

November 14, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 5579

legal arm, the merchant is not likely to abuse the rights of the public."

Beyond the economic and legal opportunities that the OEO has generated, there is a special opportunity for participation in and learning about the democratic process of decision-making.

Speaking as a loud voice in how the OEO community service center operates is the target area's Community Action Council. Meeting monthly, as partial fulfillment of the principle of "maximum feasible participation" of the poor, they served as the policy advisory group to all OEO programs operating in that target area.

The CAC has a right to review and make recommendations to the County Human Resources Commission and delegate agencies regarding program goals, progress, impact on the community, program changes, community relations and other appropriate matters.

Meetings are open to the public, and the CAC elects target area community representatives who are to make up the one-third elected target area representation on delegate agency boards of directors.

Some of the topics discussed at one recent meeting of a CAC on the Peninsula were the high school tutorial program, handling of domestic relations cases, policing of teenage children at night in target areas, a community recreation program, and employment.

"Most gratifying aspect of the program," says Mrs. McCrary at San Mateo, "is seeing and helping the young children and the teen-agers. They have pure, honest, unbiased reactions."

Nancy Thurston, director of the Redwood City program, echoes the enthusiasm of Mrs. McCrary.

"The most exciting part of the program is that the people who benefit from the program are working in it."

As Mrs. Thurston pointed out, 75 per cent of the officer staff are in the needy category and a third of the board are potential recipients under the program.

The whole idea of the centers, of course, is to help the poor help themselves.

As Rosenthal put it, "Don't look for instant change. Most of the OEO programs are an investment in human values. Compare the cost of the Vietnam War for three weeks. The amount is about the same as the entire OEO program.

"Society must be willing to invest more in itself. Otherwise, we have a false economy."

The OEO hopes to go further in revitalizing and rebuilding the target areas, and at the same time to discover more about the causes of poverty.

Members, the centers themselves are hardly operating at a luxury level. In fact, George Riley, acting director of the County Human Resources Commission, feels that they have scarcely enough to provide adequate service in the target area.

"Too often," he said, "we have to make a choice of who or what not to include in a program."

The centers are financed 90 per cent through federal OEO funds; the rest is provided by local agencies or individual sponsors.

The annual budget for the San Mateo center, Riley said, is \$40,000; Redwood City, \$42,000; and East Palo Alto, \$62,000. The new Daly City center has a \$17,000 budget.

ABM

Dr. Atkinson Assesses Strategic Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Prof. James D. Atkinson of Georgetown University is one of the Nation's internationally recognized experts on nuclear strategy. In the magazine *Ordnance* for November-December 1967, he lucidly and authoritatively assesses the current and evolving strategic balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. His evaluation is particularly timely and significant in the context of continuing hearings by the Joint Atomic Committee's Military Applications Subcommittee on the antiballistic missile question. Dr. Atkinson's article follows:

THE STRATEGIC BALANCE: RATHER THAN SEEK MERE NUCLEAR PARITY WITH THE SOVIETS, THE UNITED STATES SHOULD USE ITS TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES TO DEVELOP A VARIETY OF OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS TO LIMIT AN ENEMY'S CAPABILITIES

(Dr. James D. Atkinson)

It has been said that U.S. military-technological progress forces the Soviet Union to react to a particular development. But is this, in fact, correct? Do our strategic patterns set the pace for Soviet developments, or do the Soviets pursue their own strategic goals quite independent of us?

It can be argued that in some areas we may be able to influence Soviet policy. We of the United States might be able to convince the U.S.S.R. that we can and will maintain superiority in the production of long-range missiles.

But it is unlikely in the extreme that the Soviets can be convinced that they are precluded from achieving scientific and technological breakthroughs in particular areas—such as reentry vehicles or advanced antiballistic missile (ABM) systems—which might lead to a high level of weaponry and give them superiority over the United States at a given moment in time.

Indeed, authoritative Soviet spokesmen and military journals bluntly indicate that the Soviet effort is directed toward the attainment of superiority. Thus *Communist of the Armed Forces* (No. 3, 1966) has stated that "winning and maintaining technical superiority over any probable enemy while there is still peace is today of decisive importance."

Especially under the impact of long lead times, the essence of strategy today is not so much the new; it is, rather, the 5 years from now—and the 10 years from now.

It is important, of course, whether or not we now have over-all strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. But it is even more important to understand the trends in the military-technological competition, for upon these depends our future security.

The July 1967 study of a special subcommittee of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council, "The Changing Strategic Military Balance: U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R.," gives a blunt warning with reference to trends in the power equilibrium. The study states:

"... For 1971 it appears that a massive megatonnage gap will have developed. U.S. delivery capability is estimated to range between 6,000 megatons and 15,000 megatons, whereas the estimated high for the Soviet delivery capability is 50,000 megatons, and the projection of the established Soviet range-curve indicates a low figure for the Soviets of approximately 30,000 megatons. On the basis of this projection, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. will have reversed these roles in a 10-year period."

This study also points out a continuing strategic problem for the United States—the high yield of Soviet ICBM's and the resulting possibility of electromagnetic pulse or other unexpected weapons effects that might neutralize an entire U.S. ICBM complex however we might harden or shield it.

Allied to this is the possibility of a complete blackout of communications and the consequent transmission failure of a retaliatory order by the President. This is so since, as a result of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, "the United States can only guess at what unique effects might occur when very high-yield weapons are exploded. But the Soviets know."

Because of these and other serious questions raised, the study has received wide attention in the American press. *The New York Times*, for example, in a front-page story on July 12, 1967, stated that "the Defense Department did not directly contradict the study's findings, but argues that deliverable megatonnage was not an accurate indicator of 'true military capability.'"

The Christian Science Monitor—in an extensive analytical article on July 20, 1967—stated that "there is growing concern that the Soviet capability may exceed, now or soon, that of the United States. Allied with that is a concern that the United States is taking insufficient steps to maintain its position."

In an important public address in San Francisco on September 18, 1967, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara announced "a light deployment of U.S. ABM's" against the possibility that, in future, the Chinese Communists "might miscalculate" and launch a nuclear attack against the United States.

The Secretary of Defense rejected large-scale ABM deployment by arguing that this would be directed against the Soviet Union and that the Soviet response would be a step-up in its offensive capabilities which would "cancel out our defensive advantage."

Although Mr. McNamara stated that "there is no point whatever in our responding by going to a massive ABM deployment to protect our population, when such a system would be ineffective against a sophisticated Soviet offense," the Joint Chiefs of Staff—as well as a number of informed Senators and Congressmen on the Senate and House Armed Services Committees—believe that a large-scale missile defense is a requirement in view of the rising Soviet military-technological threat.

Furthermore, it is by no means clear that the Soviet economy is capable of reacting fully to a large-scale U.S. deployment of ABM systems; for example, one which would include both land-based and sea-based missile-defense systems.

The evidence of more than two decades following the Second World War suggests that it has been the stabilizing factor of U.S. military-technological superiority which has prevented a general nuclear war. Today, primarily under the impact of the Soviet military-technological thrust—but to some ex-

A 5580

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 14, 1967

tent from Chinese Communist efforts—that stability appears to be threatened.

If, for example, the Soviet strategists can achieve, or believe they have a very high percentage of achieving, an area-kill factor of incoming missiles (so that there is no problem of discrimination with reference to decoys and live warheads), they may at some point in time be tempted to launch a surprise nuclear strike upon the United States.

The deployment of a large-scale American ABM system or systems is one answer to the stabilization of power in the world. But it is not an end in itself.

If the military-technological revolution of our times teaches us anything, it is that there are no permanent plateaus in military technology. Instead there is constant change and rapid development.

To avoid a nuclear war and to safeguard the national security, therefore, we need to move forward with a mixture of both defensive and offensive weapon systems and to consider, for example, new types of air and sea-based strike systems made feasible by technological advances. The variety of our possible choices of action adds immeasurably to an enemy's planning problems if he attempts to prepare responses to a broad spectrum of capabilities.

A mixture of options—not reliance on one or two—compounds the task of the enemy and makes deterrence meaningful to him. There are many uncertainties and unknown factors in working out the problems of offense and defense alike, since the acid test is—and only is—actual war.

Those things—such as too great reliance on fixed missile systems—which simplify the problem—also reduce the uncertainties and unknown factors posed to the opponent. Simplification of our options may, in fact, tempt the enemy to consider a surprise attack.

Most of all, however, a "mix" of options is significant in the lead factor which it places on a potential enemy's military structure. The Soviet Union is faced with a number of constraints. If we make the Soviet leaders consider a new option, it tends to limit their capabilities—as well as blunting their desires—for playing the game of strategic blackmail in world politics.

Your Congressman: Bill Scott Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 14, 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter for November 1967:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN: BILL SCOTT REPORTS,
NOVEMBER 1967
DISTRICT VISITS

It is difficult to determine when Congress will adjourn although I had hoped it would be by the middle of this month and had made tentative plans for visits in each County in the District. Those plans have been revised to include Friday and Saturday visits this month and all of the first two weeks in December. Hopefully we will adjourn by the end of the month. The full schedule follows:

November 17, Fredericksburg.
November 18, Hanover.
November 24, King William, King and Queen.

November 25, Lancaster.
December 1, Spotsylvania.
December 2, Caroline.
December 4, Loudoun.
December 5, Fauquier.
December 6, Prince William.
December 7, Louisa.
December 8, Goochland.
December 9, Charles City and New Kent.
December 11, Northumberland.
December 13, Richmond and Essex.
December 14, Westmoreland and King George.

If you have any suggestions for me or if I can be of service to you, please contact me during these visits. The Fredericksburg visit will be in my District office at the Post Office, and the other locations will be announced through the news media. There will be no visit to Fairfax County because I have lived there for more than 20 years and see these folks daily.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Twenty boys took the Civil Service Designation Examination November 4th, and 25 took the test in July. When the November 4th list of grades is received from Civil Service, we will merge it with the July list and use this as a basis for the nominations which will be made after the first of the year. There are a few boys who have not sent me three letters of recommendation, a picture, and a transcript of high school records. I would like to have these as soon as possible. The Coast Guard Academy does not require Congressional appointment, but uses the College Entrance Examination as the basis for selection. Further information on entrance requirements may be obtained from my office.

POVERTY BILL

The House of Representatives is spending a considerable period of time considering the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. The bill, commonly known as the "poverty program," is one of the most controversial to reach the floor of the House.

All of the members appear to want to alleviate poverty, deplore substandard living conditions and lack of opportunity of many citizens in our affluent society, but many feel that the Office of Economic Opportunity is poorly administered and that what the President refers to as the "War on Poverty" is not being won. In fact, statistics show that there are over a million more people receiving welfare payments now than a year ago.

Among the programs included in the bill are the Job Corps, Community Action and VISTA programs. The goals of these organizations are all worthwhile. However, it does cause you to wonder when you see an amendment in the bill to require that the operating cost for each Job Corps enrollee be reduced from \$7500 to \$6500.

The committee report indicates that poverty workers have spent portions of their time reviewing county records to determine who is and who is not registered to vote and then going in government vehicles to take people to places of registration so that they will be qualified to vote. Poverty workers have been accused of participating in riots and violence in our cities and their officials accused of lobbying to obtain favorable action by Congress in violation of a Federal Criminal Statute.

In the last few weeks we have received a considerable number of personal visits, telephone calls, telegrams and letters urging that I support the bill without any Amendments. These contacts would ordinarily be persuasive. However, as you know, we had a questionnaire early in the Spring in which 93% of you said to cut government spending, and 80% said to cut the Poverty Program. There are few more unpopular programs and I'll vote to restrict it. Of course I'll try to pick and choose as various amendments are offered, and will vote in favor of the Headstart Program and others which seem beneficial in

helping people to help themselves. We all must be seeking ways in which we can be truly helpful to the deserving poor.

NO NEWSLETTER IN DECEMBER

In view of the holidays and the visits throughout the District, there will be no December newsletter. However, in January I want to seek your views on next year's legislative program and so I will send the newsletter and a questionnaire to all homes in the District.

SUMMER JOBS

The Civil Service Commission has announced an examination for Summer Jobs in Federal Agencies for students next year. The examination will be for GS-1 through GS-4 typists, stenographers, clerks and engineering and science aides, and for seasonal assistant jobs in the postal service. Candidates who achieved eligibility for summer jobs this past summer must compete again if they wish to be considered for summer work in 1968.

The exam will be given throughout the nation on December 9, January 13, February 10, and March 9. Federal agencies will begin making selections after the second test has been processed, so the Commission urges interested persons to apply early. Complete information about the summer job program and complete application procedures may be found in the Civil Service Commission's Announcement No. 414, "Summer Jobs in Federal Agencies." The announcement is available at high school counseling offices, college placement offices, the Civil Service Commission and many Post Offices.

AGRICULTURE PUBLICATIONS

A limited supply of the 1967 Agriculture Yearbook, "Outdoors: USA" is still available through my office. Also available are the bulletins "Your Child from 1 to 6" and "Infant Care" which may be ordered by title.

A RECENT BILL

I have introduced a bill limiting to 10 the number of questions to be asked by the Bureau of the Census in 1970, with authority to ask additional questions only if they are specifically approved by the appropriate Committees of each House of the Congress. A census has been taken since time immemorial, but the first American census was taken in 1790 and contained only five questions. This number has grown to 165 in 1960 and additional questions are proposed for 1970. Many of the questions are of a personal nature, and it does not appear essential for the government to have the answers to all of them, but rather it seems an invasion of the privacy of our citizens. In a column published in most of our weekly papers last month, this proposal was mentioned and constituents have been unanimously in favor of the bill in their responses. Certainly if anyone is going to keep the government from continuing to invade the private lives of individuals, it should be their elected representatives. Not only will this bill, if enacted, prevent intrusion by the government, but it will also cost considerably less than the anticipated questionnaire.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

On Monday the staff of the MATA briefed me on the proposed rapid transit system. I am not entirely satisfied with the proposals for Northern Virginia, and hope, therefore, that people in Fairfax and the surrounding counties who can, will attend public hearings and make their views known to their rapid transit representatives. Transportation in and out of Washington is a vital problem, and an informed citizenry can assist in providing a better system.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

Communications is the beginning of understanding.