backed as a supplement to a state-wide tax.

Invest idle public funds.

Utilize state government expertise and enforcement resources.

*For metropolitan areas*

Metropolitan area communities may consider further actions which would:

Establish a council of governments, a voluntary association of elected officials of metropolitan area local governments to promote coordinated action to solve area problems;

Establish an "urban county" by enlarging county responsibility for urban services in all or part of its jurisdiction;

Establish state responsibility for cost and operation of certain services, such as environmental pollution control, water supply and specialized crime laboratory facilities;

Annex unincorporated territory; consolidate with other incorporated units, or both;

Consolidate county and cities of an area into a single government to perform all functions; or, consolidate county and cities for the performance of certain functions, retaining separate city and county governments for other functions;

Establish a federated system of government wherein area-wide functions are assigned to a "metropolitan government," and local functions are performed by existing local governments;

Levy an area-wide tax to underwrite area-wide functions and distribute resources to local governments on an equalizing basis.

## POSSIBLE ACTIONS TO MODERNIZE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES, PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

A community and area-wide action program to modernize local government may reveal that certain actions are inhibited or forestalled by outmoded state constitutions and statutes.

If these obstacles exist, action at the state level is needed. Wherever possible, communities participating in such action may want to coordinate their efforts through state chambers of commerce, many of which are already involved in action to remove obstacles at the state level. State chamber efforts often include other state-wide organizations with a stake and an interest in better state and local governments.

Suggested constitutional amendments and enabling legislation needed to authorize and to help local government modernization have been developed and are available. They deal principally with:

Establishment of state guidelines and standards for local government reorganization and modernization;

Easing of restrictions on local government taxing and borrowing authority;

Authorization for municipalities and counties to adopt a form of government best suited to effective and efficient performance;

Authorization for municipal annexation of unincorporated areas;

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed definition of "Total Community Development,"—the "why" and the "how" see: *A Leader's Guide for Organizing a Total Community Development Program*, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 1615 H Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.



June 28, 1967

ereignty and very right to live as a nation. This could be done in the Middle East with a series of meetings alternately in Israel and in Arab nations. Probably the most propitious place would be the capital of a neutral nation.

## 2. REARRANGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL TROUBLE SPOTS

A real effort should be made in these negotiations to resolve the problems of those areas which have proved to be volatile and the source of friction—they are a threat to the peace and should be legally reconstituted. I am thinking specifically of the plight of Israel border kibbutzim right under the guns of Syrian border guards on the eastern shore of Lake Galilee; the Gaza strip where armed forces of Israel and Egypt glare at each other and provide a constant confrontation which can lead to clashes; and another bad area would be a divided Jerusalem.

It would be a wise Solomon indeed who could wave his wand of reason and bring about instant correction of these longtime, explosive juxtapositions between the Israelis and Arabs. Nevertheless, there are approaches which could be made under the aegis of the United Nations. I say this since under the charter all nations are equals there, and somehow its dignity and usual parliamentary decorum might create the proper atmosphere for building a durable peace.

Specifically I would suggest:

Declaring a demilitarized zone for the Gaza strip and along the Israeli-Egyptian border across the Sinai Peninsula.

Relocation of the Syrian borders east of Lake Galilee. I would urge the boundaries be adjusted to follow the natural divide of the ridges and heights so that Syrian guards do not have to resist the constant temptation of rolling stones or even of firing down into the vulnerable Israel kibbutzim; perhaps a DMZ could be laid along the dividing hills, policed by a United Nations Expeditionary Force—UNEF.

Establishment of an international status for Jerusalem with access from both Israel and Jordan, as well as pilgrims from other lands.

## 3. FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION THROUGH AQABA AND SUEZ CANAL

Right of free and innocent passage for all vessels, including those of Israel, should be provided—not only through the Gulf of Aqaba, but also through the Suez Canal. There are simply no grounds for denying innocent passage to any country—which is not a belligerent enemy—through an international body of water, even if one country owns it or commands its entry. Rights should be similar to those granted daily through passages such as the Panama Canal and the Dardanelles.

## 4. RELATIONS WITH JORDAN

I would like to propose a permanent, binational organization to be formed by Israel and Jordan. Its purpose would be to integrate the Jordanian refugees into those two countries, with financial and administrative assistance from the United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency—UNRWA—it could also work to

resolve the troublesome problem of the waters of the Jordan and most difficult of all, seek to settle the question of the lands west of the Jordan. If deadlock should ensue in any of these discussions, provision should be made for acceptance of advisory opinions by the International Court of Justice.

Unless a close working relationship is somehow reached with at least one of her many Arab neighbors, Israel will never have true peace in our time. The statesmen of both Israel and Jordan have right now an opportunity to perform a feat of creative diplomacy that would be an inspiration to all nations. For instance, it has been reported that Israel's Foreign Minister Abba Eban has proposed a small peace treaty under which, according to Time magazine:

Israel, for example, would give Jordan—whose only present port is on the Gulf of Aqaba—an outlet to the Mediterranean. It would promote a joint program of economic and social advancement and a regional communication system that would permit rail and road traffic between Egypt and its Arab brothers from Saudi Arabia to Lebanon.

I believe that the young and articulate King Hussein could prove a key personality in achieving such a settlement. If they could succeed, this handiwork could be a fitting memorial to the many brave soldiers, as well as the innocent civilians, who fell in the war.

## 5. REFUGEES

Refugee camps in the Gaza strip and in Lebanon should be disbanded and an agreement reached as to how the inmates should be resettled. The refugee shame must be liquidated once and for all. It is a crime against humanity to incarcerate a million people for 20 years simply as pawns in an international political disagreement. And here I must add that I believe this problem could have been resolved by the Arab nations if they had really desired to do so.

It seems to me that if the Israel diplomats can handle themselves at the conference table with the same ability and skill that General Dayan and his fighting forces showed in the military arena, many of these objectives can be achieved.

## GOVERNMENT BILLBOARDS AND HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in 1965 Congress enacted S. 2084, the purpose of which was to remove all billboards from along our Nation's highways. This measure was submitted to the Congress with the strong support of the administration on the basis that it was a major part of the beautification program as being supervised by Mrs. Johnson.

Today I call the attention of the Senate to the manner in which the Federal Government is developing into one of the worst violators of this program, which was designed to remove the billboards from our Nation's highways.

During the past 5 years in just two agencies, the General Service Administration and the Department of Transportation, our Government has spent approximately \$4½ million in the purchase and erection of approximately 70,000

billboards to be placed along our Nation's highways and in front of the various Government buildings. The sole purpose of these billboards is to make sure that the voters in the next election understand that the building projects or the road improvements are as a result of the benevolence of one of the Great Society programs.

As if these 70,000 billboards were not enough, the administration recently asked Congress to appropriate \$2 million to pay for more billboards for the use of political candidates.

This greatly expanded use of billboards by the Johnson administration is in direct contradiction of its own program to remove them from our Nation's highways.

This contradiction has led some cynics to suggest that the Great Society will next be launching a new program to purchase another 50,000 billboards to be used for the special purpose of advertising to the American people the Johnson administration's violent objection to billboards.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 7, 1967, signed by Mr. F. C. Turner, Director of Public Roads, confirming that the Bureau of Public Roads spent a minimum of \$4,255,000 in the last 5 years toward the procurement of a minimum of 69,000 billboards, and a letter dated June 9, 1967, signed by Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., Administrator of the General Services Administration, confirming that that agency has purchased 771 billboards at a cost of between \$100 to \$200 each, to be erected on new construction projects financed with Government funds.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,  
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION,  
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,

Washington, D.C., June 7, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your May 16 letter to me requested a report on the number and cost of billboards that have been ordered or purchased by the Bureau of Public Roads during each of the past 5 years. We have not purchased any signs which are commonly classed as billboards.

The second part of your request pertains to the construction identification signs which are placed on projects to comply with the provisions of Section 8(f) of the Federal Highway Act of 1960 (P.L. 86-657, July 14, 1960) which are "on any project where actual construction is in progress and visible to highway users, the State highway department shall erect such informational sign or signs as prescribed by the Secretary, identifying the project and the respective amounts contributed therefor by the State and Federal Governments."

This statutory provision is now a part of the Subsection (a) of Section 114 of Title 23, USC. The instructions of the Secretary (now the Secretary of Transportation) are contained in Public Roads Instructional Memorandum 20-1-64 as supplemented by (1) and (2), copy of each enclosed.

During the past 5 years (1962-1966) the following numbers of Federal-aid contracts were awarded by the State highway departments and direct Federal contracts awarded

by Public Roads or other Federal agencies for whom Public Roads acts as engineering supervisor.

Year	Federal-aid contracts	Direct Federal contracts	Total
1962-----	6,571	137	6,708
1963-----	6,780	111	6,891
1964-----	6,781	110	6,891
1965-----	6,113	164	6,277
1966-----	6,490	123	6,405
Total-----	32,735	645	33,380

Construction identification signs are generally furnished and erected, maintained and removed by the construction contractor. The work of providing such signs is not bid as a direct pay item. The costs of providing such signs is a subsidiary obligation of the contractor, covered under other contract pay items. While the signs meet certain general specifications with regard to size, lettering, and information, there are variations. Some are reused by repainting and relettering and some are fitted with movable panels by which the lettering may be removed and replaced as appropriate for the specific project. Accordingly, we can only make an approximation of the costs and present the following assumptions and estimates:

#### ASSUMPTIONS AND ESTIMATES

A minimum of two signs per contract.

One-third of signs used three times with relettering of project and fund amounts upon second and third usage. Initial sign cost \$75.00, two reletterings at \$30.00, total for three usages \$105.00. Average per use \$35.00.

Two-thirds of signs used one time only. Initial sign cost \$75.00, including installation and removal.

Minimum number of signs in 5 years, 69,000:

23,000 times \$35-----	\$805,000
46,000 times \$75-----	3,450,000

Estimated total----- 4,255,000

We trust the foregoing provides the information you requested.

Sincerely yours,

F. C. TURNER,  
Director of Public Roads.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following is furnished in response to your letter of May 16, 1967, requesting information as to the number of construction signs erected by this agency at the sites of public building projects during each of the past five years:

Year:	Number of signs erected
1962-----	100
1963-----	129
1964-----	218
1965-----	216
1966-----	108
Total-----	771

It is common practice to erect signs of this nature on all construction projects whether they are Government projects or projects for private ownership.

The signs are used to identify the project. They are of assistance to suppliers of materials, persons seeking employment, and others having business at the project site. The cost of such signs ranges from \$100 to \$200.

I trust that this information is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,  
Administrator.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY AT "RALLY FOR ISRAEL," IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 11 the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], together with Governor Reagan, Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, and other distinguished guests, participated in a rally for Israel at the Hollywood Bowl, in Los Angeles.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURPHY's remarks at this important event be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### RALLY FOR ISRAEL

(Speech by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Hollywood Bowl, June 11, 1967)

Your Excellency, Governor Reagan; Mayor Yorty; Mr. Chairman; Distinguished Rabbis; and my friends.

I would like to congratulate you all on this great meeting, and to thank you for the privilege of being permitted to take part in it. It seems to me that we come here today not so much to celebrate a victory as to express our appreciation for what the nation of Israel has done for the people of the world.

Once again this past week the Jewish people—as they have so often done through the centuries—have given people everywhere a lesson which we must hope will be long remembered.

First and foremost, we saw an exhibition of tremendous courage. And finally it has been laid bare for all to see who are the real troublemakers in the world today.

The threat to Israel's freedom and territorial integrity could never have materialized without the dictatorial ambitions of Mr. Nasser and the military assistance promised and given by the Soviet Union.

It was Russia and the Soviet powers who first contributed to the gathering storm by denouncing the presence of the United States Sixth Fleet and demanding its removal from the Eastern Mediterranean. This great force, you will recall, has been a force to keep the peace and stability of the area for many, many years.

It was the Soviet Union who, by a threatened veto in the week immediately preceding the outbreak of war, prevented the return to the Middle East of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force.

And it was, of course, the Soviet Union who gave moral support to the aggressive and illegal actions of Nasser and the United Arab Republic which precipitated the war.

This brings us to the next lesson of recent events.

The question is whether the United Nations, as it is presently constituted, can in fact meet the responsibilities that we impose upon it and fulfill the hopes and prayers that so many of us have held for its success for so many years.

Because of the veto power, no effective action was possible to prevent the recent war. We hear it said often that it is better to have people talking at the U.N. than fighting on battlefields. Well, I listened to a good deal of talk at the U.N. in recent weeks and I can only conclude that that august body has been providing a gigantic sounding board for the dissemination of lies and distortions and untrue propaganda by the Soviet Minister and some of his satellites.

I call your attention to his accusation two days ago of the use of Nazi tactics which he blamed on the valiant Israel. I call your attention to his speech of ten days ago where he, for one hour, accused the United States

of America of being the aggressor all over the world for the last several years.

Now if what he said about the United States of America was true then I submit that we, the United States, should be kicked out of the United Nations. And if what he said was not true, then I recommend that he be kicked out of the United Nations.

Finally, war came. The question as to who fired the first shot is academic. The real culprits and the master plan to destroy Israel were obvious. Mr. Abba Eban, Israel's Foreign Minister, summed it up quite well, I think, when he said that Israel had refused to cooperate in the plan for her extinction.

And this brings us to the third lesson—a dramatic example of how to deal effectively with the troublemakers who today probe and threaten all over the world to find trouble spots and hot spots where they can ignite further conflagrations.

A small but gallant and determined people, united in a cause that they knew was right and just, realizing no alternative was possible, employed what force they had and they employed it, I must say, with striking success. And I point out to you that they did not wait to let world opinion decide what their course of action should be. They did not worry about phrases like "measured response," "escalation," "proliferation," and the rest. They did what had to be done. They knew they were in a fight for their lives and they fought to win. And win they did—quickly and decisively.

What was the result?

The result was that the Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations, who had prevented measures to avoid war, was of course in the forefront in the clamor for a ceasefire. Their bluff had been called and, like all bullies, they ran when the going got tough.

The full lesson, I believe, is very simply this: The forces of tyranny will always be turned back when the forces of freedom act in the knowledge that they are right and with the willingness to use whatever honorable means are necessary to preserve that right.

From these lessons I believe we can find the key to the just and lasting peace we all want, not only in the Middle East, but throughout the entire world. And it is my sincere hope that the terms of the final settlement will reflect the same strength and wisdom and determination which Israel displayed so courageously last week.

The time has come when Israel must be recognized as a sovereign State by all nations. And the final peace must be fair, the peace must be honorable, and it must—by all means—be permanent.

We must demand that it be so.

I thank you.

#### HOW THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AIDS BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if you study the history of practically any American city you will find a familiar theme appearing again and again. Almost without exception, the struggles, failures, successes, and growth of the American city are accompanied by a corresponding series of struggles, failures, successes, and ultimate growth of small business. Just as the growth of America's economy and industrial might can be traced to hundreds of thousands of small businesses, the story of the growth of most of our metropolitan areas can also be traced to these same roots. Most of our great cities began small, their economy based almost entirely on

by Public Roads or other Federal agencies for whom Public Roads acts as engineering supervisor.

Year	Federal-aid contracts	Direct Federal contracts	Total
1962-----	6,571	137	6,708
1963-----	6,780	111	6,891
1964-----	6,781	110	6,891
1965-----	6,113	164	6,277
1966-----	6,490	123	6,405
Total-----	32,735	645	33,380

Construction identification signs are generally furnished and erected, maintained and removed by the construction contractor. The work of providing such signs is not bid as a direct pay item. The costs of providing such signs is a subsidiary obligation of the contractor, covered under other contract pay items. While the signs meet certain general specifications with regard to size, lettering, and information, there are variations. Some are reused by repainting and relettering and some are fitted with movable panels by which the lettering may be removed and replaced as appropriate for the specific project. Accordingly, we can only make an approximation of the costs and present the following assumptions and estimates:

**ASSUMPTIONS AND ESTIMATES**

A minimum of two signs per contract.  
 One-third of signs used three times with relettering of project and fund amounts upon second and third usage. Initial sign cost \$75.00, two reletterings at \$30.00, total for three usages \$105.00. Average per use \$35.00.  
 Two-thirds of signs used one time only. Initial sign cost \$75.00, including installation and removal.  
 Minimum number of signs in 5 years, 89,000:  
 23,000 times \$35----- \$805,000  
 46,000 times \$75----- 3,450,000  
 Estimated total----- 4,255,000

We trust the foregoing provides the information you requested.  
 Sincerely yours,

F. C. TURNER,  
 Director of Public Roads.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
 Washington, D.C., June 9, 1967.  
 Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
 U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following is furnished in response to your letter of May 16, 1967, requesting information as to the number of construction signs erected by this agency at the sites of public building projects during each of the past five years:

Year:	Number of signs erected
1962-----	100
1963-----	129
1964-----	218
1965-----	216
1966-----	108
Total-----	771

It is common practice to erect signs of this nature on all construction projects whether they are Government projects or projects for private ownership.

The signs are used to identify the project. They are of assistance to suppliers of materials, persons seeking employment, and others having business at the project site. The cost of such signs ranges from \$100 to \$200.

I trust that this information is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,  
 LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,  
 Administrator.

*File No*  
**ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURPHY AT "RALLY FOR ISRAEL," IN LOS ANGELES**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 11 the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], together with Governor Reagan, Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, and other distinguished guests, participated in a rally for Israel at the Hollywood Bowl, in Los Angeles.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURPHY's remarks at this important event be printed in the RECORD.

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

**RALLY FOR ISRAEL**

(Speech by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Hollywood Bowl, June 11, 1967)

Your Excellency, Governor Reagan; Mayor Yorty; Mr. Chairman; Distinguished Rabbis; and my friends.

I would like to congratulate you all on this great meeting, and to thank you for the privilege of being permitted to take part in it. It seems to me that we come here today not so much to celebrate a victory as to express our appreciation for what the nation of Israel has done for the people of the world.

Once again this past week the Jewish people—as they have so often done through the centuries—have given people everywhere a lesson which we must hope will be long remembered.

First and foremost, we saw an exhibition of tremendous courage. And finally it has been laid bare for all to see who are the real troublemakers in the world today.

The threat to Israel's freedom and territorial integrity could never have materialized without the dictatorial ambitions of Mr. Nasser and the military assistance promised and given by the Soviet Union.

It was Russia and the Soviet powers who first contributed to the gathering storm by denouncing the presence of the United States Sixth Fleet and demanding its removal from the Eastern Mediterranean. This great force, you will recall, has been a force to keep the peace and stability of the area for many, many years.

It was the Soviet Union who, by a threatened veto in the week immediately preceding the outbreak of war, prevented the return to the Middle East of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force.

And it was, of course, the Soviet Union who gave moral support to the aggressive and illegal actions of Nasser and the United Arab Republic which precipitated the war.

This brings us to the next lesson of recent events.

The question is whether the United Nations, as it is presently constituted, can in fact meet the responsibilities that we impose upon it and fulfill the hopes and prayers that so many of us have held for its success for so many years.

Because of the veto power, no effective action was possible to prevent the recent war. We hear it said often that it is better to have people talking at the U.N. than fighting on battlefields. Well, I listened to a good deal of talk at the U.N. in recent weeks and I can only conclude that that august body has been providing a gigantic sounding board for the dissemination of lies and distortions and untrue propaganda by the Soviet Minister and some of his satellites.

I call your attention to his accusation two days ago of the use of Nazi tactics which he blamed on the valiant Israeli. I call your attention to his speech of ten days ago where he, for one hour, accused the United States

of America of being the aggressor all over the world for the last several years.

Now if what he said about the United States of America was true then I submit that we, the United States, should be kicked out of the United Nations. And if what he said was not true, then I recommend that he be kicked out of the United Nations.

Finally, war came. The question as to who fired the first shot is academic. The real culprits and the master plan to destroy Israel were obvious. Mr. Abba Eban, Israel's Foreign Minister, summed it up quite well, I think, when he said that Israel had refused to cooperate in the plan for her extinction.

And this brings us to the third lesson—a dramatic example of how to deal effectively with the troublemakers who today probe and threaten all over the world to find trouble spots and hot spots where they can ignite further conflagrations.

A small but gallant and determined people, united in a cause that they knew was right and just, realizing no alternative was possible, employed what force they had and they employed it, I must say, with striking success. And I point out to you that they did not wait to let world opinion decide what their course of action should be. They did not worry about phrases like "measured response," "escalation," "proliferation," and the rest. They did what had to be done. They knew they were in a fight for their lives and they fought to win. And win they did—quickly and decisively.

What was the result?

The result was that the Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations, who had prevented measures to avoid war, was of course in the forefront in the clamor for a ceasefire. Their bluff had been called and, like all bullies, they ran when the going got tough.

The full lesson, I believe, is very simply this: The forces of tyranny will always be turned back when the forces of freedom act in the knowledge that they are right and with the willingness to use whatever honorable means are necessary to preserve that right.

From these lessons I believe we can find the key to the just and lasting peace we all want, not only in the Middle East, but throughout the entire world. And it is my sincere hope that the terms of the final settlement will reflect the same strength and wisdom and determination which Israel displayed so courageously last week.

The time has come when Israel must be recognized as a sovereign State by all nations. And the final peace must be fair, the peace must be honorable, and it must—by all means—be permanent.

We must demand that it be so.

I thank you.

**HOW THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AIDS BIRMINGHAM, ALA.**

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if you study the history of practically any American city you will find a familiar theme appearing again and again. Almost without exception, the struggles, failures, successes, and growth of the American city are accompanied by a corresponding series of struggles, failures, successes, and ultimate growth of small business. Just as the growth of America's economy and industrial might can be traced to hundreds of thousands of small businesses, the story of the growth of most of our metropolitan areas can also be traced to these same roots. Most of our great cities began small, their economy based almost entirely on

ereignty and very right to live as a nation. This could be done in the Middle East with a series of meetings alternately in Israel and in Arab nations. Probably the most propitious place would be the capital of a neutral nation.

2. REARRANGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL TROUBLE SPOTS

A real effort should be made in these negotiations to resolve the problems of those areas which have proved to be volatile and the source of friction—they are a threat to the peace and should be legally reconstituted. I am thinking specifically of the plight of Israel border kibbutzim right under the guns of Syrian border guards on the eastern shore of Lake Galilee; the Gaza strip where armed forces of Israel and Egypt glare at each other and provide a constant confrontation which can lead to clashes; and another bad area would be a divided Jerusalem.

It would be a wise Solomon indeed who could wave his wand of reason and bring about instant correction of these longtime, explosive juxtapositions between the Israelis and Arabs. Nevertheless, there are approaches which could be made under the aegis of the United Nations. I say this since under the charter all nations are equals there, and somehow its dignity and usual parliamentary decorum might create the proper atmosphere for building a durable peace.

Specifically I would suggest:

Declaring a demilitarized zone for the Gaza strip and along the Israeli-Egyptian border across the Sinai Peninsula.

Relocation of the Syrian borders east of Lake Galilee. I would urge the boundaries be adjusted to follow the natural divide of the ridges and heights so that Syrian guards do not have to resist the constant temptation of rolling stones or even of firing down into the vulnerable Israel kibbutzim; perhaps a DMZ could be laid along the dividing hills, policed by a United Nations Expeditionary Force—UNEF.

Establishment of an international status for Jerusalem with access from both Israel and Jordan, as well as pilgrims from other lands.

3. FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION THROUGH AQABA AND SUEZ CANAL

Right of free and innocent passage for all vessels, including those of Israel, should be provided—not only through the Gulf of Aqaba, but also through the Suez Canal. There are simply no grounds for denying innocent passage to any country—which is not a belligerent enemy—through an international body of water, even if one country owns it or commands its entry. Rights should be similar to those granted daily through passages such as the Panama Canal and the Dardanelles.

4. RELATIONS WITH JORDAN

I would like to propose a permanent, binational organization to be formed by Israel and Jordan. Its purpose would be to integrate the Jordanian refugees into those two countries, with financial and administrative assistance from the United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency—UNRWA—it could also work to

resolve the troublesome problem of the waters of the Jordan and most difficult of all, seek to settle the question of the lands west of the Jordan. If deadlock should ensue in any of these discussions, provision should be made for acceptance of advisory opinions by the International Court of Justice.

Unless a close working relationship is somehow reached with at least one of her many Arab neighbors, Israel will never have true peace in our time. The statesmen of both Israel and Jordan have right now an opportunity to perform a feat of creative diplomacy that would be an inspiration to all nations. For instance, it has been reported that Israel's Foreign Minister Abba Eban has proposed a small peace treaty under which, according to Time magazine:

Israel, for example, would give Jordan—whose only present port is on the Gulf of Aqaba—an outlet to the Mediterranean. It would promote a joint program of economic and social advancement and a regional communication system that would permit rail and road traffic between Egypt and its Arab brothers from Saudi Arabia to Lebanon.

I believe that the young and articulate King Hussein could prove a key personality in achieving such a settlement. If they could succeed, this handwork could be a fitting memorial to the many brave soldiers, as well as the innocent civilians, who fell in the war.

5. REFUGEES

Refugee camps in the Gaza strip and in Lebanon should be disbanded and an agreement reached as to how the inmates should be resettled. The refugee shame must be liquidated once and for all. It is a crime against humanity to incarcerate a million people for 20 years simply as pawns in an international political disagreement. And here I must add that I believe this problem could have been resolved by the Arab nations if they had really desired to do so.

It seems to me that if the Israel diplomats can handle themselves at the conference table with the same ability and skill that General Dayan and his fighting forces showed in the military arena, many of these objectives can be achieved.

GOVERNMENT BILLBOARDS AND HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in 1965 Congress enacted S. 2084, the purpose of which was to remove all billboards from along our Nation's highways. This measure was submitted to the Congress with the strong support of the administration on the basis that it was a major part of the beautification program as being supervised by Mrs. Johnson.

Today I call the attention of the Senate to the manner in which the Federal Government is developing into one of the worst violators of this program, which was designed to remove the billboards from our Nation's highways.

During the past 5 years in just two agencies, the General Service Administration and the Department of Transportation, our Government has spent approximately \$4½ million in the purchase and erection of approximately 70,000

billboards to be placed along our Nation's highways and in front of the various Government buildings. The sole purpose of these billboards is to make sure that the voters in the next election understand that the building projects or the road improvements are as a result of the benevolence of one of the Great Society programs.

As if these 70,000 billboards were not enough, the administration recently asked Congress to appropriate \$2 million to pay for more billboards for the use of political candidates.

This greatly expanded use of billboards by the Johnson administration is in direct contradiction of its own program to remove them from our Nation's highways.

This contradiction has led some cynics to suggest that the Great Society will next be launching a new program to purchase another 50,000 billboards to be used for the special purpose of advertising to the American people the Johnson administration's violent objection to billboards.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 7, 1967, signed by Mr. F. C. Turner, Director of Public Roads, confirming that the Bureau of Public Roads spent a minimum of \$4,255,000 in the last 5 years toward the procurement of a minimum of 69,000 billboards, and a letter dated June 9, 1967, signed by Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., Administrator of the General Services Administration, confirming that that agency has purchased 771 billboards at a cost of between \$100 to \$200 each, to be erected on new construction projects financed with Government funds.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,

Washington, D.C., June 7, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your May 16 letter to me requested a report on the number and cost of billboards that have been ordered or purchased by the Bureau of Public Roads during each of the past 5 years. We have not purchased any signs which are commonly classed as billboards.

The second part of your request pertains to the construction identification signs which are placed on projects to comply with the provisions of Section 8(f) of the Federal Highway Act of 1960 (P.L. 86-657, July 14, 1960) which are "on any project where actual construction is in progress and visible to highway users, the State highway department shall erect such informational sign or signs as prescribed by the Secretary, identifying the project and the respective amounts contributed therefor by the State and Federal Governments."

This statutory provision is now a part of the Subsection (a) of Section 114 of Title 23, USC. The instructions of the Secretary (now the Secretary of Transportation) are contained in Public Roads Instructional Memorandum 20-1-64 as supplemented by (1) and (2), copy of each enclosed.

During the past 5 years (1962-1966) the following numbers of Federal-aid contracts were awarded by the State highway departments and direct Federal contracts awarded



June 28, 1967

for peace takes courage and determination. And President Johnson has proved that he has ample supplies of both.

The truth is, as the St. Petersburg Times pointed out, "that the world's leaders are plotting peace—not war."

I insert this excellent editorial into the RECORD:

## HOPE FROM THE SUMMIT

The spirit of Glassboro is one of hard work and hope.

President Johnson and Premier Kosygin surprised the world by conferring 5 hours and 15 minutes in a session arranged only 24 hours before—then setting up another meeting for Sunday afternoon.

Their attitudes, statements and good humor before and after the talks can only generate hope that progress will be made toward settling some of the great international issues.

"We have exchanged views on a number of international questions," said President Johnson after the meeting.

On every point he listed thereafter, the two powerful nations represented by these men share tremendous mutual interests:

In the Middle East, both the United States and the Soviet Union have faced the threat that irresponsible national leaders can pose to world peace. Both have looked over the brink of World War III and carefully backed away.

In Vietnam, both know the hazard and high cost of even limited war, now it erodes sensible relations and how it blocks progress toward more important goals.

On the necessity of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, significantly mentioned twice in Mr. Johnson's brief statement, both leaders feel the urgent pressure of H-bombs in the hands of an unpredictable Red China.

All these and other questions combine into the supreme shared interest: How two great nations now wasting so much of their resources on the machines of war can find a way to spend them—as both their people and leaders overwhelmingly prefer—on their neglected domestic needs.

The most intriguing information from the meeting was President Johnson's statement that the two had "exchanged views on the question of direct bilateral relations" between the United States and the Soviet Union. This could mean almost anything.

Perhaps Americans who want so desperately to find a solution to the war in Vietnam should guard against lifting their expectations too high. But certainly there is every reason to be more hopeful about the course of world events after this meeting than before.

Premier Kosygin evidently came to the United Nations well prepared by the collective leadership in the Kremlin for talks with President Johnson. He is staying over to continue them Sunday.

The lights in Washington and Moscow will burn throughout the night as officials prepare for Sunday's talks. Those lights glow with hopefulness, for the truth is that the world's leaders are plotting peace—not war.

*File in*

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have all had many anxious moments as we watched the developments in the Middle East over the past few weeks. It was feared by many that an outbreak of fighting would pull the United States and Russia into the conflict and thus start world war III. Thank God it did not.

There have been charges and counter-charges of aggression levied by both sides. Because of the high interest which our country has in this particular area, I feel that it is essential that an analysis of the situation be made in historical perspective. This, Mr. Speaker, is what I intend to do.

## EARLY HISTORY

The history of the modern State of Israel might be said to have originated, late in the 19th century, in the person of an Austro-Hungarian Jew named Theodor Herzl. He began to speak of a "return to Zion," not only in the traditionally accepted spiritual sense, but also in a dynamic political sense. The fruits of his work were seen in the establishment of a Zionist organization which had as its goal the creation of a modern Jewish State. In the wake of World War I, American and British Zionists were able to obtain the Balfour Declaration of 1917 from the British Cabinet, which favored "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," a declaration which President Wilson enthusiastically endorsed. From that time to the present, there has existed either an overt or subliminal struggle between the Jewish and Arab peoples.

With the dawning of the 1930's, however, the Palestine question became more acute. The hideous atrocities of the Third Reich progressively increased the number of Jews emigrating out of Germany and her peripheral nations. The Arabs became alarmed at this growing immigration, fearing that they would themselves become both an ethnic and religious minority. Simultaneously, the growing ambitions of Nazi Germany exaggerated the already recognized importance of the Middle East as the fulcrum of Mediterranean power, and with this exaggeration grew up pressures to enhance Anglo-Arab relations. Thus it was that in 1939 the British Government issued a white paper limiting Jewish immigration to 75,000 over the following 5 years, indicating that such control would be in the hands of the Arabs thereafter, and that Palestine would become independent within 10 years time.

There was a general realization that if the white paper were adhered to, the Jews would have been relegated to a minority position and so would have died Herzl's dream of an independent Jewish State. World Jewry, however, did not accept the policy, and in 1942 the World Zionist Organization called for "a Jewish State in Palestine, a Jewish Army to defend it, and unlimited Jewish immigration." The United States soon became the chief supporter of this cause, for it was extremely aware of many contributions which Jewish tradition gave not only to itself, but indeed to the whole of Western Civilization.

When the British Labor Party regained power in 1944 they upheld the white paper which they had so vehemently attacked when out of office. It would appear that the rewards of Arabian oil were dominant incentives in this decision. At the same time, both the Democratic and Republican Parties included within their platforms planks avowing unlimited immigration to Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish

State. Humanitarianism, in this instance, dominated the profit motive.

Britain eventually took the problem to the United Nations after the closing of the war, and let it be known that she was intent upon surrendering her mandate to Palestine on May 15, 1948. The United Nations considered the question in a series of General Assembly committees and in November of 1947 voted in favor of partitioning Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish State. On May 14, David Ben-Gurion proclaimed Israel a sovereign nation and just minutes afterwards, it was recognized by the United States.

The Arabs immediately declared war, and although outnumbered and surrounded, Israel fought courageously to assure success in the first test of her nationhood. Having made substantial gains, she was in a good position to accept the armistice lines proposed by Dr. Ralph Bunche. It was this agreement which gave to Israel a larger portion of land than was originally intended by the United Nations Palestinian partition, and which, contrary to U.N. wishes, rather than internationalizing the Holy City of Jerusalem, divided it between Israel and Jordan. Because of the continuous clashes which occurred along both sides of the border—despite the efforts of a U.N. truce supervision organization—the U.N. General Assembly established a Palestine Conciliation Commission which has struggled with the problems of the Middle East even up to the present time.

## THE TRIPower STATEMENT

In view of the frustration experienced by working both independently and in conjunction with the Palestine Conciliation Commission in an attempt to stabilize the Middle East, the United States finally became a party to a tripower statement—Britain and France being the other two parties which was issued on May 25, 1950. The statement held in part that—

The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

It is interesting to note that the only time that the United States acted under this agreement was in the Suez Canal crisis of 1956 when she did so in opposition to other signatories. We shall review this crisis in detail.

## THE SUEZ CRISIS

In July 1956, Nasser's Ambassador made a trip to Washington to receive aid in the form of a loan to be used in financing a high dam at Aswan on the Nile. The idea for the dam grew out of Anglo-American desire to better relations with Egypt, and was met with praise by the Nasser government. Upon arrival, however, the Ambassador was refused the funds supposedly because of a cotton-for-arms trade agreement negotiated with Czechoslovakia in 1955. This agreement, thought Dulles, taxed Egyptian resources to the extent that it made the country a bad risk for a loan. The fact that Nasser had been dicker with the United States on the question

June 28, 1967

of nonrecognition of Communist China did little to elevate Egypt's case in Dulles' eyes.

As a result, Nasser took it upon himself to nationalize the Suez Canal, the revenue from which was to be used in implementing the Aswan project. This was clearly not in the interests of Britain and France.

During the same period, Israel was becoming greatly alarmed by the enormous acquisitions of arms reported in the Arab world. Her alarm was intensified when Egypt, Syria, and Jordan announced a joint military command surrounding Israel.

Therefore, on October 29, 1956, Israel suddenly attacked the Egyptian outposts in the Gaza strip and Sinai Peninsula. The speed and careful execution of this attack enabled the Israeli Army to quickly attain its objectives. Although the extent of collusion between the British, French, and Israelis prior to the attack is largely unknown, it has been generally established that French forces supplied the vital air cover necessary in the early hours of the war. With this in mind, in addition to the fact that Israeli planes approached their bombing runs at low altitudes from the direction of the Mediterranean, we can appreciate the high credibility attached to charges that British and American air power was used in the most recent war, although such charges were eventually disproven.

Under the triple pressure of the United Nations, the United States, and the U.S.S.R., France, Britain, and Israel accepted a cease-fire and agreed to pull back their forces. The United Arab Republic accepted the presence of a U.N. Emergency Peacekeeping Force which acted as a buffer in the Gaza strip and at the outlet for the Gulf of Aqaba. This latter positioning was logical because of that part of the settlement which guaranteed Israel access to the high seas by way of the Port of Elath. This force remained until it was ordered out by U Thant at the request of Nasser some 17 days before the recent hostilities broke out.

This action by U Thant has come under severe criticism by certain parties and it would do us well to examine it more closely. To begin with, the force was positioned on Egyptian soil with the consent of Egypt. Although Israel was asked to accept a similar force, she refused. If she had accepted it at that time, Nasser's recent request would not have created such an anxious condition. Also, we might note that all of U Thant's advisors, including the notable Ralph Bunche, informed the Secretary General that he had no choice but to comply with Nasser's request. In addition, both India and Yugoslavia, whose troops constituted approximately one-half of the UNEF, refused to maintain them contrary to the wishes of Egypt, and ordered their immediate withdrawal.

Thus we can see that U Thant's decision would not be criticized under the rationale that, had he refused to withdraw the force, world diplomacy would have taken appropriate steps to avert an armed conflict. This is especially apparent when one considers the active arms buildup

engaged in by Egypt at the expense of the Soviet Union just prior to the outbreak of hostilities. It is perhaps this, coupled with the distorted image which Nasser had of his own military strength, which contributed most to the development of the recent war.

#### THE 1967 ARAB-ISRAEL WAR

After the UNEF pulled out on May 18, a series of United Arab Republic troop buildups in the Sinai Peninsula, the declaration of the Gaza strip as an "emergency zone," and the blockade of Aqaba against Israeli-bound shipping stimulated concomitant buildups on the part of Israel. Being a small country, surrounded on three sides by hostile neighbors, she took the major step of mobilization. Simultaneously, U Thant was attempting to effect a cooling-off period by means of Cairo, since Israel had already, according to James A. Wechsler of the New York Post, refused to accept the UNEF troops on its soil.

At this time Russia entered the scene by accusing Israel of "aggravating the atmosphere of military psychosis," a charge which rings as ludicrous when we recall that at the same time she was feeding an inordinate supply of arms into the Arab countries.

This series of events rightfully alarmed the small nation of Israel. Egypt refused to negotiate on Aqaba and the bellicosity of the Arab statements intensified daily. In blockading Aqaba Nasser had, in order to enhance and solidify his own political position, kindled a fuse which was destined, he presumed, to culminate in an explosive Arab victory. He counted on the support of the Soviet Union to neutralize any attempted interference from the West.

But Nasser miscalculated on three major points:

First. The Soviets proved, although not as spectacularly as they had in Cuba in 1963, to be "fair-weather friends." Although they supplied the Arabs with arms, they made no attempt, beyond the usual verbal platitudes, to intercede on the Arab side. Russian national interest proved stronger than dangerous international meddling.

Second. Nasser had grossly underestimated the efficiency and speed of the Israeli military machine. He was overconfident with his impressive display of offensive and defensive weaponry. Little did he realize that the naive placements of that weaponry, the chaotic communication and supply organization which fragmented his forces, and the lack of an integrated military strategy, would prove catastrophic in the first days of the war.

Third. Finally, and most importantly, we come to that intangible factor which Nasser should have, but evidently did not, take into consideration: that thing called "esprit de corps." Small Israel, like small David in the Biblical story, defeated her modern day Goliath.

As a result of these miscalculations and the speed and accuracy of Israel's militarily brilliant Blitzkrieg operations, the Arab States were soundly defeated. Israel acquired the Gaza strip, the east bank of the Suez Canal, Sharm el-Sheikh, the Sinai Peninsula, western Jordan and southwest Syria, the total of

which is four times Israel's former holdings. Now we are faced with the gargantuan problem of seeking a settlement which will dispel the tension and afford peace and security to all nations in the Middle East.

#### THE PATH AHEAD

On June 20, President Johnson outlined the American proposal for a just peace settlement. I would like to consider the points so made, Mr. Speaker, seriatim, and comment upon them:

First. "The recognized right of national life." The fact that the Arab States do not recognize Israel as a political entity, and in fact have vowed its destruction, is an open invitation to belligerency. Israel was created by an action of the United Nations for reasons mentioned above. She has shown herself to be a dynamic country with a growing economy, and there are no indications of internal collapse. If the Arab States were to negotiate directly with Israel for a settlement, such recognition would be afforded, and this would be extremely important to the cause of a lasting peace.

Furthermore, such recognition would make much more credible, guarantees of Israeli security which must form the basis of any territorial adjustments.

Second. "Justice for the refugees." Almost 20 years ago, a sizable number—over 880,000—refugees were displaced by the creation of the State of Israel. Most of these people were victims of an historical fact, and in spite of relief funds supplied by the U.N., their plight is still a sorry one. Although it is likely that their presence has been exploited by Arab leadership as a substantial contribution to a "causis belli," Israel should take immediate steps to either resettle the refugees or to indemnify those displaced.

Third. "Innocent maritime passage." Any adjustment concerning an Israel pullback from Suez or Sharm el-Sheikh must necessarily be based upon the unequivocal guarantee by the Arab States of free passage of all Israel-bound shipping. If we had to arbitrarily select one action which acted as the chief precipitant of the recent struggle, we would undoubtedly find ourselves citing the closing of the Strait of Tiran. This must never happen again.

Fourth. "Limits on the wasteful and destructive arms race." It is imperative that we do not view the recent Middle East war as a monolithic confrontation of East and West, but rather as a regional dispute which assumed magnitude because of the di-polar cold war policies of the Middle East arms race. It comes as no surprise that smoking is highly dangerous in the proximity of a powder keg. An arms race creates a powder keg atmosphere; and if one cannot eliminate the smoker, he must eliminate the explosive.

Also, the economic backwardness of the underdeveloped countries in the area would enhance the plea to divert high arms costs into projects more beneficial to the people.

Fifth. "Political independence and territorial integrity for all." I must reiterate here what I said before: The twin guarantees of national security and maritime rights must proceed any drawbacks or

June 28, 1967

territorial adjustments. Yet adjustments must be made if a stasis is to be effected in the Middle East and peace is to be preserved. I salute Israel for its efficiency and bravado, and I am assured that her success will in no way tempt her to deviate from those principles that she was fighting for: freedom, political independence, and territorial integrity.

If these proposals are carried out, then, in President Johnson's own words:

That land, known to everyone of us since childhood as the birthplace of great religions and learning for all mankind, can flourish once again in our time.

Mr. Speaker, although history never actually repeats itself, it sometimes comes very close. The history of this conflict has many lessons to each to all. It is my hope that these lessons have been well learned. Freedom is a precious thing, and free men everywhere are willing to die for it. Israel showed once again that a people cannot be intimidated by belligerency and saber rattling, that they do not shrink from an enemy who is disproportionately larger or stronger, when the existence of their nation is at stake. Indeed, true men would rather die on their feet than live on their knees. And this, Mr. Speaker, is no less true today than it was 191 years ago when our forefathers stood with their flintlocks and fought for their independence against the strongest empire in the world.

Let this be a lesson to all those who would underestimate the hearts of men or try to subjugate them to the blind forces of power hunger or ideology.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by the President of the United States.)

[Mr. DORN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the House have long been concerned about our national policy, or lack of policy, on the question of an anti-ballistic missile defense. This has not been a partisan concern, but one of profound differences of judgment between the President and the Secretary of Defense on the one hand, and entire Joint Chiefs of Staff and many of the most knowledgeable members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, on the other.

In recent weeks my concern over this question has greatly increased. However, in view of the presence of Premier Kosygin in this country and the prospect of his talks with President Johnson I have withheld detailed comment until now.

June 17, 1967, Red China exploded her first Hydrogen Bomb. That was 11 days ago.

October 16, 1964, Red China detonated her first nuclear device. That was 2 years and 8 months ago.

The first atomic explosion by Communist China was rated around 20 kilotons. The latest thermonuclear blast was estimated between 2 to 7 megatons—at least 100 times as powerful as Red China's first atomic explosion.

Each of Red China's six nuclear tests has evidenced more rapid technological progress and greater sophistication than most U.S. experts had predicted.

It took the United States 6 years and 3 months to get from the first Alamogordo atomic test to the first H-Bomb at Eniwetok.

It took the Soviet Union 3 years and 11 months to cover the same stages of development, after the United States had shown the way.

Red China took 2 years and 8 months to join the H-bomb club.

Throughout that entire period of peril, a one-sided debate has paralyzed administration policy on the life-and-death question of an anti-ballistic missile defense system for the United States. The almost unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top professional military experts, and the cognizant committees of the Congress has been in favor of proceeding with some form of ABM development and deployment which, the Defense Department estimates, might save millions or tens of millions of American lives.

The debate has been one-sided because President Johnson, as Commander in Chief, and Secretary of Defense McNamara, his civilian deputy, have repeatedly deferred this decision and declined to spend preproduction funds appropriated by Congress for ABM defense.

At first, the administration argument was that an ABM defense was impractical and would be a waste of money. When rumors first spread, through press reports, early in 1963, that the Russians apparently were developing an ABM defense, Secretary McNamara engaged in semantic hair-splitting with congressional questioners which seemed to deny that the Soviet Union had an ABM "system"—defining system in the technical sense of a complete weapons system—and thus implying that the United States was at least even with the U.S.S.R. in this technological race. That was 4 years ago.

More recently, the administration line has shifted to the theme that Soviet leaders might be persuaded, in a hopeful atmosphere of detente, to agree to stop the costly ABM race on which they were well along and the United States had not yet decided to start. But, despite numerous authoritative articles and discussions in the press, there was no official administration confirmation of the deployment of a Soviet ABM defense until November 10, 1966—2 days after the 1966 national elections—when Secretary McNamara announced there was considerable evidence to this effect. He also said it was "much too early to make a decision for a deployment against the Chinese threat." The Red Chinese had just tested a nuclear-tipped 400- to 500-mile ballistic missile on October 27, 1966. That was 8 months ago.

In his latest state of the Union message, January 10, 1967, President John-

son noted two developments, an increase during the past year of Soviet long-range missile capabilities and the beginning of an antiballistic missile defense around Moscow. But his main emphasis was on what he termed his "solemn duty to slow down the arms race between us—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—if that is at all possible, in both conventional and nuclear weapons and defenses."

That was 5 months and 2 weeks ago.

In the Republican appraisal of the state of the Union delivered January 19, 1967, I said:

The Administration has finally admitted to the American people that the Soviet Union has increased its Intercontinental Ballistic Missile capability and is deploying an Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense System. In anticipation of a life-and-death decision on just such a development, Congress has voted millions of dollars which the Administration did not seek and apparently has not used.

The Congress did its duty and gave the President a clear expression of its will and the means to carry it out.

Before more precious time is lost, Congress and the American people are now entitled to a clear explanation from the President of the perils and problems facing the United States in the new global balance of strategic power.

We, too, seek to avoid a costly new round in the nuclear arms race. But the least the Nation must do now is to speed up its readiness to deploy Anti-Ballistics Missiles in a hurry if our survival requires its.

That was 5 months and 1 week ago. I repeat it again today.

In his budget message to Congress on January 24, 1967, the President spelled out his decision on an ABM defense for the United States, pledging that during fiscal 1968 he would—

Continue intensive development of Nike-X but take no action now to deploy an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense; initiate discussions with the Soviet Union on the limitation of ABM deployment; in the event these discussions prove unsuccessful, we will reconsider our deployment system.

That was 5 months ago.

Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin gave an oblique answer at a news conference in London on February 9, 1967. This is from the New York Times' account:

Premier Kosygin suggested at a news conference today that defensive anti-ballistic missile systems were less dangerous to mankind than offensive systems, and therefore more desirable even if they should prove more costly.

While avoiding a direct answer to a question on the subject, he gave no encouragement to hopes for a moratorium on anti-ballistic missile defense development as a means of limiting the arms race between the great powers. . . .

His reply was that "a system that serves to ward off an attack does not heighten the tension but serves to lessen the possibility of an attack that may kill large numbers of people."

It is difficult not to agree with the Communist leader in the way he dismissed the cost-effectiveness argument favored by Mr. McNamara.

It might be cheaper to build offensive than defensive systems.

Kosygin said—

But this is not the criterion upon which one should base oneself in deciding this problem.

This was 4 months and 2 weeks ago. Nevertheless, President Johnson continued to support Secretary McNamara or vice versa. Testifying March 6, 1967, before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, McNamara conceded the continuing split between himself and the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff, represented by their Chairman, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, on the ABM question.

General Wheeler told the House Armed Services Committee that he had gone to President Johnson, on his own initiative, to present the Joint Chiefs' case to the Commander in Chief in this important difference of opinion with the Secretary of Defense.

In the heavily censored transcript of committee testimony, it is evident that Mr. McNamara still felt that the Russians were wasting their resources on defensive measures against a missile attack and that the United States should not follow suit. He argued that the U.S. response to a Soviet ABM system should not be a U.S. ABM system, but a step-up in our deterrent offensive capability. If we embarked upon an ABM defense, Mr. McNamara assumed that Soviet planners would use the same reasoning as he used and increase their offensive capability. At the same time he acknowledged that, even though the United States had widely advertised that it was not proceeding with any ABM deployment, the Soviet Union was increasing its offensive missile capability anyway. But he persisted in the view that the United States should not expedite an ABM deployment.

General Wheeler took the position that "the Soviets will undoubtedly improve the Moscow system as time goes on and extend ABM defense to other high-priority areas of the Soviet Union." He estimated that they have the resources to do so and are willing to spend whatever it takes to gain strategic superiority or strategic parity with the United States.

On behalf of his colleagues of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler testified that the Soviet objective—both in offensive and defensive strategy—is "to achieve an exploitable capability, permitting them freedom to pursue their national aims at conflict levels less than general nuclear war."

While the debate on the desirability of a U.S. ABM defense system has concentrated until very recently on sharply varying U.S. estimates of Soviet intentions and capabilities, Red China's breakthrough into the select group of four thermonuclear superpowers injects an entirely new factor.

The timing of Red China's H-bomb breakthrough was most significant. It came as the whole world was groping to assess the lessons of the Israel-Arab war and the near-confrontation of great powers that had been averted. The most immediate conclusions from this crisis are:

First. As proved by Israel, a sudden and preemptive air strike has not been summarily discarded by military planners of other nations. This is especially true if the odds against a successful defense are very unfavorable.

Second. As proved by Nasser, fanatic and authoritarian regimes do not neces-

sarily act rationally or evaluate risks by the same standard we do. Furthermore, they can suffer what a Western government would consider unacceptable human and material losses and still survive politically.

Third. As proved by the United States and the Soviet Union, when the two superpowers neutralize each other with their mutual nuclear deterrents, lesser nations are pretty much left free to resolve regional issues by force.

None of these lessons, I am sure, was lost on Red China or on the other nations of Asia.

I hope they are not lost upon Secretary McNamara, and will cause him quickly to reverse his 1966 postelection view that it is "much too early to make a decision for a deployment against the Chinese threat."

Even those who cherish the most optimistic hopes that Russian Communist leaders will act reasonably and with restraint in their thermonuclear strategy cannot possibly put the Chinese Communist leaders in the same category. Peiping itself does not.

Red China's capability in the field of nuclear weaponry consistently has been downgraded and underestimated by administration policymakers. When Red China achieved atomic status, Americans were told it would take many years for them to perfect advanced systems for delivering a nuclear weapon. When, within 6 months, Red China mounted an atomic warhead on a 500-mile ballistic missile, Americans were reassured that it would be many more years before the Chinese could pose any intercontinental threat to the United States.

Secretary McNamara testified on January 25, 1966 before the House Armed Services Committee that "the Chinese Communists have detonated two nuclear devices and could possibly develop and deploy a small force of ICBMs by the mid-to-latter part of the 1970's." Whether this estimate is better or worse than Mr. McNamara's previous estimates on the Vietnam war, the necessity of a U.S. merchant marine, the usefulness of Reserve forces and the future of manned aircraft and nuclear-powered ships, cannot yet be determined. His danger date, however, is only 8 to 10 years away.

Other Pentagon officials have pointed out that a primitive submarine-launched nuclear-tipped missile could be developed by Red China in a much shorter period, and conceivably could already exist.

Fortune magazine in an authoritative June 1967 article on ABM defense estimates that 5 to 7 years, from the time the go-ahead is given, would be needed to deploy even a thin U.S. anti-ballistic missile defense. Cost estimates, depending upon the degree of protection provided, range from \$3 billion to \$40 billion, spread over a period of years.

The article quotes Lt. Gen. Austin Betts, Chief of the Army's Nike X research and development, as believing the optimum moment has arrived to begin production. It points out that further delay could mean the breakup of contractor teams and the onset of obsolescence in components.

There appears to be general agreement that the current fiscal 1968 Defense Appropriation, voted 407 to 1, contains as much money as could be used in the coming 12 months—some \$908 million on top of the \$4 billion previously provided for antiballistic missile research and development. This includes the extra \$167.8 million which Congress voted last year for initial deployment which the administration declined to use.

I can no longer see any logic in delaying this crucial decision for an indefinite time while the United States attempts to get agreement with the Soviet Union to slow down an expensive ABM race. Premier Kosygin threw cold water on any ABM moratorium at his U.N. news conference June 25 and President Johnson has not revealed any progress on this subject during their private talks at Holly Bush.

What is perfectly clear is that U.S. reluctance to move forward on ABM defense deployment has in no way slowed the Soviet program, defensively or offensively, nor impaired the thermonuclear progress of Red China. Both are moving full speed ahead.

Gen. Harold Johnson, the Army Chief of Staff, summed up the sentiment of professional military leaders when he told the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on March 10, 1967:

Now, one cannot argue against discussing the issues that are to be discussed with the Soviets, you cannot argue that at all. However, the uneasiness that I feel is basically this: *When do we stop discussing and when do we reach a decision point?*

That was 3 months and 2 weeks ago.

Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB of California, ranking Republican on the subcommittee, summed up the House Appropriations Committee's answer to the President and Secretary McNamara on the House floor June 13, 1967. He said:

In commenting on the reluctance to begin to deploy the Nike-X system on the part of the Administration, our committee report states:

"It would appear that the initiation of deployment of light or thin defense, now, may very well be a most useful first step toward whatever level of ballistic missile defense ultimately appears necessary." In other words the report, adopted unanimously by the committee, says: "Get Going!"

That was 2 weeks ago. The key word is "now."

Four days after the House overwhelmingly endorsed this view of the urgency to get going on ABM, the Red Chinese H-bomb was exploded.

Initial reports on this significant event, overshadowed by the U.N. wrangling on the Middle East, quoted Washington weapons specialists as surmising that "Red China would be more likely to set it off on a test stand so that its yield and other effects could be measured more precisely"—another disturbing sign of assuming a potential enemy thinks exactly as we do.

Later, after Japanese atomic scientists said their analysis showed the bomb had been exploded at a high altitude, the Washington Post on June 22 quoted Washington intelligence officials as believing the Red Chinese H-bomb was



licemen trying to do their duty also have constitutional rights. In the stories related by Mr. Starnes you can read about a few of such people who have been savagely deprived of their rights.

*Derwinski*

## U.N. Troops in Mideast: Forces Without Teeth

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Rev. John B. Sheerin is a thoughtful writer who discusses the Middle East conflict in a very penetrating fashion in the following article which appeared in the June 23 edition of the *New World*, the Archdiocese of Chicago Catholic newspaper. I insert his commentary at this point in the RECORD:

SUM AND SUBSTANCE—U.N. TROOPS IN MIDEAST: FORCES WITHOUT TEETH

(By John B. Sheerin, C.S.P.)

The Middle East conflict, at this moment of writing, is quite unclear. The U.N. Security Council has been unable to pinpoint blame for the shooting war. The uncertainty as to who fired the first shot is, however, not the only unanswered question.

One haunting query is: Why did U Thant pull his U.N. force out of the Gaza Strip? President Johnson has adverted to this "hurried withdrawal" and British Prime Minister Harold Wilson has said "We played our full part to . . . urge that this peace-keeping force should not be dismantled. But the decision was taken and new dangers inexorably followed."

It is noteworthy that Prime Minister Wilson spoke of UNEF as a "peace-keeping force." It seems probable that U Thant did not conceive the role of the UN force to be that of "peace-keeping." Judging by the chain of events just before the withdrawal of the force, it appears that he did not have a clear idea of precisely what its purpose was.

Apparently the Arabs considered the U.N. force as an army of occupation. The Russians had been calling it a "military intervention" and the Arabs undoubtedly believed it was. U Thant wanted to disprove this notion and he felt that the quickest way to do so was to affirm that the force was on Egyptian soil at the sufferance of Egypt, and that it could be removed as soon as Egypt so desired.

If that were true, UNEF could not be considered a "peacekeeping" unit at all. It would have been nothing more than a group of invited foreign guests.

Some have said that U Thant submitted to Nasser's demand because he realized it would be futile to ask UNEF to stand up to the Egyptian threat.

Again, some say that he knew that India and Yugoslavia would not for a minute allow their troops in the U.N. force to remain on Egyptian territory against the will of Nasser.

The puzzling fact, however, is that U Thant must have known that Nasser would make his demand and yet he made no personal plea to him to change his mind. Instead he made it crystal clear to Nasser that he was ready and willing to pull out the U.N. troops at a nod from the Egyptian dictator.

I do not mean that U Thant was deliberately betraying the cause of peace by conspiring to hand the Gaza Strip to Egypt and

give Nasser a green light for an invasion of Israel. In his message announcing he would take UNEF out, he told Nasser his misgivings: "I believe that this force has been an important factor in maintaining relative quiet in the area of its deployment."

The source of the trouble, as I see it, is that U Thant was not at all sure that UNEF was designed to be a "peace-keeper." The original mandate for the force did not empower it to "enforce the peace."

It was designed with the noblest aspirations for peace but a mandate of this kind has to have teeth in it—if it is to be effective. Without a mandate to "enforce" peace UNEF was hardly more than a symbolic presence.

The whole episode may have the salutary result of clarifying the role of any future UNEF force. It should have power to enforce and preserve the peace—even if the country on whose soil it is stationed should decide to demand its removal.

A symbolic presence is no presence. The Middle East conflict should teach us that the decisions of the U.N. need to be enforced if we are ever to have world peace, and this means that the policemen must have the right as well as the fire-power to suppress disturbers of the peace.

## East-West Trade—The Dangerous Illusion

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the article entitled "East-West Trade—The Dangerous Illusion," by John E. Davis, the national commander of the American Legion.

Writing in the *American Legion* magazine for July 1967, Mr. Davis sets forth the objections, both short range and long range, which the American Legion has to the concept of broader trade relations between the United States and the Communist bloc nations. I commend his comments to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

EAST-WEST TRADE—THE DANGEROUS ILLUSION  
(By John E. Davis)

A proposed "East-West Trade Relations Act" is receiving serious consideration in the Congress, and is backed by the Administration. It would encourage and simplify much broader trade relations between the United States and the Communist-bloc nations. The American Legion is officially opposed to this concept, and we have both short-range and long-range objections.

In our short-range objections, our National Executive Committee this May called on Congress to prohibit further trade between the United States and any Soviet-bloc country "which is providing North Vietnam with assistance of any form that can increase the war-making potential of the enemy. . . ." We need explain nothing further to justify that objection. Any such trade amounts to trading with the enemy in time of war. In the short run, we can only express amazement that East-West trade should be advanced while hostilities backed by the entire Communist world continue in Vietnam, and have since taken on a new dimension in the Near East.

Our long-range objections are better reflected in the action of our last National Convention, which opposed trade with the Com-

munist bloc *except* in specific cases in which concrete advantage to us could be spelled out. So long as the Cold War continues, even in the absence of armed conflict, we believe that should be the absolute limit of trade agreements with the Communist bloc. Here we recognize that trade *might* be used as a means of weakening the cohesiveness of the Soviet bloc, that our trade *might* be helpful in causing a member country of that bloc to weaken its ties with the Soviet power centers.

We have, for instance, engaged in limited trade with Communist Poland and Yugoslavia in such hopes. In the case of Poland, even Senator Fulbright has had to admit that its leaders have actually drifted toward a greater reliance on the Kremlin while enjoying favorable U.S. trade relations.

We have *possibly* made some headway in encouraging Yugoslavia's visible spirit of independence from Soviet domination with some small trade, though that isn't conclusive yet. Whether we succeed or fail in such ventures, they are at least tied to a very clear purpose, in which we are trying to use trade instead of bullets as a weapon in the Cold War.

But the proposals for a general broadening of our trade with the Communist world totally escape any practical purpose. They prevent us from using trade as a weapon, by simply extending it freely in broad terms. The very arguments in favor of broader East-West trade are dreamy and generalized. The commonest one of all is that we would be "building bridges of friendship." On the record, trade is a game of advantage, not friendship. Right up to the eve of war, Hitler and the Japanese Empire traded with those they attacked in WW2, and as we well know, they traded most earnestly in whatever would best strengthen them for the coming conflict.

Last December, Assistant Secretary of State Katzenbach argued that proposed East-West trade would be in consumer goods, therefore it could not be expected to bring any advantage to the Soviet military thrust. He went on to cite an Italian Fiat agreement to build a compact car plant in the Soviet Union as an example of the kind of profitable trade we are losing in the absence of an East-West trade agreement.

I find such argument to be frightening. When our own President is embarrassed by burdens that military operations in Vietnam impose on his domestic program, how can our government argue that the same principle does not apply in the Soviet Union? *Anything that we do to provide consumer satisfaction in the Soviet Union frees Soviet energies and resources for their aggressive external policies.* The point is so obvious that I am not really arguing it, but simply pointing out the bankruptcy of the rationales in favor of broad East-West trade. Even in the case of the Fiat plant, *we* now have been approached to lend Fiat the money for machine tools through the Import-Export Bank. Obviously, the Soviets will not release sufficient capital from their offensive programs even to acquire such an asset. They will be happy instead to see us help capitalize this plant in Russia for the benefit of Russia and Italy, while they save what capital they can to foot war in Vietnam, the Middle East, Latin America, etc.

The present move toward East-West trade traces to a report in favor of it by the Committee for Economic Development issued in May 1965. A minority report in the same study, drafted by committee member Robert E. Kleberg, should have received more attention. Wrote Kleberg, in part: ". . . it would be unrealistic to hope that mutually useful trade could be developed with the Communist countries under present circumstances. We would receive little benefit from such trade and would expose the Western world to some or all of the following hazards:

"(1) An increase in Communist propaganda and subversion in Latin America under the guise of trade.

"(2) An opening of the trade barriers

which we have attempted to impose around Cuba.

"(3) A further detriment to our balance of payments position as a result of the credits which we would have to extend to Communist countries.

"(4) An increase in the flow of our technical information and know-how to the Communist world.

"In short, Communist governments look upon trade as a political weapon and use it as such. So long as this is true, we should attempt to deny it to them."

These are hard, demonstrated facts, none of which are met by saying "Bridges of Friendship."

### The Model State Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an excerpt on the subject of pollution from the monthly magazine, *Industry*, published by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, by my valued friend, the able and distinguished State senator from my district, Hon. Joseph D. Ward, of Fitchburg.

Senator Ward, chairman of the special commission on the problems of water pollution in the Commonwealth and the laws thereof relating to water pollution, and author of the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act of 1966, has labored over a considerable period of time on pollution problems in Massachusetts. Under his leadership, the special water pollution commission has come up with a splendid, far-reaching, most significant report touching very comprehensively upon the very serious problem of pollution in our State. This study is one of the finest contributions to the subject matter of pollution.

Senator Ward's informative article is not only ably done but very interesting and enlightening. It is extremely relevant on the nature, extent, and severity of the problems of pollution and points out the need for massive public attention on a cooperative basis at every level of government to insure that the most vigorous attacks will be made on this very challenging problem, the solution of which is so necessary to the well-being of our Nation.

The article follows:

#### THE MODEL STATE PROGRAM

(By Sen. Joseph D. Ward, of Fitchburg, Chairman, Special Commission Studying Water Pollution and Water Supply in Massachusetts)

The year 1966 can be marked as one establishing the fusion of an effective Federal-state partnership in Massachusetts in attacking one of the most serious and intractable problems of our time—water pollution.

The President had already signed into law the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. This law, in effect, prescribed an Eleventh Commandment in the United States. "Thou shalt not pollute." In essence it provided that beginning on July 1, 1967, no one might pollute the major streams of this country below

established water quality standards. The states, however, were given the responsibility of establishing these standards for the rivers within their respective jurisdictions.

In 1966 the Congress passed the Clean Rivers Restoration Act that provided a substantial part of the money to aid the states in carrying out its mandate. This law offered the states various economic incentives for water quality control depending upon the nature of the control action taken to implement Federal policy.

Late in 1966 the Massachusetts Legislature moved decisively to effectuate the 1965 Federal directive and to take optimum advantage of the 1966 Federal aid program. During the last hours of the legislative year, the General Court passed, and the Governor signed, one of the signal accomplishments of the session—a comprehensive state water pollution control program.

The new law, popularly known as "The Massachusetts Clean Waters Act of 1966," has been acclaimed as one that incorporates the most advanced thinking on water pollution control measures in the nation. It could well be used as a prototype for other state programs because it has the range of features considered as vital by experts in the matter of water pollution control. Those at the state level who worked long and hard at the problem were gratified to learn that Secretary of the Interior Udall on his inspection trip to Massachusetts characterized it as a "model State program."

The chronology of action in 1966 leading up to its passage follows:

On March 23 the Senate established a special committee to study and investigate water pollution in the Commonwealth and make its recommendations to the Legislature. Senate President Maurice A. Donahue named me chairman of the group including Senators Harrington of Lowell, Nucifora of Pittsfield, Rurak of Haverhill, Hammond of Westfield, and DeNormandie of Lincoln. Our committee surveyed the waters in Massachusetts, examined a variety of public and private treatment facilities, discussed the problem with municipal and industrial officials, traveled to Washington and conferred with a variety of high Federal officials, and held a day-long public hearing on pollution at the State House. The committee actively sought data, views and recommendations during its study from knowledgeable private groups such as university officials, League of Women Voters and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts. It met with the AIM's Water Resources Committee in coordinating its study with industry. It also consulted with the Department of Public Health, the Department of Natural Resources and the Water Resources Commission on matters relating to anti-pollution legislation and enforcement, as well as other agencies and officials.

On April 5 the Senate President called for a \$100 million bond issue to aid the cities and towns in the construction of additional needed treatment facilities.

On April 14 Governor Volpe submitted a program asking for a \$100 million bond issue to aid the local communities in constructing treatment facilities under the supervision of the Department of Public Health.

On April 21 the House of Representatives established its own special committee to make an investigation and study of water pollution, headed by Representative Raymond F. Rourke of Lowell. Other members were Representatives Lombard of Fitchburg, Smith of Lawrence, LaFontaine of Gardner, Zoil of Salem, and Dolan of Ipswich. So that there would be no duplication of work between the Senate and House committees, the House unit agreed to direct its study to the laws of other states.

On August 16, following months of study and investigation, the committees announced their findings and unanimous recommendations at a joint press conference. The recommendations made by the two groups were

enacted into law without substantial change and became the new state program when Governor Volpe affixed his signature on September 6. Both committees judged it was necessary to enact a program that complemented as much as possible the Federal program to make maximum use of available Federal aid. Accordingly, their recommendations comprehended three basic elements: adequate treatment plants; efficient administration and enforcement; and accelerated research. The program that Massachusetts enacted embodies all three essential facets.

Chapter 687 of the Acts of 1966 provides for a ten-year 150-million-dollar bond issue to complement available Federal construction aid to assist the local communities construct the required treatment works. As of the moment, because of this feature of the state program, local communities can now qualify for up to 80% of the full cost of the construction project in state and Federal funds. This part of the program is, without question, the most important. It offers the only practical long-term solution to the problem of municipal and industrial pollution in Massachusetts. Up to \$15 million of this money may also be used to augment available Federal funds for vital research and development purposes. This research and development feature of the state plan is a clear recognition of the importance of developing the technology of control to find new and improved waste treatment and water purification methods. In this area lies the greatest hope of ultimately reducing the costs of pollution control.

Chapter 685 sets up a new state agency, the Division of Water Pollution Control, in the Department of Natural Resources to administer and enforce all the requirements on water quality control. Before this law was enacted, the responsibility for water quality control was vested in the Department of Public Health, Division of Environmental Sanitation. The Legislature felt, however, that water quality control merited intensive attention in a separate agency in conjunction with the variety of other water programs administered by the Department of Natural Resources. The rationale for the transfer of this authority was the same as for the comparable shift at the Federal level when President Johnson transferred responsibility for water quality control from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of the Interior. One often overlooked, but important, aspect of this law allows the Water Resources Commission from the proceeds of the bond issue to construct off-site reservoirs to provide both sources of pure water supply and low flow augmentations in time of drought and in such other times as rivers and streams may require additional water flow to carry off treated effluents.

Chapter 700 provides for a workable exemption from the local property tax for any real or tangible personal property used for waste treatment purposes by industry. The exemption would be total if the property is used entirely for control purposes. If it is only partially used for control purposes, the exemption would be prorated.

Chapter 701 allows an accelerated depreciation allowance for state corporate tax purposes for the capital investment made by a corporation in an approved waste treatment facility. The corporation may write off the capital investment made for treatment facilities against the net income of the corporation allocable to Massachusetts in the year that the investment was made rather than over the life of the facility.

The Legislature was firmly convinced of the intrinsic merit and appropriateness of tax incentives to industry for water quality control purposes. This becomes clear when it is considered that expenditures of large sums of money in nonproductive assets such as water treatment facilities would work severe hardships on most industries. Also, such incentives were considered essential to