

next year. I am pleased to say that I am in hearty agreement with the regents' choice, for the man selected, Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, is a friend of mine and one for whom I have the greatest respect.

Dr. Hollomon has been a high official of the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington for the past 5 years, and he is now serving as the Acting Under Secretary. His is a good old-fashioned American success story. He came from Norfolk, Va., where his parents were in the undertaking business. He earned practically all of his college expenses, working in a foundry, to put himself through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. After World War II he went to work for the General Electric Co., where he was one of their brightest young men in management before he was called to Washington.

He was a good citizen of Schenectady, N.Y., for many years. He headed up a committee which reorganized the school system. He was the president of the museum. In 1954 Fortune magazine and the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce named him one of the 10 outstanding young scientists in the United States. He has won many other honors, from organizations in this country and abroad, and honorary degrees from five universities.

As the senior officer of the U.S. Department of Commerce, he has held the major responsibility for testifying before committees of the Congress, some 25 or more times every session. I have come to know Dr. Hollomon because of this testimony, and because of occasional visits which a busy Washington life affords. Monday, the day his appointment was announced, we both were in Oklahoma and for the first time we had a chance to discuss the problems of higher education in Oklahoma. He was interested in my views because I had served as a member of the Board of Regents of Oklahoma 4-Year Colleges. I was interested in his because he is intimately acquainted with colleges and universities throughout the land.

It was a very heart warming chat. Dr. Hollomon has a deep insight into the minds of young people, and he knows how to build an institution to meet the needs of the State at the same time that the institution is cultivating the State's finest resource, its young minds. He is a gifted man, and Oklahoma is fortunate to acquire his talents at this particular time.

DARK CLOUD HOVERING OVER THE FINANCIAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, recent research has pointed up some grim statistics which have shown that there is a real dark cloud hovering over the financial security of the United States. This is of interest to every man, woman, and child in this country.

Since 1960 the population in the United States has grown 10 percent. During the

same period of time Federal spending has increased 83 percent. It cannot be argued that this is entirely due to the war in Vietnam because during this period of time expenses which are not related to our defense effort have risen 97 percent. Deficits for the past 8 years, including fiscal 1967, will total at least \$50 billion. There are now some 42 million people receiving regular checks from the Federal Government. During the period since 1960 Federal employees have increased by 25 percent in number and the cost of the Federal payrolls has gone up 75 percent.

At the rate we are going the decade between 1960 and 1970 will see Federal spending doubled, without regard to the costs of the war in Vietnam.

Equally alarming is the fact that unless there is a change in Federal spending the rate may well double again during the 1970's, which would mean a \$300 billion Federal budget by 1980. Preposterous as this may seem, I would like to point out that a \$160 billion budget was even less likely in 1960 when our spending was \$76.5 billion.

There are ways to prevent this gross invasion of the public's earning power. The hastily formulated crash programs for solving our Nation's problems simply must be abandoned. This approach presumes that money available in unlimited quantities will solve every problem overnight. As Maurice H. Stans, a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget has said, "there is no such thing as an instant tomorrow." Crash programs result in huge wastes and costly mistakes of great magnitude which pile additional problems on top of those we already have.

We must proceed to solve the problems of this country within our financial means in an orderly and financially responsible manner, through education, training, research and the cooperative development of men and resources with States, local government, and private industry.

The time to start this process is now, when we are spending an estimated \$30 billion a year on Vietnam and face the prospects of an enormous addition to our national debt by a deficit in the same amount.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we support the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 as it has been amended and reported by the House Committee on

Armed Services. This legislation updates and improves the present Selective Service System in a number of important respects.

In addition to extending the present Draft Act and related laws for a period of 4 years, the committee bill includes the following major provisions:

First. A National Manpower Resources Board is established which in conjunction with the National Security Council will identify those professional, scientific and critical skill areas that justify a draft deferment.

Second. Before any change in the existing method of determining the relative order of induction for registrants within the various age groups may be effected, the President is required to advise Congress that such change is in the national interest. The proposed change will become effective after the expiration of a 60-day period unless Congress adopts a resolution rejecting the change.

Third. A method of maintaining the authorized strengths of the Reserve and the National Guard is provided.

Fourth. Uniform criteria for future undergraduate college student deferments are established. Students receiving such deferments shall be placed in the prime age group liable for induction after they leave school, receive a degree or attain age 24, whichever occurs first.

Fifth. The President is required to establish, whenever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction. Such criteria shall be administered uniformly by all local boards.

Sixth. Those opposed to participation in war in any form by reason of religious training and belief shall be exempt from service in the Armed Forces. Conscientious objectors will be required, if selected for induction, to perform noncombatant duty or two years of civilian service if they are conscientiously opposed to both combatant and noncombatant training and service.

Seventh. Individuals are prohibited from serving on local or appeal boards after they have completed 25 years of service or attained age 75. Also, women may be appointed to serve on such boards.

We support the recommendation that the order of call for eligible registrants be revised so that those in the younger age group would be called to active duty first. Under the present system of priorities for induction, the oldest are selected first from the age group of 26 years and under. This system has resulted in considerable uncertainty. An individual classified as available at 18½ remains subject to possible induction until he reaches his 26th birthday. Moreover, the degree of his exposure to induction increases directly with his age and reaches its maximum point on the day before he reaches age 26. The younger men, as a group, are more adaptable to the routines of military training and there are fewer dependents' problems at these ages. Also, a man who is awaiting a draft call has greater difficulty in finding and keeping suitable employment.

We believe that a system of carefully controlled student deferments must be

May 25, 1967

Continued. As noted by the American Council on Education:

Students are deferred for the national not individual interests.

If student deferments were abolished, the future supply of doctors, lawyers, college professors, research scientists, graduate engineers and other specialists could be seriously threatened. Moreover, in order to insure a maximum degree of fairness, those receiving student deferments shall not be eligible for another deferment except in extreme hardship cases. And, on termination of the student deferment, the individual shall be immediately liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group regardless of his actual age.

The proposed National Manpower Resources Board, in conjunction with the National Security Council, will identify those occupations, professions and areas of postgraduate study that are critically required in the national interest and that warrant a deferred status. Under this procedure, the number of deferments presently granted to students engaged in graduate study would be sharply reduced. The Board also would identify skilled trade areas critical to the national interest which require continuation of apprenticeship programs. Trainees in such programs would be provided a deferred status similar to that provided college undergraduate students.

In the past, diverse classification actions by local boards have created certain inequities. The changes in the law embodied in the proposed bill should materially reduce, if not eliminate, this problem. Certainly, the uniform standards for student deferments together with the recommendation that future draft calls concentrate on the younger age group should improve the handling of future registrants. Also, the President is required to establish, wherever practicable, national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under the Draft Act.

Although there is an acknowledged need for certain improvements, we believe that the Selective Service System has, for the most part, operated successfully over the last 26 years. The soundness of the System has been proven through its demonstrated ability to meet rapidly fluctuating conditions. During this 26-year period, approximately 14 million men have been inducted into the armed services without any adverse effect on the economy of the Nation. There has never been a scandal arising out of the administration of this law and there is today public confidence in the basic honesty of the System. The continued use of local boards and the appointment of individuals to such boards on the recommendation of the Governor insures that the control of the System shall remain at the local and State level.

A BILL TO ALLEVIATE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY ACCESS PROBLEMS

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will help solve one of the problems concomitant to the rapid and badly needed development of our Interstate Highway System.

At this time, as my colleagues know, Federal funds are apportioned for construction of interstate highways on a Federal-State, 90-10 matching ratio.

Yet, as our 41,000-mile interstate highway network nears completion, many areas, especially where the interstate follows a path close to a State boundary, are being inundated with problems caused by this construction.

I speak of problems created where highways and bridges leading to and from interstate highways and adjacent to them are badly in need of improvement, to handle the unduly heavy traffic brought to the area by the interstate; or where, under similar circumstances, a new highway or bridge is needed.

In these cases, much of this increased load and need for improvement or new construction is related to the Interstate System, for which 90 percent of the cost is borne by the Federal Government. Why then, should not the costs of these related needs, created by the Interstate System, be borne at the same ratio?

I stress this need in areas where the Interstate System passes near State boundaries for two reasons. First is the unduly concept of the Interstate Highway System itself, as one which provides a national approach to safe, yet rapid travel.

Also of importance is the case where one State's portion of the interstate highway passes near the border of another State and causes the latter State new and untold expenses. Yet the State hit with the expense may not have even been consulted about the route.

I feel that a proper and suitable connection of interstate highways with access bridges and highways at such interstate connecting points is important to the aims of the whole program. It makes little sense to construct fine, new interstate highways if, in so doing, we cause serious traffic and safety problems on immediately adjacent highways. Or if, to alleviate these problems, we force on the States in which these adjacent highways are located, costs nearly impossible to meet.

My bill would alleviate some of these problems. It would permit States to use a portion of their interstate highway funds for such "approach highway" improvements or construction, where the need is the result of an adjacent State's portion of the Interstate System.

My bill would also include safeguards to insure that States did not merely improve local highways, using the interstate as an excuse; and in so doing neglect the Interstate System itself.

My bill would, first of all, limit such projects to 3 percent of the State's interstate Federal allocation; it would limit such projects to those located within 5 miles of the interstate highway itself; and it would require a finding by the Secretary of Commerce that such a project is "the product of coordinated planning between the States involved and that a safe, adequate highway facility

in both States, including connections to the highway on the Interstate System, will be provided."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I feel that my bill would help alleviate serious local traffic and safety conditions caused by the advent of the Interstate System; and would insure some continuity of this traffic flow without putting a severe financial burden on the States involved.

ABM ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE DEFENSE SHAPING UP AS BIG 1968 ISSUE

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, two excellent articles appeared in the Sunday Chicago Tribune, May 21, 1967, concerning the controversy over the advisability of building an anti-ballistic-missile defense system. As every newspaper reader knows, there has been a running battle for a number of years now between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Senate Armed Services Committee on one hand and the Secretary of Defense McNamara on the other concerning this issue. Secretary McNamara believes that an ABM system would be ineffective and costly while those favoring such a system contend that the lives of those saved by the presence of an ABM system in a nuclear attack would justify the expense in addition to acting as a deterrent factor.

As this issue could well be a factor in the 1968 elections, information on this subject should be of interest to all citizens. To give the two articles wider dissemination, I place them in the RECORD. The above-mentioned items are: "Anti-Ballistic-Missile Defense Shaping Up as Big 1968 Issue," which thoroughly reviews the pros and cons of the controversy and which was written by Fred Farrar and "U.S. Nike X: A Two-Barreled ICBM Hunter," both of which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 21, 1967:

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE DEFENSE SHAPING UP AS BIG 1968 ISSUE—INEFFECTIVE, McNAMARA ASSERTS, BUT JOINT CHIEFS WANT IT

(By Fred Farrar)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—One of the major issues in the 1968 Presidential campaign will be whether the United States should build an anti-ballistic missile defense system to protect its cities.

Russia appears to be building such a defense network. Many voices including those of the joint chiefs of staff, have said that there is no choice but to do likewise or be left at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara reasons otherwise.

He estimate it would cost a minimum of 40 billion dollars to build an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system that would protect United States population centers. He contends the money would be largely wasted.

To build such a defense without also constructing a nationwide system of shelters at additional billions is pointless, he said. The shelters would protect the public from radioactive fallout from enemy missiles and from the nuclear warheads an ABM system would use to destroy the enemy missiles in flight.

The way McNamara sees it, and ABM defense cannot be completely effective in stopping an intercontinental ballistic missile attack.

May 25, 1967

The result, he figures, is that up to 120 million Americans would die in an all-out Russian missile attack no matter how extensive an ABM defense the United States could build.

SOVIETS WOULD REACT

His prediction of 120 million fatalities is based on the assumption that the Soviet Union would respond to the United States building of an ABM system by increasing its missile force.

His calculations also show that without an American ABM system, and given the number of missiles Russia now has, American casualties would still reach 120 million in an all-out soviet missile attack.

If the U.S.S.R. did not increase its missile force, McNamara's figures show, an ABM defense would keep American fatalities to about 30 million.

JOINT BAN SOUGHT

His alternative, and so far President Johnson appears to be going along with him, is to get the Soviet Union to agree that both sides would not build ABM defenses.

This, he says, would maintain the status quo of both sides having the capability to destroy each other and, for this reason, both would hesitate to initiate an all-out nuclear war. And, he says, both sides would save enormous sums of money.

The Soviet Union has indicated that it is willing to enter into such talks. If the talks should fail, McNamara would spend 5 billion dollars to build a skeleton ABM system that would protect American offensive missile sites.

THREAT OF RETALIATION

He would do this to impress on the soviets that the United States would protect its capability to destroy the Soviet Union should it launch its missiles against the United States. For this purpose, 375 million dollars has been included in the proposed 1968 fiscal year defense budget for the initial steps in building such a system.

Meanwhile McNamara wants to improve the offensive missile force to protect the United States' edge over the Soviet Union in deliverable nuclear warheads. As of March, the United States had 1,628 intercontinental missiles to Russia's 470.

McNamara told Congress earlier this year in testimony on the country's military posture that "the foundation of our security is the deterrence of a soviet nuclear attack."

STRENGTH IS VITAL

"We believe," he said, "such an attack can be prevented if it is understood by the soviets that we possess strategic nuclear forces so powerful as to be capable of absorbing a soviet first strike and surviving with sufficient strength to impose unacceptable damage upon them.

"We have such power today. We must maintain it in the future, adjusting our forces to offset actual or potential changes in theirs."

Building an ABM defense network won't, by itself, protect the United States against a nuclear missile attack by Russia, McNamara believes, because no matter how effective the ABM defense is some warheads would slip thru. And for the same reason, a soviet ABM defense could not guarantee the soviets immunity from an American retaliatory attack.

As a result, McNamara's reasoning goes, the only effective way for either nation to avoid a nuclear missile attack is to have enough missiles not only to break thru any ABM defense the other might install but also to inflict enough damage to destroy it "as a viable 20th century nation."

McNamara predicted that if the United States builds an ABM defense, it would force the soviets to increase their offensive missile force in order to penetrate it.

This in turn, he said, would force the

United States to further increase its offensive force at awesome expense to maintain America's lead in deliverable warheads.

OFFENSE OUR DEFENSE

So, McNamara says, let the soviets build an ABM defense for their cities if they still insist on it after, and if, the talks are held. But the United States, he reasoned, should content itself with an ABM system that protects its offensive missiles only—at a saving of 35 billion dollars—while relying on its stepped-up offensive missile capability to protect its cities by deterring the U.S.S.R. from launching an attack.

It all sounds logical and "cost effective" [McNamara's guiding policy of getting the most defense for the least amount of money], and it would seem to be the best answer to the ABM dilemma—if McNamara is right.

The joint chiefs of staff, the military professionals charged with insuring the defense of the country, have long favored the development and building of an American ABM defense.

WHEELER URGES SYSTEM

In testimony last January before the armed services committee and the department of defense appropriations subcommittee of the Senate, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, again asked Congress for money to start work on an ABM system that would at least protect the 25 biggest cities in the country.

Wheeler said there is no doubt within the intelligence community that the Soviet Union is indeed building an ABM system and "will probably extend and improve their ABM defenses over the coming years."

"Should the soviets come to believe," he said, "that their ballistic missile defense, coupled with a nuclear attack on the United States, would limit damage to the Soviet Union to a level acceptable to them, whatever that level is, our forces would no longer deter, and the first principle of our security policy is gone."

THREAT OF ATTACK

Wheeler went on to say that "lack of a deployed United States ABM increases the possibilities of a nuclear war" being triggered either by accident or by a third country.

He also said that failure to build an ABM defense would create a strategic imbalance "both within our forces and between the United States and the Soviet Union."

"I could lead," Wheeler said, "to soviet and allied belief that we are interested only in the offensive—that is, a first strike—or that our technology is deficient, or that we will not pay to maintain strategic superiority. We also believe that damage to the United States from a nuclear strike can be reduced by an ABM system in a meaningful way."

HIGH COST FOR RUSSIA

In congressional testimony last year Wheeler dealt with the contention that the soviets would be able to penetrate any ABM defense the United States might build.

"This is quite true," he said. "But this is going to be a very costly process for them. They will have to leave uncovered certain targets in order to penetrate successfully other targets.

"I believe the American people can afford this defense. I have recommended this consistently over a number of years, and I must say that my colleagues join me in this recommendation [while] recognizing the limitations. . . ."

The joint chiefs of staff also believe that in the final analysis the effectiveness of our offensive missiles as a deterrent depends on the state of mind they create in the soviet leadership.

If the soviets are convinced the United States can inflict more than acceptable damage on them, they probably would be deterred from attacking.

COMMITTEE INDORSES MOVE

Sentiment also is strong on Capitol Hill for going ahead with an ABM defense. On March 16, the Senate armed services committee unanimously went on record as recommending a start on constructing an ABM defense if the talks with the Soviet Union fail.

Conceding that an ABM defense would be expensive, Sen. Richard Russell [D., Ga.], committee chairman, said that "if it saves some 20 to 40 million lives it would be worth it."

CITE LOWER COST

Meanwhile, military leaders say privately that studies done within the military establishment show that an ABM defense that would give the United States almost complete protection can be built for 20 to 25 billion dollars instead of the 40 billions quoted by McNamara.

There is another question that disturbs informed persons who do not share McNamara's views on the futility of an ABM defense and the wisdom of relying on deterrence to ward off an attack. They are concerned with persistent reports that the soviets have learned how to use the X-ray effect from high-yield [up to 60 megatons] high altitude nuclear blasts to render incoming missiles harmless.

It was revealed last week that earlier this year Dr. John S. Foster Jr., director of research and engineering in the defense department, told Congress in closed session that the United States is developing a system for using the X-ray effect in its ABM system if it is ever built.

SOVIETS HAVE ADVANTAGE

However, our scientists do not have the advantage of the knowledge the soviets gained from their high altitude tests, and the test ban treaty now prevents the United States from making such tests of its own.

The "hardened" underground silos, which protect America's Minuteman I ICBMs, were designed to withstand nuclear blasts 2,000 to 2,500 feet away. This was considered adequate protection when they were built because it was doubtful if the soviets could come much closer with their missiles.

But now it is considered conceivable that within five years the soviets will be able to drop a warhead within 600 feet of a Minuteman silo.

MISSILES ON TRUCKS

It is apparently in recognition of this that the air force has revived a plan to put some ICBM missiles on trucks or railroad flatcars. These would in effect be mobile missile sites, which the soviets would have difficulty hitting.

Another question mark is whether the U.S.S.R. will ever agree to a ban on ABM defenses. One expert on the nuclear confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union doubts that the soviets would. He points out that the foundation of their military thinking has always been to put defense first.

And, he adds, even if the soviets were convinced that they didn't need an ABM system to defend themselves against the United States, they would still want one to defend against any possible missile attack by Red China.

U.S. NIKE X: A TWO-BARRELED ICBM HUNTER

Washington, May 20—If the United States builds an anti-ballistic missile defense, it would consist of a double-barreled system called the Nike-X.

One barrel would send nuclear-tipped guided missiles 400 miles into space to intercept and destroy enemy intercontinental ballistic missiles before they reach the United States shoreline.

The other would send out smaller and faster, but still nuclear-tipped, guided mis-

May 25, 1967

siles to try to destroy enemy ICBMs missed by the first barrel.

REPLACEMENT FOR NIKE

The first barrel is the Spartan missile system. The 48-foot long Spartan is a much improved version of the Nike Hercules anti-aircraft missile now deployed around Chicago and other major cities and military installations. Its job is to protect the country as a whole.

The second barrel would be loaded with the Sprint missiles system. The Sprint is a 27-foot-long, cone-shaped rocket capable of speeds up to 17,000 miles an hour.

Its job is to protect individual cities by intercepting enemy ICBMs 10 to 20 miles above the earth. To do this it would be deployed around the select cities.

FAVOR 50 CITIES

The decision as to what cities, if any, would get this protection has not been made. But the joint chiefs of staff would like to see at least the country's 25 largest cities protected, if not the 50 largest.

But the missiles are only a part of the Nike-X system. Possibly even more important would be the sophisticated radar complex that would be required to get the missiles on target.

One radar component, the multifunction array radar, would detect and track incoming missiles and separate the real warheads from dummy warheads sent along for the purpose of confusing United States defenses. With the help of computers, it would do all this at dazzling speed.

The second component, the missile site radar, would take data from the computers and lead the Spartan and Sprint missiles to their targets.

Since 1956 the United States has spent 2.5 billion dollars in research and development work on the Nike-X system, and another 440 million dollars for further development is included in the budget for the coming fiscal year.

"EVIL" RHODESIA THRIVES AMID "DEMOCRACIES" FALL

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, many attempts have been made to sum up the importance of disassociating the United States from the mandatory sanctions imposed by the United Nations against Rhodesia.

Many times Members of the House and the Senate have taken the floor to point out the gross injustices of these actions—actions by the United Nations and the United States which were promulgated in the name of justice.

Many times the case of the Rhodesians has been brought to the attention of Members of Congress and through the press to the people of the United States.

Before turning to another excellent article which succinctly sums up the dilemma in which this administration has embroiled the American people, let me again say that our present sanctions against Rhodesia are ridiculing the principles of democracy for which this country has stood over many years. They are a travesty upon the United States, the United Nations, they are dangerous, unwarranted, economically stupid, politically motivated, wasteful, and strategically asinine.

The article which I include covers ground which we have seen before, but it does it well enough to warrant attention. It was written for the Phoenix Gazette by Elspeth Huxley.

The article follows:

"EVIL" RHODESIA THRIVES AMID "DEMOCRACIES" FALL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Rhodesia, an admittedly imperfect democracy, has been reprimanded and boycotted by the black dictatorships of Africa, and by Britain and the United States because its predominantly white government declared its independence from Britain. In this controversial article, a member of the famous Huxley family denounces the hypocrisy—and cruelty—of America's sanctimonious stand. Elspeth Huxley is the author of "With Forks and Hope," "On the Edge of the Rift," "The Flame Trees of Thika," and other books on Africa.)

(By Elspeth Huxley)

LONDON (NANA).—When Britain pulled out of Africa, she equipped each of her former colonies with a tidy suit, cut in the latest Westminster style, of democratic institutions—free elections, one-man-one-vote, parliaments, loyal oppositions, the lot.

Today only two out of twelve, Kenya and Zambia, retain even a semblance, already drastically altered, of this democratic outfit. The rest have gone over either to military uniforms or to styles designed for rulers of single-party states. A rigid press censorship operates in all of them.

Does the free world condemn Tanzania, Sierra Leone, or Uganda as unconstitutional, undemocratic or otherwise undesirable? Does the free world pass resolutions, apply sanctions, talk of a "return to legality"? Certainly not. The United States and Britain continue to post embassies, exchange treaties, supply experts and give away to them enormous suras of money.

No matter how many elected leaders they assassinate, as in Nigeria; imprison, as in Sierra Leone, no matter how Communist they become, as in Tanzania; nor no matter how much they suppress human rights, govern by decree and force thousands of citizens into exile—they remain fully accredited members of the United Nations.

Ian Smith's Rhodesia is, of course, quite different. It has minority rule. Ergo, it is undemocratic. Rhodesia still, it is true, has a legally elected government; the army confines itself mainly to keeping out terrorists trained in neighboring states by Communist guerrillas to commit acts of sabotage; people go about their business freely and the two racial communities, African and European, mingle in the legislative assembly, in the mixed-race university, and in hotels and other public places.

Nevertheless, says Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson, Smith is a "rebel"; his government is illegal, and his cabinet of rather stodgy tobacco farmers and middle-class businessmen constitutes "a threat to world peace." So all the nations of the world must ostracize this wicked country and refuse to buy its tobacco, chrome, copper, meat and other products or sell it oil, machinery, or anything else. Its 4,250,000 people need to sustain their muttonous lives. Wicked Rhodesia!

At the start of this Wilson-Smith dispute, Rhodesia's wickedness was said to consist in a white minority of 230,000 ruling a black majority of just over four million. (Had the ruling minority been black, no one would have worried.) But this issue has long ago been overlaid by quite another matter. It was not much of an issue in any case, because under Rhodesia's constitution, it is only a matter of time before the white voters are outnumbered by black ones on the same roll. But the present dispute has nothing to do even with the pace of African political ad-

vancement. It is about the "legality" of the Smith government in Salisbury, nothing more.

By making his unilateral declaration of independence in November 1965, Smith became, technically, a "rebel." This was because he did not wait for a member of the British royal family to come and haul down the Union Jack and hoist a different flag to the tunes of a prize-winning national anthem and the accompaniment of a lot of speeches, saluting and tribal dancing, essential features of the now well-worn ritual of gaining independence in Africa.

Rhodesia had in fact enjoyed virtual independence for 40 years. It was never under Britain's colonial office, but under the commonwealth relations office which handled self-governing countries like Canada, Australia and India. When Smith and Wilson, after prolonged negotiations, culminating in abortive talks on the cruiser "Tiger," failed to agree about the pace (not the fact) of African enfranchisement, Smith jumped the gun.

So now his government is illegal. That is what sticks in Wilson's gullet. And that is what the U.N. sanctions are all about: Not justice to Africans, but a "return to legality" by Smith.

How many Americans, in wonder, realize that they have been pushed into supporting a policy more or less the same as that of George III and Lord North? If Smith had been prepared to kneel before Governor Sir Humphrey Gibb in Salisbury to say "I have sinned," and to hand over all the powers of his government to Wilson to dispose of as he thought fit, we should have heard nothing about sanctions. It was because Smith refused so to humble and humiliate not only himself, but the people who elected and now support him, that the U.S. has found itself embroiled in sanctions against Rhodesia.

I wonder, too, how many Americans have thought through to what this policy would mean if it succeeded. Its aim is to ruin the economy of one of the very few comparatively peaceful, prosperous and efficiently governed countries left in Africa. Things in Rhodesia are far from perfect but they are even farther from the chaos that prevails elsewhere.

In Sudan, an 11-year-old civil war has killed or driven into exile probably about half of the Negro population of the south who have rebelled against their northern Arab rulers.

The once-powerful federation of Nigeria, giant among African states, is on the road to dissolution following intertribal massacres on a scale that called for the bulldozing of corpses into communal graves.

The Congo now under military rule, is still in ferment. Uganda's single-party ruler, Milton Obote sits on a powderkeg of communal strife. There have been five recent military coups among the French-speaking African nations. And so on.

Law and order are such rare commodities in modern Africa that deliberately to set out to destroy them seems, to say the least, a bit muddleheaded.

And that does "ruining the economy" mean in human terms? Quite bluntly, it means starvation. We all know that large parts of the world are hungry, and are getting hungrier as populations draw ahead of food resources. One-third of the people in the world are underfed. Last year, for the first time, the increase in world food production failed to keep pace with the increase in population.

Some nations, like the United States, feed themselves and export their surpluses to help feed the hungry. On a small scale, Rhodesia is one of these. It feeds its own people pretty adequately and exports, among other things, meat and cereals. There are great potentialities for raising more beef. Meat is one of the United Nations' mandatory sanctions. No one may buy Rhodesian beef. So, by U.N. de-