

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Rutherford M. Poats, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development;

John C. Bullitt, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development; and

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack B. Weinstein, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

ORDER FOR YEA-AND-NAY VOTE ON CONVENTION, EXECUTIVE C, 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the convention, which will be voted on after the morning business is concluded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may further impose on the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], may I be recognized for 2 minutes?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON DECLARES A DECADE OF URGENCY FOR THE THE AMERICAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his speech to the Latin American heads of state at Punta del Este, President Johnson reaffirmed our commitment to be creative partners in hemispheric development.

I warmly commend the President. For, in his words:

In unity—and only in unity—is our strength.

And hemispheric unity is closer to realization today than at any time in recent history.

The President outlined the work ahead: The creation of "a great new common market;" the expansion in volume and value of Latin American exports; the initiation of "great multinational projects that will open up the inner frontiers of Latin America;" and modernizing agriculture and sharing the blessings of science and technology.

The President pledged his leadership to help the hemisphere meet these challenges.

Let us now declare—

He said—
the next ten years the Decade of Urgency.

I believe the people of the Americas will join with President Johnson to match our resources with our resolve to bring a new era of growth and opportunity to the promising lands of Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the President's memorable address.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1967]
TEXT OF JOHNSON'S SPEECH AT URUGUAY CONFERENCE

First, President Gestido, may I express, on behalf of my entire delegation, gratitude to you for the courtesy and generosity that Uruguay has offered her sister nations at this conference. We have come to Punta del Este as the leaders of 20 governments—and as the trustees for more than 400 million human beings.

We meet in a city where, five and a half years ago, an Alliance was formed, a pledge made and a dream begun. Now we must measure the progress we have made. We must name the barriers that will stand between us and the fulfillment of our dream. Then we must put in motion plans that will set us firmly on the way toward the proud destiny that is our peoples' right.

We meet as friends, as neighbors, as allies. Hundreds of years ago we were the New World. Now each of us faces the problems of growing maturity, of industrialization, of rapid urban growth, of sharing the opportunities of life among all our people.

A CONTRACTING HEMISPHERE

We no longer inhabit a new world. We cannot escape from our problems, as the first Americans could, in the vastness of an uncharted hemisphere. If we are to grow and prosper, we must face the problems of our maturity. And we must do it boldly, wisely—and now.

If we do, we can create a new America where the best in man may flourish in freedom and dignity. If we neglect the planning, if we ignore the commitments that it requires, if our rhetoric is not followed by action, we shall fail not only the Americans of this generation but hundreds of millions to come.

In unity—and only in unity—is our strength. The barriers that deny the dream of a new America are stronger than the strongest among us—acting alone. But they cannot stand against our combined will and common effort.

"A NATION COMMITTED"

I speak to you as a ready partner in that effort. I represent a nation committed by history, by national interest and by simple friendship to the cause of progress in Latin America. But the assistance of my nation will be useful only as it reinforces your determination and builds on your achievements, and only as it is bound to the growing unity of our hemisphere.

Here, as I see it, are the tasks before us: First, you will be forging a great new common market—expanding your industrial base, increasing your participation in world trade and broadening economic opportunities for your people.

I have already made my position clear to our Congress: If Latin America decides to create a common market, I shall recommend to the Congress a substantial contribution to a fund that will help ease the transition into an integrated regional economy.

TO OPEN INNER FRONTIERS

Second, you will design, and join together to build, great multinational projects that will open up the inner frontiers of Latin America. These will provide, at last, the physical basis for Simón Bolívar's vision of continental unity.

I shall ask my country to provide, over a three-year period, substantial additional funds for the Inter-American Bank's funds for special operations, as our part of this special effort. I have also asked the Export-Import Bank to give urgent and sympathetic attention, wherever it is economically feasible, to loans for earth stations that will bring satellite communications to Latin America.

Third, I know how hard you are striving to expand the volume and value of Latin-American export. Bilateral and multilateral efforts to achieve this are already under way. But I made clear yesterday afternoon in our private session that we are prepared to consider a further step in international trade policy.

We are ready to explore with other industrialized countries, and with our people, the possibilities of temporary preferential tariff advantages for all developing countries in the markets of all the industrialized countries. We are also prepared to make our contribution to additional shared efforts in connection with the International Coffee Agreement.

Fourth, all of us know that modernizing agriculture and increasing its productivity is an urgent task for Latin America, as it is for the whole world. Modernizing education is equally important. I have already urged our Government to expand our bilateral assistance in the fields of agriculture and education.

NEW ROLE FOR TECHNOLOGY

Fifth, you are engaged in bringing to Latin-American life all that can be used from the common fund of modern science and technology. In addition to the additional resources we shall seek in the field of education, we are prepared to join with Latin-American nations in:

Creating an inter-American training center for educational broadcasting, and supporting a pilot educational-television demonstration project in a Central-American country.

Establishing a new inter-American foundation for science and technology.

Developing a regional program of marine science and technology.

Exploring a Latin-American regional program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

MUCH DEPENDS ON HEALTH

Sixth, the health of the people of Latin America ultimately depends on everything we do to modernize the life of the region. But we must never forget that when children are not provided with adequate and balanced diets, they are permanently affected as human beings and as citizens.

Therefore, we propose to increase our food program for preschool children in Latin America, and substantially improve our school-lunch programs. We are also prepared to set up in Latin America a demonstration center in the field of fish protein concentrates. We believe that this essential ingredient of a balanced diet can be provided at much lower cost than in the past.

April 14, 1967

S 5186

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

U.S. COLLEGES TO HELP

Finally, I shall urge that funds be provided to help establish Alliance for Progress centers at colleges and universities in the United States.

Our partnership must be based on respect for our various cultures and civilizations. And respect is built on knowledge. This new education program will offer new opportunities for students and educators of your countries and mine to work together.

Our discussions here are couched in the technical terms of trade and development policies. But beyond these impersonal terms stands the reality of individual men, women and children. It is for them, not for the statisticians and economists, that we work. It is for them, and especially for the young, that the hope and the challenge of the alliance exists.

"CLEANING OUT REDTAPE"

For them, we must move forward from this hour, producing more food, developing more trade, taking on the hard problems of tax reform and land reform, creating new jobs and economic opportunities, cleaning out the red tape and acting with the sense of urgency our times require—and above all, following through on the plans we make.

I pledge to you today that I will do all I can, in my time of leadership, to help you meet these challenges."

One of the first groups I met with after I became President was composed of your ambassadors to Washington. From that time to this, I have accelerated America's commitment to the Alliance, by increasing substantially the contribution of my country by more than 35 per cent of the previous three years.

I know what is at stake for you and my country in Latin America. And I know that the clock is ticking. I know that the dream of the new America will not wait. I know that you sense the same urgency, the same need for speedy decision and effective action in your country as in mine.

A WORD TO THE YOUNG

My fellow Presidents, I should like to conclude by speaking not only to you but to the youth of our nations, to the students in the schools and universities, to the young people on the farms and in the new factories and labor unions and in the civil service of our Governments, to all those who are moving into their time of responsibility.

This is the message I bring to them: All that has been dreamed, in the years since this alliance started, can only come to pass if your hearts and minds become committed to it. It is our duty, we who hold public office and bear great private responsibilities today, to create an environment in which you can build your part of the new America.

It is your duty to prepare yourselves now, to use the tools of learning, command the idealism that is your national heritage, for the human purposes that lie deep in our common civilization.

You cry out for change for what Franklin Roosevelt called a New Deal. And you do not want it imposed from above. You want a chance to help share the conditions of your lives. You, the youth of the Americas, should know that revolutions of fire have brought men in this hemisphere, and in jungles half the world away, still greater tyrannies than those they fought to cast off.

PACE OF CHANGE TOO SLOW

Here in the countries of the Alliance, a peaceful revolution has affirmed man's ability to change the conditions of his life through the institution of democracy. In your hands is the task of carrying it forward.

The pace of change is not fast enough. It will remain too slow unless you join your

energies and skills and commitments in a mighty effort that extends into the farthest reaches of your hemisphere.

The time is now. The responsibility is ours. Let us declare the next 10 years the Decade of Urgency. Let us match our resolve and our resources to the common tasks until the dream of a new America is accomplished in the lives of all our people.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 15 minutes.

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

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK. I have the floor. Does the Senator wish me to yield to him?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought the Senator was finished.

Mr. CLARK. I have 15 minutes by unanimous consent but I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. President on yesterday, I said that so far as I was concerned the vote on the problem that the average citizen should be permitted to vote one dollar to finance a presidential campaign was just one skirmish in a big battle and that the struggle is not over at all. As a matter of fact, those who were opposing my position yesterday arranged to express their situation in a rush to get to a vote, since they had all their people here at a time when some of my supporters were not here.

I have analyzed the vote. Had every Senator been in his seat, knowing what I know about their votes on this subject, I believe I would have won yesterday on a vote of 50 to 50 with the Vice President presiding prepared to vote with me.

I recognize the fact that there are one or two Senators who would have voted with me merely to give the committee the opportunity to study the matter and report its recommendations, not agreeing necessarily on the general issue itself. But, inasmuch as it appeared that their vote would not have done any good, anyway, they did not vote with me.

This is a big issue. It needs study. It needs consideration. I am still firmly of the view that the answer to the problem is to move ahead toward good government and not move backward.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much for yielding to me at this time.

ARM
THIRTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR WHOM?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most interesting article published in the New Republic magazine for March 1967, and written by Frederic W. Collins, dealing with the subject of "\$30 Billion for Whom?—Politics, Profits and the Antimissile Missile."

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

THIRTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR WHOM?—POLITICS, PROFITS AND THE ANTIMISSILE MISSILE

(By Frederic W. Collins)

(NOTE.—Frederic W. Collins, Washington correspondent for 25 years, is a columnist for the Ridder newspapers.)

The Secretary of Defense thinks it would be foolish to spend billions on an antiballistic missile defense (ABM), and President Johnson said on February 17 that it would be "another costly and futile escalation of the arms race." But pressures for the contrary view are strong and getting stronger, and their source is not just the Joint Chiefs. We should all be grateful to Arthur Wiserberger and Co., which on February 4, 1967, published in the financial section of *The New York Times* this revealing advertisement:

"NIKE-X \$30 BILLION FOR WHOM?"

"If the US deploys its Nike-X defense, \$30 billion could flow into certain electronics, missile and computer companies. The impact would be enormous.

"About \$2.4 billion has already been spent on Nike-X development. Some companies are benefiting from this spending now, are likely to continue benefiting even if the program remains in the R&D stage, and could profit handsomely if a full-scale program is approved. Among the companies involved: Aercjet, AT&T, Ampex, Avco, Brown, Burroughs, Control Data, Douglas, Ford, GCA, General Dynamics, General Electric, General Telephone, Hercules, IT&T, Kaman Aircraft, LTV, Lockheed, Martin Marietta, Melpar, Microwave Associates, Northrop, Radiation Inc., Raytheon, Sperry Rand, Thiokol, Varian, Westinghouse.

"Nine of these stocks have been selected for analysis in a 24-page special issue of the Wiesenberger Investment Report (WIR). The issue assesses each of the nine companies for its investment value apart from Nike-X, for its prospects as a Nike-X beneficiary, and for the relative leverage Nike-X might provide.

"This special issue is yours for just \$5—or as a bonus with a low-cost trial subscription to WIR. We offer it as evidence that WIR is a service you should be reading regularly—as do many bankers, brokers and fund managers who invest billions of dollars of other people's money. You need only mail the coupon."

There is a most interesting and deeply educational exercise which can be carried out with that list as a basis. The first step is to check out the plant locations of the companies. The resulting sketch map of their production geography can then be developed into a map of their political potential in specific detail.

License was taken to permit two amendments of the published list. I consider McDonnell Aircraft to be implicit in the list because of its kinship of interest with Douglas. AT&T was put aside because to have included it would have smothered all the other detail. Through its connection with Western Electric, prime contractor, it ties into what the Pentagon says are "several thousand firms in nearly every state in the Union" sharing contract awards as subcontractors and vendors.

Those amendments noted, the companies on the list have, among them, more than 300 plants, and at a conservative estimate, at least one million employees. These plants are spread through 42 states, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The only states not included are Alaska, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota and Vermont. Plant locations can be correlated with individual congressional districts. The districts count up to 172.

From this analysis it is fair to derive the statement that these companies might feel

April 14, 1967

justified in asking the sympathetic attention of 84 out of 100 members of the United States Senate and 172 out of 435 members of the House of Representatives.

There is necessarily a certain amount of impressionism in this political map-making. In large cities like Los Angeles, or Chicago, or New York, congressional district lines wriggle around telephone poles and manhole covers in such a way that precise correlation with plant locations is more trouble than that particular part of the task is worth. In such cases, doubt has been resolved by tagging fewer rather than additional districts; the total is thus on the low rather than the high side.

Too, not every plant of every company can be supposed to be engaged in work connected with ABM. A Hercules plant making chemicals for sewage treatment has less direct interest in intercepting missiles than a Hercules plant making rocket propellant, and so on with Thokol, Raytheon and the rest. However, the principle is invoked that what's good for General Motors is good for General Motors in each and all of its many mansions, and vice versa.

The advertised list is beyond question a description of a concentration of political power on a scale difficult to grasp, and despite its magnitude, normally unobserved because it so rarely resolves itself into a single, unified, coherent entity easily visible to the naked eye of the general public.

A VARIETY OF POLITICAL PATTERNS

Once extracted, the basic elements can be arranged and rearranged in a fascinating variety of political patterns. Sperry Rand, for example, can say with justifiable pride that it occupies 90 plants in 22 states. Even leaving out the electric shaver and farm equipment divisions, Sperry Rand counts plants in 19 states (38 senators) and 32 congressional districts (32 representatives). General Telephone & Electronics claims 45 manufacturing plants in 13 states in a 1965 report.

California has the greatest number of plants derivable from the advertised list, at least 55, in at least 25 congressional districts. The heroic figure there seems to be Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb of the 24th district, with six plants of five companies: Two Aerojet Generals, Burroughs, McDonnell, McDonnell-Hycon, General Dynamics. Perhaps this high concentration of interested parties has no influence on Mr. Lipscomb's judgment. At any rate, he told his constituents in his January 30 newsletter that, "The Soviets have continued their development of long-range missile capabilities and missile defenses. They have in fact begun to deploy certain anti-missile defenses. In my opinion, the threat from world communism is not eased and it is of utmost importance that we maintain a decisive superiority in both offensive and defensive weapons." Right behind Mr. Lipscomb are three men with five plants: Charles E. Wiggins in the 25th (three Aerojet Generals, McDonnell-Hycon, Hercules); Alphonzo Bell in the 28th (Douglas, Lockheed, two Northrops and a Sperry Rand; Mr. Bell is soliciting the opinion of his constituents in the matter); and Charles S. Gubser in the 10th, with two Lockheeds, a Westinghouse, a Varian, and a Raytheon.

The king of them all seems to be Representative P. Bradford Morse of the Massachusetts fifth district, with nine plants (although only four companies) from the advertised list: three Avcos, two GCAs, three Raytheons and an LTV-Ling-Altec Inc. This is in some ways encouraging. Morse, who has been silent so far on the ABM controversy, is counted among the really good men in the House; his qualities provide some evidence that the political system may have a tensile strength not hopelessly inadequate to the stresses generated by the rise of the military-industrial complex.

It is significant that among the companies listed, a great many are quite new. Some are

coeval with the space age; others were little more than corporate husks until they gained weight from the nourishments of aerospace spending. This Jack-and-the-Beanstalk attribute of sudden growth prompts reminder that until Dwight Eisenhower's Presidency there did not exist (a point he himself made) "this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" against which he warned in his valedictory of January 17, 1961. Rereading that passage gives further reminder that to relate the political power of the military-industrial complex only to Congress is to tell only part of the story. "The total influence," he said, "... economic, political, even spiritual... is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government."

So, on a President's say-so, and with our list, we can conceive of some community of interest between those companies and 42 governors, and the officials of 257 towns and cities—mayors, city and town managers, city and town councils—and heaven knows how many members of state legislatures. In California, there are 46 cities and towns whose local interests are intertwined with the interests of firms on the list; in Massachusetts, 22; in New York, 20; in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, 16; in Connecticut, 13; in Michigan and Virginia, 12.

The political relationship is not, of course, one with the officeholders on one side and lonely, friendless companies on the other. This is a situation, for instance, in which labor unions find alliance with management natural. Pounding on political doors to keep the government business coming is a skill the unions mastered in the ancient days when government arsenals turned out the weaponry and there was no third party, private industry, involved. For the sake of the cause, also, the support of citizens who pay the bills is sought—if conscripted is not the word—by all the arts of public relations. (It may be noted that at least two of the companies on the list, Avco and Westinghouse, include broadcasting among their connections, and ITT's passionate yearning for the American Broadcasting Co. is front-page news.) Not to be forgotten are the advertising battles in which contractors seek to prove that their particular line of miracles surpasses all others. This activity is always on the threshold of scandalizing the public, and our friends in the Nike-X community have just been told by the Pentagon to knock it off until policies and appropriations have been thrashed out.

And to the roster of friends of an antiballistic missile defense there can also be added the shareholders—investors and speculators—in numbers untold.

Finally, in a game this big, there is a tremendous ploy available to industry, thanks to the Pentagon. In this case it occurs as a list of the cities to be protected. There are two lists: one of 25 cities to be favored if a "thin" defense is decided upon, another of 25 more cities to be included if a "thick" defense is undertaken. This kind of name-dropping by the Pentagon generates a fierce determination on the part of other cities to be included, with a commensurate expansion of the political pressure in behalf of an "adequate" anti-ballistic missile.

The conventions of fair discussion in this country require that parties of interest be credited with an overriding concern for the national welfare. But the vision of \$30 billion must disorient even the noblest entrepreneur. His only hope of keeping himself whole lies in rationalizing a compatibility between the national safety and entrepreneurial interest. Where he has worked this out he is in shape to answer that big question: \$30 billion for whom?

To ponder the meaning of the ad is to marvel again at the prescience of Mr. Eisen-

hower: "Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together." On January 17, 1961, the wildest dream would not have pictured a serious effort in 1967 to obtain by peaceful methods the peaceful goal of reciprocal US-Soviet self-denial in anti-missile deployment. Realistically, the firms on the advertised list cannot be expected to do other than pin their hopes on hardware rather than diplomacy. The golden prize has been put on display in the Treasury window with that teasing legend: \$30 billion for whom?

In the good old days it used to be said, "The tariff is a local issue." Now, in 42 states, 172 congressional districts, and 257 communities—before we even add the Pentagon's "several thousand firms in nearly every state in the Union," and late entries from the Pentagon's thick and thin lists—it may be said that "Nike-X is a local issue." Whether that many local pressures, skillfully marshaled by professionals in the task, can override a President and a Secretary of Defense is the current cliff-hanger.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to me, this article is a devastating exposure of why some of the largest firms and corporations in the United States of America are anxious to have us deploy an antiballistic missile system which, in my opinion, would be doing a grave disservice to our foreign relations in general, and our relations with the Soviet Union in particular.

It would not—I repeat, not—give this country significant additional protection against an antiballistic missile attack on an intercontinental basis directed against us by the Soviet Union.

GRENVILLE CLARK—LEGACY OF A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a recent issue of McCall's magazine contains an interview with the late Grenville Clark, entitled, "The Legacy of a Great American."

It consists of a dialogue in question and answer form between the interviewer from McCall's magazine and Mr. Clark, which took place shortly before Mr. Clark's death. This is a most illuminating and interesting article on the views on a number of matters of great importance, including world peace through world law, of the late Grenville Clark who was, in my opinion, a very great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LEGACY OF A GREAT AMERICAN (An interview with Grenville Clark)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Grenville Clark was the founder and leader of the worldwide movement that can best be described as an attack on war. His proposals for the setting up of a world government, operating under world law, to support an enforced system of disarmament, in parallel with the development of other world institutions to create a peaceful world, have been published in twelve languages, including Russian and Chinese. Entitled "World Peace Through World Law," Mr. Clark's plan (prepared in collaboration with Harvard professor Louis B. Sohn) has been hailed as "the greatest contribution of

the American profession of law to world peace." For it Mr. Clark was given the American Bar Association Gold Medal, its highest award.

(Born in New York City in 1882, Grenville Clark attended Harvard Law School with Franklin D. Roosevelt. He excelled in rowing, running, boxing, racket games, golf, shooting. He had been duck hunting early in the morning before tape-recording this interview.

(As a young lawyer, he formed, with Elihu Root, Jr., what was to become one of the country's most prestigious law firms. In addition to serving his country—as a private citizen—in two world wars and during the Depression, Mr. Clark served as a member of that select body the President and Fellows of Harvard College, was instrumental in forming the Civil Liberties Committee of the American Bar Association, and was one of the founders of United World Federalists. He held the Distinguished Service Medal and the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Medal and honorary LL.D. degrees from Harvard, Princeton and Dartmouth. At the time of his death earlier this year, an editorial in the New York "Times" characterized Mr. Clark as "one of the great private citizens of his time." Shortly before, a number of prominent persons here and abroad had joined in advocating Mr. Clark for the next Nobel Peace Prize.

(Interviewer Richard D. Heffner is University Professor of Communications and Public Policy at Rutgers, author of "A Documentary History of the United States" and editor of Alexis de Tocqueville's "Democracy in America.")

INTERVIEWER. It has often been said that without your single-handed efforts—as a private citizen—America could never have sent such an effective fighting force to France in World War I and that the Selective Service Act, which you drafted and steered through Congress, "shortened World War II by two or three years." When did you decide that disputes between countries could no longer be settled by military means?

CLARK. I began thinking about it before World War II and had already written a plan for peace in 1939, but this work had to be put aside when the Secretary of War, Henry Stimson—whose appointment I had been instrumental in arranging—asked me to come to Washington. "You got me into this," he said. "Now you must come down here to help me out." So I did and stayed on for nearly four years. When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, Stimson phoned me to come immediately to his office and asked me to draft a declaration of war.

INTERVIEWER. When did you first issue what amounted to a declaration *against* war?

CLARK. I'll come to that in a minute. There's a little background to it. In July, 1944, after the invasion of Normandy, Stimson said to me, "This war is now almost over, as you and I know. It will go on another year, perhaps, which can't be helped. But the end of it is absolutely certain. It will stop soon after this new bomb goes off. The result will be so horrible that it will stop the war almost instantly."

He then said, "What you should do is go home and try to figure out a way to stop the next war and all future wars."

INTERVIEWER. He said, "Stop the next war"?

CLARK. Yes. "Stop the next war and all future wars," he said. "That is the great thing. I won't live long enough to do much about it, but you should try to keep alive and do something effective to solve the problem."

"That's when I got started. I wrote my first article on the subject, entitled "A New World Order—the American Lawyer's Role," as soon as I got home from Washington. And then, after the atom-bombing of Japan, I realized the United Nations Charter—new as it was—was not adequate to meet the requirements of the coming nuclear period. So, along with

Justice Owen Roberts. I got up a conference of prominent Americans, out of which came a proposal for strengthening the United Nations. Then, in 1950, I received a very pressing invitation from a couple of friends on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to appear before it and to go deeply into my ideas on world peace through world law. My heart was troubling me at the time, and Paul Dudley White told me I mustn't go to Washington, because to testify at length under pressure was the last thing in the world for me to do. So my Senatorial friends suggested I write out my ideas.

Somebody sent a copy of the statement I prepared for the Senate committee to Cass Canfield, of Harper's, who put it out as a book. The sequel is interesting. Senator Ralph Flanders, a friend of mine, read it and phoned me. "I've written a letter to every member of the United States Senate about this book," he said. "I want ninety-five copies of it, and I want them tomorrow morning. Can you get them here tomorrow morning?" So I sent the books by messenger—by plane—to Senator Flanders, and he had them in the morning. He sent them to the other ninety-five Senators with his letter and his own copy to Paul G. Hoffman.

INTERVIEWER. He was head of the Ford Foundation then, wasn't he?

CLARK. Yes, with Robert M. Hutchins as his right-hand man. A couple of days later, Paul Hoffman called me up and said, "Can Bob Hutchins come on and see you?" So Hutchins came up and spent a day with me and said, "We want to give you some money." "Well," I said, "I guess so, but I can get on without it." In general, I don't like to be tied up with anybody. Perhaps that's a fault of mine, not to have obligations to anybody, to a political party or anything. "You won't have any obligations," Hutchins said. "Let us give you some money." "Well," I said, "yes, I guess I will, but money for my own work is not what interests me. What needs to be done is a vast, worldwide campaign, which will require tens of millions of dollars," I said. "I'm talking about twenty-five million or so, you know." "Oh, well, that's nothing," Hutchins said. "Write out your plan."

So I wrote him out a plan for worldwide study of world law. After receiving it, the Ford Foundation invited me, with my late wife, to come to its headquarters in California, for a discussion. I expounded the plan at length, and they questioned me closely for some hours. The foundation's main stated objective at that time was the promotion of peace, and they seemed satisfied with my explanations. Their only suggestion was that it might be *too little* money for the declared purpose and that it ought perhaps to be done on a greater scale.

INTERVIEWER. What went wrong?

CLARK. Soon thereafter Senator Joseph McCarthy came along, and for a combination of reasons, they stalled it. A couple of years went by. Finally, some friends of mine on the foundation's board tipped me off that it was being said that my proposal was contrary to the policy of our government.

John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State, and although he took an entirely different line from mine in most respects, nevertheless he really believed in the concept of enforceable world law to prevent war. I was older than he was, and I'd known him a long time. I remember his saying to me shortly before he took office in January, 1953, "You know very well that I can't do what you think ought to be done. You know me well enough to realize that it is beyond my scope, but perhaps you can do it. For God's sake, try to do so! I'll do what I can, but don't expect too much from me." It was rather pitiful, I thought then and since.

Dulles also said, "I suppose that you think I'm going to make a big failure of the whole thing." "Oh," I said, "not entirely. No. But what's the use of my saying that you

can make a success of it when you don't really intend to go for this thing as your main purpose? What's the use?"

After that, I had no real touch with Dulles until I heard that the Ford Foundation directors were likely to vote my plan down because it was contrary to national policy. I called up Dulles and told him this. He replied, "How shocking! I'll straighten that out. What do you want me to do?" "Well," I said, "I want you to write a strong letter in answer to what I hear is being said—immediately, because the directors are meeting tomorrow morning. Please get it to them, so that your message can be read at the meeting." He said, "All right. I'll do it immediately."

Foster Dulles did, in fact, write a powerful and eloquent letter, saying that he hoped the Ford Foundation would approve my plan. He even called me up the following morning to ask whether I had received the copy of his letter he had sent special delivery. When I said, "Yes," he asked, "Well, what about it? Is it good enough? If it isn't, dictate changes to me right now, and I'll telegraph them to them." He was in that mood. I replied that the letter could not be better.

Well, believe it or not, in spite of all that, the directors voted the plan down by eight to seven. They did give me \$25,000 a year for research and a secretary for five years. They really pushed it on me. But the big plan didn't come off, and no foundation to this day has done anything on an adequate scale for the cause of world order under world law.

INTERVIEWER. Could you sketch briefly the essentials of your plan to make the United Nations a truly effective world organization?

CLARK. Well, the first requirement is a provision prohibiting all nations in the world from possessing armaments, the same as our state and federal laws that prohibit armed groups. There's no state in the Union, and no nation in the world with any pretense to civilization, that permits armed groups in the community—armed to protect themselves as a group or to enforce their will as a group. There are powerful penalties against such armed groups.

INTERVIEWER. How would disarmed nations defend themselves?

CLARK. You can't ask nations to give up all their arms, including nuclear and conventional ones, unless you provide reliable means for protecting the legitimate interests of every country. We are so used to those means in our local communities and states that we are hardly aware that we have them. Now, what are these means?

They are federal, state and local laws against violence. They are courts to interpret and apply those laws, and they are police forces to deter or apprehend violators. Correspondingly, you must have *world* law against international violence, *world* courts and other tribunals to settle disputes between nations, *world* police to prevent or suppress violations of the world law. These are the three basic elements.

INTERVIEWER. You mean the same on a world scale as we have in our own country?

CLARK. Yes, precisely the same as we have in every village, town and city and in every state of the Union. Exactly the same institutions—simply expanded and adapted to a world scale. I think the whole thing is as simple as that.

INTERVIEWER. Do you think there may be something very different between living with these rules on an international level and living with them on a national level?

CLARK. No, I rather think it isn't any more difficult. The reason we haven't made more progress in establishing a world rule of law corresponding to the local and national rule of law is that up to this point, life hasn't been so intolerable for the nations. There have been many terrible wars, but the peoples have gone on.