

We are alerted because these groups, like their progenitors which gave them birth, are taking advantage of serious weaknesses and illnesses within our society, fomenting disorder rather than contributing solutions to these problems. They are putting their tentacles down, obtaining every toehold they can, especially in our colleges, our universities, and even among our strong business, labor and civic organizations.

For their coup d'etat, they are seeking to withdraw the crusading spirit of this country by attacking the very heart of our country, through those we love the most, our youths, and the institutions which we have established to give them the best preparation we possibly can for their roles in life—our colleges and universities. And, today, they are going one step farther, even into our high schools and grade schools, since they realize quite analytically that thousands and thousands of our youngsters will not be going on from high school into our colleges and universities, but are preparing themselves for lives outside the fields requiring college and university training.

As chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, one of my major responsibilities is to insure that this is not done. This does not mean that the Committee will be going into the communities of this country and onto the high school, college and university campuses to operate programs in opposition to these efforts.

But it does mean that we have a responsibility to investigate, report and recommend to the Congress of the United States what the situation is, how extensive the problems are, and what might be done to curb the revolutionary violence which is tearing this country apart. Those investigations are now being conducted and have been in progress since the Committee was established on February 19th.

The student rebellions which have paralyzed our colleges and universities are not a sudden event. They have been building up for many years. The causes are not solely attributable to Marxist and communist activity but the Marxist oriented actions of the old and new left are becoming more visible with the occurrence of each campus disorder.

The general public has false notions about the nature and methods of totalitarian revolutionary groups, believing they operate only secretly behind closed doors and a deep conspiracy. But, the public, I think, overlooks the fact that human beings are limited in communication, for the large part, to speech and writing—and revolutionaries, whether of the far Left or the far Right, are human beings. To communicate with each other they must write and speak their thoughts and disclose to one another their plans.

They communicate small circulation magazines and newspapers and publicized in direct mail appeals to groups of their interest. Admission fees to their meetings are always nominal—from 50 cents to a dollar, rarely more than five—hence, almost any individual or the representative of any group has, almost for the asking, access to such meetings where plans are made and decisions rendered.

Toward solution of our campus problems today, I would recommend a return to the ideals which led to the founding of The American Legion and urge once again:

One. That we give of our efforts so that all students will get "a square deal" on the college and university campuses of the United States, that the classrooms and services belong properly to the majority of the campus students, not to the disruptive minority. This does not mean that universities should be run by the students anymore than they should be run by politicians. Universities should be run by experts—expert educators, who are charged with the responsibility of developing the most important

resource of this nation or any nation—our youth;

Two. That we exert pressures on those administrators who require a stiffening of backbone, to establish a policy of firmness in dealing with those on the campus, who in the name of dissent, flout the law and invoke violence. Too long this nation has suffered from the result of permissiveness. Suspension and expulsion are still effective tools of discipline if they are wisely and timely used. Our campus problems will never be solved by the "namby-pamby" attitude exhibited by some of our university administrators. Those who fail to take the necessary disciplinary action or who follow a policy of appeasement only should be forthwith removed; and I might observe that timely disciplinary action in nearly all cases requires action long before the campus explodes into firebombings, the seizure of university buildings, and other forms of violence;

Three. That we in the Congress re-evaluate our draft laws. Personally, I have come to believe that our policy of college deferments are the primary underlying cause of campus disorder. College deferments should be abolished and those who have not fulfilled their military obligation and fall within the prescribed age group should take their chances by lottery;

I make this recommendation not by way of punishment, but to remove what I consider one of the basic underlying causes of campus disorders. The lottery method, I recognize, as not the best way to utilize our manpower requirements, but I believe it should be employed at a time we are faced with the problem of answering the question: Who is to serve when all are not required to serve?

Four. I call upon responsible governmental officials, university officials, and news media officials to work to achieve balance and perspective in campus coverage. There is no doubt that there is a direct relationship between the intensity of violence in a college confrontation and the number of TV cameras and the number of reporters on the scene. Don't accept my word as an accurate assessment of this phenomenon. Discuss this problem with the intelligence units of every police department in St. Louis, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, the men who work with these problems continuously; and you will hear the same assessment;

Five. That we listen more to the voices of strength and reason and less to the voices of weakness and indecision. Americans cannot afford the luxury of living in the world of "make believe." The world is not what we would have it to be and unilateral action to achieve the world of our dreams will not bring it to pass. Those who love freedom in Czechoslovakia today will testify to the folly of such self-delusion;

Six. That we cease to confuse legitimate dissent with criminal action. I am firmly convinced that we need to improve our enforcement of existing laws much more than we need new laws. This recommendation includes the necessity for many of our judges and courts to descend from the ivory tower and deliver us more realistic decisions that will permit our law enforcement officers and university officials to more effectively cope with complex and difficult problems.

Seven. That we re-define "national security for America," to insure that it includes the internal as well as the external security of this country; and

Eight. That we re-dedicate ourselves to promotion of 100 per cent Americanism and the combatting of the harmful aspects of any ism—communism, nazism, fascism, socialism—that we re-examine the isms and explore the operations of them so we can combat effectively those which would destroy our country and the principle for which it stands.

I am convinced if this Nation would give as much intelligent and responsive attention to controlling the riots and disturbances on our campuses and removing the causes for them as The American Legion has done in solving the problems of the American veteran, this country would be on the threshold of a new era in human understanding.

With the support of The American Legion and other organizations like it, I think we can go a long way toward getting the job done. This will be the "real ammunition" we seek.

Thank you.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW

### HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1969

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 was a shock to the conscience of the world and a brutal act of tyranny that all free men deplored.

The consequences of the invasion seemed inevitable—loss of the few freedoms so briefly exercised, renewed police terror, and a change in government leadership. Few thought, although many hoped, that Alexander Dubcek would remain in power indefinitely and maybe restore the lost reforms. It is true that Mr. Dubcek sought to preserve communism in Czechoslovakia, but he also wanted to give his people a degree of freedom; not freedom as we know it in the United States, but at least freedom from arbitrary terror. Now Alexander Dubcek has been replaced as party secretary, and a few leading figures remain as symbols of reform.

It is now that the people of the world who desire freedom and respect courage must remember the people of Czechoslovakia and stand with them during the coming period of increasing repression. Person-to-person contact keeps this memory poignant and alive.

Recently, a series of five articles came to my attention. They are anecdotal accounts of life in Czechoslovakia, as the author saw it during the Christmas holidays of 1968. The author is Don Miller, a young administrator from the University of Michigan. Mr. Miller has visited Czechoslovakia three times since 1964 and has become good friends with a number of young Czechoslovaks. His outlook on Czechoslovakia is that of a man concerned for his friends' welfare but tempered by his training as a historian. Mr. Miller has a degree of bachelor of arts in history from the University of Michigan, a master of arts degree from Brown University, and has done work toward a degree of Ph. D. in history at the University of Zurich, Switzerland.

News coverage of the invasion and occupation has mostly given us accounts of troop movements, group protests, and scenes of street fighting. The world has viewed it as a national tragedy and has thought in general terms of the loss of independence for the Czechoslovak nation. This coverage has not brought home

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### PRAISE THE LORD AND PASS THE AMMUNITION

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct privilege for me to be the featured speaker at the 50th anniversary prayer breakfast of the American Legion Convention in St. Louis, Mo., last Saturday, hosted by Missouri's Governor, the Honorable Warren E. Hearnes, and at the request of the Executive National Committee of American Legion, I am inserting my remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### PASS THE AMMUNITION

(Address of Congressman RICHARD H. ICHORD, chairman, House Committee on Internal Security, before the American Legion, 50th Anniversary Prayer Breakfast, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., May 10, 1969)

Some things are fitting and proper.

Among those most fitting and proper is that this breakfast should be here in St. Louis, for Missouri and St. Louis are honored that the American Legion was founded at a caucus here May 8 through 10th, 1919. And it is fitting and proper that the Governor of our State, a chief executive who stands firmly for the principles and ideals of the American Legion should be our host.

Let me say to my visiting fellow Legionnaires who may not be intimately acquainted with the Governor of the State of Missouri that your host is not only a man who voices the call for law and order, he does not hesitate to take the decisive action to enforce law and order.

It is fitting, too, I believe that we should take up the cry made famous a few years ago, when a beleaguered chaplain shouted out the words, "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." For it is time, past time, I would emphasize, for us to "praise the Lord" for this great nation which is ours, the great institutions which we have built, and then to "pass the ammunition" to those who would defend this nation and its institutions, including our great colleges and universities. We do not have a perfect nation. We have our ills and deficiencies, serious ills and deficiencies, but we can still thank our Creator for the privilege of living in a nation which has given more people greater freedom and more material comforts than any other country in the history of man.

When I speak of "ammunition," I speak not of shells and bullets, nor of mortars and men on the firing line. I speak of "ammunition" which can help us to establish the kind of internal structure that makes and keeps a nation worthy of its people.

Today, this country is fighting a great internal battle—a battle which has sprung up because of the gap between ideal and fulfillment, principle and opportunity, spirit and power. It has become most difficult to find the valid relationship between these extremes. The battles being fought are perhaps not as clear cut as the ones in which the men of the American Legion have been involved in World Wars I and II and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, but already there have been loss of life, maiming, great destruction of property, continuing chaos, riots and rebellion. Perhaps we shall never succeed in fully bridging the gap between ideal and

fulfillment, but at least we should not "kill ourselves off" in our struggles to accomplish this end.

And, if I may be so blunt, though the battle lines aren't so clearly drawn, the issues are requiring the same kind of decision-making as was necessary at Verdun, the Battle of the Bulge, the 38th Parallel and Khe Sanh. As one of our past Presidents once said, "When hours may decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action."

This is the kind of world we face today, with the campuses of our colleges and universities the battlegrounds today, the playgrounds of our high schools and grade schools the battlegrounds of tomorrow—unless we assess the problem quickly, decide upon what action to take intelligently, and act responsibly.

Toward solving our problems we could do much worse than look at the techniques used by the American Legion to serve the returning veterans of America's wars.

When the American Legion was founded there were three major ideals uppermost in the minds of the men who made up the American Expeditionary Force. Those ideals were:

1. Creation of a fraternity based upon firm comradeship born of war service and dedicated to a square deal for all veterans, particularly the disabled, their widows and orphans;

2. National security for America, including a universal military training program for the prevention of future world conflicts;

3. Promotion of a 100 percent Americanism and the combatting of communism, nazism, fascism, socialism and all other foreign isms.

No organization ever lived up to its ideals so well as has The American Legion. It organized a Veterans Bureau to consider the needs of the disabled veterans resulting from the unwieldy mass of laws and regulations governing them. Through the efforts of The Legion, Congress has enacted law after law—born out of the efforts of The Legion to aid the returning veterans.

With the establishment of the Veterans Administration in 1931 to handle veteran benefit programs, The Legion's continuous campaign for justice to the war-disabled and for equalized treatment of widows and orphans began to show results. Pension legislation was passed. Rehabilitation services began to be provided. Medical programs were expanded. Education services were enlarged. Home, farm and business loans were made possible. Veterans employment has been protected. Readjustment allowances have been provided for the unemployed. Child welfare programs have been improved.

The American Legion has provided a home base for its members to get things done. The American Legion Child Welfare Foundation filled The Legion's need for an organized method in which grants could be made in the future which would bring the best results to the greatest number of children.

The National Legislative Committee, now Commission, was established early, in the life of the Legion when it became obvious a central legislative unit was necessary if legislative programs and proposals of the Legion were to be presented effectively, if they were to compete with the proposals of others interested in the same issues.

The Legion has made a few decisions wiser than that, for it has enabled the American veteran to wield the kind of influence that is his due on the American scene. Through the efforts of the Legion, such great legislation as the National Defense Act of 1920 was passed. This act, for example, gave the U.S. its first workable plan for a small Reg-

ular Army, augmented by a large National Guard and Organized Reserve.

The recommendations of the American Legion, made principally through its National Security Commission, have had a profound effect on our Nation's history.

Three of the Legion's activities have long been of interest to me, and truly of vital interest to the entire nation. I speak of the Legion's interest in *Americanism*, in anti-subversive activities and in youth activities.

Since the inception of the Legion, *Americanism* has been one of the Legion's great concerns. At the caucus here in St. Louis 50 years ago, among the things those assembled considered were: "relief work, employment, and *Americanism*." At the charter convention in Minneapolis that same year, the *Americanism* Commission was established by convention action.

In the beginning, the Commission was charged with the task of combatting anti-Americanism tendencies, educating citizens old and new in the ideals of true *Americanism*, distribution of information about "the real nature and principles of American government," and fostering the teaching of *Americanism* in all schools.

This mission sometimes led the *Americanism* Commission over difficult routes. For example, as many of you know, early in the 1920's unemployment and other conditions contributing to national unrest coincided with an upsurge of communism and other subversive isms. Through the years the Commission served yeoman duty in helping to solve these problems through education and action.

Much of the Commission's work was concerned with the problems of unemployment until that phase was taken over by the National Economic Commission of The American Legion.

In the field of anti-subversive activities, The American Legion continues to be the outstanding opponent of communism and other divisive dogma. Throughout the years, the *Americanism* Commission has gathered data which has been filed and catalogued, so that now any Legionnaire, through his post and department, has at his command one of the best library and information services on subversives and subversive activities available anywhere.

"To foster and perpetuate a one hundred per cent *Americanism*," The Legion has channeled much of its efforts into education of our youths—for their roles as leaders of tomorrow.

Hundreds of programs with literally thousands of participants have benefitted from the generosity and the foresight of The American Legion—Junior Baseball, Boys State, Boys Nation, Oratorical Contests, School Awards to youths outstanding in honor, courage, scholarship, leadership and service. All these have helped to make America strong. I, myself, am a beneficiary of the programs initiated by the men, we honor this morning, the founders of the American Legion. As a 14-year-old participant in the American Legion's oratorical contest, I had my first experience with the Legion.

All these efforts, so brilliant and so capably administered, have done much to help this nation adhere to the principles and philosophies on which this nation was founded.

Today, this nation is battling new isms, isms which I am sure are outgrowths of old cancers breaking out anew with new characteristics, attracting new leaders and a new cadre of supporters. These isms are emerging as indigenous, radical, partly revolutionary groups, apparently controlled neither by Moscow or Peking but infiltrated to a considerable degree by their agents.

the feeling of fear, rage, and frustration from broken dreams that was shared individually by millions of Czechoslovaks. Mr. Miller's articles help to bring these feelings home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entirety of the five articles entitled, "Czechoslovakia: Today and Tomorrow," written by Mr. Miller.

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

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW—I  
(By Donald E. Miller)

Since the Russian invasion this past August, and during the days of the Dubcek liberalization in the months before, thousands of articles, and perhaps millions of words, have been written about Czechoslovakia. They have sought to examine the country and its people politically, economically, socially—and in every other conceivable way.

Yet few articles have discussed Czechoslovakia in human, or individual, terms. We know about groups cheering, fighting, protesting, and demanding. But we have read little about individuals in Czechoslovakia. Assuming one of the purposes of the liberalization was to re-assert the dignity and worth of the individual—and that of the Soviet invasion to suppress individual freedoms—what is the individual in Czechoslovakia thinking about these days? What does he think about the events of the past year? How does he regard the future?

I recently spent two weeks in Czechoslovakia, my third trip there in the past four years. During my visits I have come to admire the people greatly; perhaps, too, I even understand them just a little bit. I hope that in this forthcoming series of articles you will gain a greater understanding of the people of Czechoslovakia, whose fight for freedom has lasted almost a thousand years and may perhaps last a thousand more.

As my plane, a sleek British European Airways jetliner, broke out of the cloud cover and approached the runway of Prague's Ruzyně Airport, I had mixed feelings. I couldn't help being excited at the thought of being back in Czechoslovakia; but this excitement was tinged with the normal amount of apprehension, in view of the events there these past months.

My excitement mounted as the plane came to a halt before the main terminal building. I looked out the window at it—new, modern, and functional like so many thousands more around the world. Above the building in huge block letters I could read the word PRAGUE. I wondered how much Prague had changed from my visit three years before. It wasn't long before I would find some answers!

My first few hours in Prague were crowded with what seemed like a million impressions. A few things stand out above the rest: the friendliness and interest of the people—it was there and strong—exactly as I remembered it from my last visits; at the airport, my luggage hadn't been inspected or opened; on the way from the airport into town, I saw the names of the Czechoslovak leaders, Dubcek and Svoboda written literally a hundred times on the sides of apartment buildings, grocery stores, and fences. On many buildings, writings had been already white-washed—I could only wonder what these had said.

After registering and settling in at my hotel, I took a short walk on Prague's Wenceslas Square, the main street of the city, a combination of New York's Fifth Avenue and London's Piccadilly Circus. At the head of this broad avenue, and on a height commanding the whole street, is the National Museum. It was here where much of the fighting be-

tween the Russian tanks and the Czechs took place—and it is very evident.

The Museum is a dull implacable gray—much like many of the buildings in Paris before the French embarked on a government program to white-wash them. The Museum had, in fact, had a white-washing of its own—not by a government program as in France, but by the guns of Russian tanks. The front of the Museum, facing on Wenceslas Square, had been riddled by thousands of Russian bullets. In a thousand places, the dull gray of the Museum had been chipped away by Russian gunfire, leaving gaping white holes. It was an awesome sight, I will never forget it. The Museum became the symbol to me of the Russian presence and power in Czechoslovakia. If life on the street had gained a semblance of normality once again, as indeed it really had, one had only to look at the National Museum to understand the magnitude of the problem lying beneath the normality in the streets.

To understand how the Czechoslovaks were facing up to this problem you didn't have to walk very far from the National Museum—in fact, only about one hundred and fifty steps to be exact, to the base of the statue of Good King Wenceslas. (Wenceslas had been one of the most famous kings of Bohemia, which encompasses Prague and the western part of Czechoslovakia; and many years ago this statue had been erected here in his honor.) The Czechs had turned the Wenceslas statue into a memorial for those who had died during those first days of the occupation. The first to die was a 14-year-old boy, killed near the statue, and people began bringing flowers and laying them at the base of the statue as a memorial to him. Others died in Prague, and they were similarly honored with flowers at the base of the statue.

Soon the statue became more than a memorial honoring the dead of the Soviet invasion. It became the focal point of passive Czech resistance and defiance to the Russian presence in Czechoslovakia. Today, the statue is always crowded with people looking at the flowers placed there daily and reading messages of sympathy and support placed there by Czechoslovaks and foreigners. One wreath placed there especially touched me. It was placed there by Americans. On one side was the Czechoslovak flag; on the other, the American flag. The message, in bold large black letters, read simply:

"We are with you.

"We care about you.

"Signed Two USA STUDENTS."

Before I left Prague, I decided to place a tribute of my own. I took my luggage tag—red, white, and blue American Tourster—reversed the address side and had some Czech people I had met write in Czech: "Our sympathies and our admiration. From one American and from All Americans." I was given a commemorative wreath free of charge by a florist when I happened to mention to him what I was planning to use it for. Slowly, carefully, on Christmas Day, with many persons watching, I placed the wreath and the tag carefully wrapped around it, at the base of the statue. This was not only my tribute but the tribute, I thought, of the many Americans who could not be there with me. I think often of this tribute. I wonder if it is still there and what people think as they read it.

In the United States, just prior to my trip, I had taken some Czech lessons. In Czechoslovakia, I determined to, and did, speak Czech. One of those with whom I spoke was a very pretty young girl, a student at Charles University in Prague. After talking with her for some time, she called her home and then invited me to spend Christmas day with her and her family. This was something I really had not expected, for Christmas in Czechoslovakia is a very personal holiday, a family holiday, and not many foreigners are

invited into Czech homes to share it with them.

To spend Christmas with a Czech family, less than four months after the Russians had invaded their country, would be a very special experience. I wondered, as we drove there, what it was going to be like.

First of all, I can say it was charming. In the corner of the living room, was a huge Christmas tree. Instead of multi-colored electric lights, there were real candles and sparklers on the tree—an enchanting sight. A while later, one of the lighted candles fell, setting fire to a part of the tree. We put it out with wine.

Christmas dinner was delicious. Fish is the traditional Christmas fare in Czechoslovakia, with potatoes, salad, chocolate cakes, and wine. All very special, and very fattening, I thought to myself, as I let my belt out a notch.

After dinner came the exchange of presents. This especially touched me, for the presents were simple and the family feeling strong. (Bars of soap for the daughter, a scarf for the son, cigarettes (Kent) for the father.) At least, superficially, Christmas in Czechoslovakia 1968 did not seem so different from Christmas elsewhere in the Western world. Later on, when we began discussing politics, I realized how different it really was.

Our discussion began humorously. I learned that this year in Czechoslovakia, people were sending one another special Christmas and New Years greetings. Instead of the traditional "Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year," Czechs were wishing one another: "Merry Christmas and a Better New Year."

The Soviet invasion, all thought, was a sign, not of Soviet strength, but of Soviet weakness. From the Czech point of view, perhaps the invasion's most telling and long-lasting effect would be its impact upon Czechoslovak youth. Until now, the Germans had been looked upon as the great enemy. Though the Russians were never exactly considered buddies, it had generally been felt that they weren't such bad guys and that it benefited Czechoslovakia to have them around looking after Czechoslovak interests.

Today, this had changed. The Russian invasion and the continued Russian presence in Czechoslovakia is considered by the country's youth to be the act of a mortal enemy. This they will never forget, and this is bound to have a telling effect on Russian-Czechoslovak relations far into the future.

On the streets, Czechoslovak kids still plays their favorite cowboys and indian game. But it is now has a new twist. The cowboy now says to the villain, "You're a Russian soldier, and when I say 'Bang,' you fall down dead."

On August 20, 1968, Russian tanks crossed the border into Czechoslovakia. Life there would never again be the same.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW—II  
(By Donald E. Miller)

Presov, not far from the Russian border, is about 400 miles east of Prague; yet it is as different from Prague as it is from Chicago. Presov is a provincial town with about 40,000 inhabitants. Its people, a mix of Slovaks, Ukrainians, Hungarians, and gypsies, tend to be gay, extroverted, and interested in fun and the good life, whereas those in Prague are dour, hard-working, and materialistic—not much different, in fact, from people in most big cities in the West.

It is almost as if Presov and Prague exist in two different worlds, let alone one country. Yet, there is one thing uniting the peoples of Prague and Presov—hatred of the Russians and unflinching support for Czechoslovakia's liberal leaders.

I arrived in Presov at eight in the morning after a grueling thirteen-hour train ride

from Prague. If the Czechs could survive their trains, I thought to myself as the train pulled into the station, they could survive anything.

I wasn't in the best mood as my friend Richard and I greeted one another after an absence of more than two years. My mood changed, though, as we walked from the railroad station to his apartment, for there was much on the way to interest me. As in Prague, pictures of Dubcek and Svoboda were everywhere. They were in the shop and dwelling windows. A poster of a smiling Dubcek called for unity from a fence.

Fifteen minutes—and one thousand pictures of Alexander Dubcek and Ludvik Svoboda later, Richard and I reached his apartment. We were greeted warmly by his wife Natasa and their two sons, Vladko (6 years old) and Milanko (one year old) and were ushered into the living room. There in the living room were the inevitable photos of Dubcek and Svoboda—but with a difference. Between Dubcek and Svoboda, there was a photo of me. What an unlikely triad—Dubcek, Svoboda and Miller, I thought to myself.

Richard told me why I was up there. "You see, Don, Dubcek and Svoboda are the hope of Czechoslovakia. They are here; we know them and we respect them. But America, too, though it is so far away, remains one last hope. Your picture there reminds all of us about America. We like to think that you care about what is happening in Czechoslovakia. Besides, your big American smile helps when the going gets a little rough here some days."

Later in the day, Richard and I walked around Presov. It is an attractive and an interesting town, but the most critical thing about it is its location. It is on the high road from the Russian border, about 60 miles to the east, into the heartland of Czechoslovakia and is the first town of any size in Czechoslovakia west of the Russian frontier. Hundreds and thousands of Russian military vehicles had poured through during the Soviet invasion and many stayed. Still, through the first difficult days of the invasion, Presov had remained relatively quiet. There were demonstrations in the streets, sit-downs at the University (hearing this made me feel at home), and work-stoppages at the factories. But the Russians had the power, and the people of Presov knew it.

It was a far different story in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia's second largest city. I learned some days later when Richard and I visited there. The city had been in turmoil for days. According to whichever rumor you chose to believe, from five to two hundred people were killed in Bratislava, and at least 15,000 fled the city for the Austrian border, less than an hour away.

During my visit, Bratislava was quiet, but scars of the invasion days remained. There were two memorial plaques in the city center—one was near the University—listing those, mostly young, who had died. As in Prague, flowers were placed on the tablets daily.

At the Slovak Parliament Building, near the Technical University, one could spend an interesting few minutes watching workers plaster over the many bullets pock-marking the front of the building.

Visible reminders of the invasion and occupation remain in Bratislava; but in truth you have to look for them. For life in Bratislava, as in Prague, or Presov, or Olomouc or any one of a hundred other Czech cities and towns, has in fact returned to something approaching normality.

But the people haven't. I heard them discussing politics heatedly in the streets and in their homes—something unusual before the Dubcek liberalization began a year ago. Newspapers, still basically free to write what they think, stimulate their thought—as do radio, television, and the theatre.

In Bratislava and everywhere else in Czechoslovakia, the communications media still seemed free. Perhaps, as one American later said to me—it is a verbal catharsis. Perhaps, it is something more. Let me relate some of the incidents, in any case.

One night in Bratislava, Richard and I went to see "Fiddler on the Roof" in the Slovak language (In Bratislava, Slovak is spoken, and in Prague, Czech. They are quite different languages, though someone speaking Czech in Bratislava can be understood.) It was one of the most magnificent and unusual musical comedy productions I have ever seen—and no doubt would probably be a sensation in the United States performed exactly as it was. Aside from the brilliant production, the highlights of the evening were certainly two political jokes, relevant to the current Czechoslovak political scene.

"Fiddler on the Roof" is about Jewish life in Russia, under the threat of Russian persecution. (I felt that this alone had some political significance.) In one scene, the family, threatened by the Tsar's police, decides to leave their little town to emigrate to America. Before leaving, the old father offers a prayer. Looking up into the sky, he says: "Oh God, won't you help us now." The audience, catching the political significance of the line, cheered and applauded wildly.

In another scene, a young couple promise to marry only each other—against the wishes of the girl's father, who alone has the power to decide whom she will marry; and he wants her to marry an old but rich Jewish man. The father, hearing of the couple's vow to one another, confronts them and says: "So you have promised that you will marry only one another. What good are your promises? Where do you think you are—in Moscow?" The applause was deafening!

The next night in Bratislava, we saw "Madame Butterfly" at the National Opera. In the opera, Madame Butterfly falls in love with an American sailor, and three or four times in the musical scoring one could easily detect the first two lines of "The Star Spangled Banner." I still wonder whether the playing of "Madame Butterfly" in Bratislava at this particular time was coincidental. Later on, I was told that the program schedule of the National Opera in Prague, which up until that time had been determined by the opera administrators, was to be from now on dictated by the government.

Nor was it any different on radio and television. One night in Presov, we listened to Radio Bratislava, the official government radio, from eight until eleven o'clock. If you didn't know you were listening to Czechoslovak radio, you might think it was WJL in Detroit. For three straight hours, Radio Bratislava played nothing but American music. The most popular song in Czechoslovakia today is a ballad called "Massachusetts"—in effect, a New England "I Left My Heart in San Francisco." California was represented by "Do You Know the Way to San Jose" and "San Francisco." Nor should I forget to mention "Give My Regards to Broadway" and "Back Home Again in Indiana."

The big thing on Czechoslovak television during my visit was the Apollo Eight mission. Coverage was complete, from lift-off to splash-down. Borman, Lovell, and Anders were hailed as warmly throughout Czechoslovakia as in the United States. Along with the Apollo Eight coverage were broadcast reports out of Moscow to the effect that the mission was reckless and unsafe. People smiled at these reports, and prayed for the success of the mission and the astronauts. Before Dubcek, such TV coverage of an American space mission would have been completely unheard of. Today, four months after the Russian invasion, the American space spectacular was covered in the greatest detail.

Czechoslovakia today is in transition. The Russians want to turn back the clock; the Czechoslovaks want to push ahead. There is a giant tug of war going on there and the prize is Czechoslovakia itself. It would be difficult to predict the ultimate winner. What is certain is that during the contest, the Czechoslovak people will suffer greatly.

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW—III

(By Donald E. Miller)

I spent much of my time in Presov at the university.

Czechoslovakian universities, like their counterparts in the United States, France, and Japan, are in ferment. Students are in revolt against old ideas, the Establishment, the Russians. Students throughout the country were, in fact, in the vanguard of the Dubcek liberalization drive. They were in the front lines of those who fought the Russian invasion; they protest and demonstrate and agitate to this very day.

I learned that in Presov, university students had organized demonstrations and sit-ins, in protest against the Russian invasion and the large garrison of Soviet troops stationed in the city. Now, during my visit, however, the university was comparatively quiet.

I had hoped, while in Presov, to talk with many people at the university. This I did. I remember, in particular, one young professor of English. I talked with him more about American problems than Czechoslovak problems, for after all, as he exclaimed, "What is there, after all, to discuss about Czechoslovakian problems. Our future is settled, we have no choice. We never did. We go with Russia."

He was interested and curious about Vietnam, America's racial problems, America's attitude toward Russia and Czechoslovakia. But most of all, he showed his greatest interest—and he was the rule, not the exception—in the Kennedys—John, Robert, Jackie, and Ted. Adulation of the Kennedys is not confined to the United States alone.

Though we spent some time talking about John and Ted Kennedy, his interest focused mostly on Robert Kennedy and Jackie. "Why?" he asked, "was he killed? He was a good man." This comment I heard at least six or seven times during my stay in Czechoslovakia. "He was a good man." I think about it often.

And Jackie Kennedy! His comments on her marriage were much the same as in the United States. "Why did she marry that old guy?" Did she marry him for his money? But why? She had enough of her own, didn't she?"

Another of the people I met that day at the university, who made a great impression on me, was an administrative secretary, a woman in her forties. She had little cause to love the Russians. Her father, a doctor, had been sent to Siberia by the Russians at the end of World War II and had come back in 1950 or 1951 a broken man. The Russian invasion for her was simply one more sad saga in her life sponsored by Russia. Still she radiated courage and humor. I admired her greatly.

I was also taken on a short tour of the liberal arts building of the university, by my friend, who at 27 years of age was Chairman of the university's Department of English. It was unprepossessing by American standards and rather dirty (like most buildings in Czechoslovakia). A foul smell permeated the building. But the most important impression I left with was this: where it counted, the building's facilities were excellent. For example, I saw a language laboratory there second to none. I saw an excellent science lab, and well-lighted, well-equipped classrooms. And, the ratio of students to teachers at the liberal arts faculty

May 12, 1969

E 3825

of the university, I was told, was only 10 to 1. It gave me something to think about.

My conversation with Richard, as we toured and later talked, inevitably got around to student unrest. The target of student discontent, he told me, in Czechoslovakia, as in most other countries around the world, was the established order. Students, in fact, had been agitating for many years. They were idealists. They wanted to change things, to make a better life for themselves and for those who followed. And, he smiled and nodded, there was much that needed changing. Could you blame them for trying?

For example, he told me, admission to the university was not necessarily based on ability. He had several times been forced to admit unqualified students who were the sons and daughters or relatives of Communist party members. Though a practical man, Richard still clings to the idealism of his youth. Telling this story upset him.

Students, he said, also wanted a voice in the running of the university. They demanded a vote and a voice in the highest administrative councils of the university and backed this up by class boycotts and sit-ins. Eventually they got what they wanted. It was still too early, he said, to judge their performance, but he was clearly for giving them a chance—if only because he felt they couldn't do any worse than those already wielding power.

As if to support this conversation, I had noticed a sign on one of the university bulletin boards during the tour. It announced a meeting of one of the student governing groups. "Come to the next meeting of the Student Government Council. Participate. Speak your mind. Vote. This isn't like former Student Government Councils. We're no longer a rubber stamp. We have the vote; we have the power. And we want to use it for you."

Later on in the evening, Richard and I went to the Dean's Office. This was not the Dean's Office at the University, but it was the name of a nearby tavern, very popular with students. We talked, and we drank. Mostly, I guess, we drank. And after we had drunk enough, we sang. Richard would sing a Czechoslovak song and I would follow with an American song. So it went into the early hours of the next morning, I was told. I didn't remember.

Nor did I recall the songs I had sung, on behalf of America. Later on, I was told that I had sung stirring renditions of the national anthem, "America The Beautiful," "This Land Is My Land," "Rudolph The Red-Nosed Reindeer," and "Moon River." Much of the singing elsewhere in the Dean's Office—for singing in Czechoslovakia always accompanies drinking—had stopped, and the other people in the tavern watched and listened to the American songs being sung less than 60 miles from the Russian border. A couple of times, I was told, they applauded. I'll just have to believe it, I guess, for I honestly don't remember.

This day in Presov, as I reflect upon it, was most unusual. I had learned a great deal about Czechoslovakia that day, and about what it meant to be a citizen of Czechoslovakia.

As I thought further about it, I also had probably learned a good deal more about what it meant to be an American. I thought about my country and its problems and I felt, that day in Czechoslovakia, that we in America could and would solve our problems. I felt good.

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW—IV (By Donald E. Miller)

There is a big joke in Czechoslovakia these days that in Communist countries, "nothing works." And it's almost literally true. On the train from Bratislava to Presov, the central heating didn't work, and I froze. On another train, I saw one of the pullman beds

completely collapse when a young guy jumped in too enthusiastically. The home water supply is equally erratic; now you have it in your apartment, now you don't. It's as mystifying as the magician's magic rabbit.

The funniest thing that "didn't work", though, occurred during the performance of "Madame Butterfly" in Bratislava. Butterfly's great love, the American naval officer, has just sailed his ship into the harbor and an ecstatic Butterfly, singing a beautiful aria, rushes over to the sliding Japanese door in her home overlooking the bay, so that she might see the ship for herself. She pushes open the door—or rather tries to, because it "didn't work." So she completed the aria leaning on the door which had only opened a few inches or so.

So, on and on. I would like to think that nothing *does* work in a Communist country—not even a Russian invasion. But, in fact, I do not know. It is still too early to tell. I can draw some conclusions, though, from what I observed among the people, and from what people themselves told me.

I'll never forget a news feature I saw in a movie in Presov. It described graphically the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia, from the heady and happy days of the Dubcek liberalization drive through the Russian invasion. As Russian tanks poured across the border and through the Czechoslovak heartland, women were crying. I felt the tears well up in my eyes too.

Life on the street seems more or less normal. People laugh and smile again. Lots of them scowl, but it's not really so different anywhere else in the world. It's hard to tell that anything extraordinary happened in Czechoslovakia, much less a Russian invasion and occupation by half a million troops.

But when you talk with people, when you spend time with them in their homes, then you begin to realize the seriousness of their situation. For beneath the "normal" surface, it is evident that they are deeply worried, and more than a little frightened and concerned about their future and the future of Czechoslovakia.

They wonder when, not if, Dubcek will go. The most popular leader in Czechoslovakia since the days of its founder Thomas Masaryk, Dubcek is a legend almost in his own time—streets have been named after him, even a breakfast roll. Alexander Dubcek's days are numbered, and everyone in Czechoslovakia knows it. The only question is how many more days does he have left. It might happen by some miracle or other that Dubcek will be able to hang on and salvage his liberalization drive, but nobody I talked to in Czechoslovakia really believed it.

They wonder, too, how long it will take before the freedoms acquired during the Dubcek days will be totally taken away from them. For if, as I have said before, Czechoslovaks still seem as free to say what they think, they also seem more cautious when they speak. A Czechoslovak will talk to you quite willingly about the political situation in his country, on the street or in a train or in any other public place, but, as he does, he'll now glance over his shoulder from time to time. If he sees a policeman, and even if the policeman gets close enough to hear the conversation, he will go on talking. Perhaps, he'll say something about how stupid the police are; but the important thing, I think, is that he is thinking about them once again and is being conditioned little by little to their presence again.

In truth, the secret police are beginning to make their move again. They are not moving quickly; they are not moving effectively. Today, they are only a minor irritant more or less, and few seem really afraid of them. But tomorrow—it's hard to tell.

Most thoughtful and realistic Czechoslovaks think that little by little their freedoms will be taken away. Czechoslovakia today is

not quite the place it was during the golden days of Alexander Dubcek. There is a difference. It's perceptible enough, and as time passes, the difference will be greater.

Not much time has passed since the Soviet invasion—not enough time to consolidate the conservative ends of the Russian invasion. There will be resistance to conservatism and it could be considerable. But few people think that the resistance can or will be strong enough to stop the inevitable return to more repressive days.

Czechoslovaks are considered a practical people. More than one forecast the doom of freedom in Czechoslovakia, not without a tear or two in their eyes. But this isn't the first time freedom has been crushed in Czechoslovakia, and if history is any judge, it won't be the last.

Czechoslovakia, however, does not exist in a vacuum. Where it goes from here depends not only upon itself and Russia, but also to a certain extent upon China and the United States.

The Chinese have never been terribly popular in Czechoslovakia—until now, that is. Czechoslovaks, it is evident, share many of the same color prejudices as Americans or Englishmen. There is little sympathy for the Negroes in America, for example. And the many students from Communist China who have come to Czechoslovakia to study have never really been accepted into the society. Heaven help the young Czechoslovak girl who brings home a Chinese date to meet Mom and Dad!

But now this has changed. Russia, Czechoslovaks realize, must contend on three fronts: Eastern Europe, China, and America. Now, Russia has its hands full in Eastern Europe (i.e. Czechoslovakia) and has the freedom to do what it feels necessary to secure its position there. America is still occupied in Vietnam, so will give the Russians little trouble—at least, until the Viet-nam conflict has been resolved.

But the Chinese—that is another story. The Chinese-Russian border, extending thousands of miles, now seems relatively quiet, although if you want to believe the rumors, there has been serious and bloody fighting along the border for many years. If this fighting does get worse, and Czechoslovaks consider this inevitable, then Russia would have to switch its military emphasis eastward, leaving Eastern Europe free to . . . Well, it's hard to say.

Today, then, Czechoslovaks look upon the Chinese as a kind of yellow saviour. Until now, the Chinese have been unsuccessful in gaining any kind of foothold in Eastern Europe—with the lone exception of tiny Albania. The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia may have changed all that.

What about America? America has always been popular in Czechoslovakia. Over one million Czechoslovaks emigrated to the United States, and rare is the Czechoslovak family which doesn't have a relative or know people in America. Moreover, Woodrow Wilson, back in 1918, was in effect one of the founding fathers of the Czechoslovak republic.

There is a great reservoir of good will for America in Czechoslovakia—something I will discuss in greater detail in my next and last article. Nobody in Czechoslovakia expected America to come to her aid after the Russian invasion; but most Czechoslovaks believe that Russia informed America beforehand of the invasion, and that we said we would not oppose it. This is disturbing. It may even be true. Who knows?

Still, America's reaction, or inaction if you will, has not emptied this reservoir very much. Czechoslovaks are tied to America and Americans by strong emotional bonds. They admire us and would like to be more like us. America is Czechoslovakia's ultimate hope—in an emotional, not a political sense.

There are things we can do, under these present and difficult circumstances to help

Czechoslovakia. First and foremost, Czechoslovakia's door on the West must be kept open—and widened if, and as far as, possible. The most important and critical wedge we have to do this is economic. Communism, in addition to everything else it has done to Czechoslovakia, has shattered its economy. One of the most prosperous nations in Europe, and in the world, between the two world wars, Czechoslovakia, under Communism, has plunged into an economic abyss. It has fallen so far, that it is now behind East Germany, Hungary, and Poland in Eastern Europe, in terms of its economic productivity. And this, for the proud people of Czechoslovakia, is humiliating.

One of the bases of the Dubcek reforms was, in fact, economic. Dubcek had promised to get Czechoslovakia moving again economically, a promise which brought him strong support from most segments of Czechoslovak society.

Today, as a result of the Russian invasion, Czechoslovakia remains in the economic doldrums, tied to Russia, with little hope of extricating itself. In such a situation, Western currency, especially American dollars, through trade, become highly desirable and important. Some may say that increased trade between Czechoslovakia and the United States can only help international Communism. This may be true in some few instances, but it is essentially a naive comment. Increased trade between Czechoslovakia and the United States, and increased economic contact will, in point of fact, open Czechoslovakia's door on the West wider. And if you want to consider this from a political and psychological standpoint, this helps us more than it helps international Communism.

Increased cultural exchanges and stepped-up student and faculty contacts and exchanges are of critical importance. Czechoslovaks hunger for contact and news from the West and from America, and such contacts supply them.

I save for last my thoughts that more travel by individuals to Czechoslovakia would be of great benefit to Czechoslovakia, to America, and to the individual. In my next article, I will give you a few hints on how to travel in Czechoslovakia. You won't have to know very much; just tell them you're American.

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA: TODAY AND TOMORROW—V (By Donald E. Miller)

If you have seen most of the world and are looking for a rewarding experience on your next trip—or if you have seen nothing and want to make your first big trip one to remember—why not consider a trip to Czechoslovakia. The country is beautiful beyond description and what is more, has not undergone the ravages of commercial tourism. Its people are hospitable to all visitors, but their interest, curiosity, and warmth for Americans is exceptional. American probably has no greater ally and supporter in the world than the people of Czechoslovakia, and American tourists in Czechoslovakia benefit greatly from this fact of Czechoslovak life. Let me give you a few examples.

In Bratislava, Czechoslovakia's second largest city, "Fiddler On The Roof" was being performed on stage. I was dying to see it. There was only one performance which I could attend, however, and it was completely sold out. Here's what happened when my friend Richard and I tried to get tickets:

RICHARD. Could we please have two tickets to tonight's performance of "Fiddler On The Roof?"

TICKET SELLER. I'm sorry, but tonight's performance is sold out.

RICHARD. Isn't there anything? Standing room? This is our last night in Bratislava, and we'd like very much to see it.

TICKET SELLER. I'm sorry, there's nothing left. We've had to turn away hundreds of people.

ME (aside): Richard, tell her I'm American.

RICHARD. Excuse me. I forgot to mention that my friend over there is American. He saw the play in New York and would like very much to compare it with this production here in Bratislava.

ME (in the Czech language). If it's possible, I would like to see "Fiddler On The Roof" please. Thank you.

This was already too much for one poor Czechoslovak ticket seller to talk. She picked up the phone and talked with her boss. That night, Richard and I watched "Fiddler On The Roof" from two of the better seats in the house. It was a magnificent production.

Lest you think that example was the exception rather than the rule, here's what happened in Presov, when Richard wanted to buy for me some Czechoslovak records to take back to the United States:

RICHARD. I'd like to have a copy of "Massachusetts" (the biggest current hit in Czechoslovakia) on a 45 r.p.m., please.

STORE CLERK (gruffly). So would fifty other people. We're out of it. We don't know when we'll have it in. (He then walked away.)

RICHARD. Excuse me. It's not for me. It's for my friend over there. He's an American and lives near Massachusetts.

ME (in the Slovak language). Hello. How are you?

STORE CLERK. You're American! I have a brother in America. He lives near Chicago.

So, again, the defenses caved in. He left his other customers (there were six or seven of them, as I recall) and spent a half-hour with us. Not only did he "happen" to find a copy of "Massachusetts," but he selected five or six others "that I am sure you would enjoy listening to back in America."

It has been my experience, in my travels, that Americans do not often get "favored nation" treatment in many countries around the World. In Czechoslovakia, such treatment is regarded as our national, and natural, right.

Such treatment in a country which is literally a still undiscovered tourist paradise should make for an unforgettable vacation. Here are some of the things you might want to see on your trip to Czechoslovakia.

#### THE PRAGUE AREA

Prague, Czechoslovakia's capital and largest city, is the most beautiful city in Czechoslovakia, and perhaps one of the most beautiful cities in Europe. Wencelas Square, Prague's main street, is worth seeing in its own right. The fact that Wencelas Square has played a major role during and now, after the Russian invasion makes it for me the single most fascinating tourist attraction in Prague. On the Square are located the National Museum and the Statue of Good King Wencelas.

Of great beauty and interest in Prague, as well, is Hradcany Castle, high above the city. Hradcany Castle today is the seat of the Czechoslovak government and the home of the president of the republic. Also, see Charles Bridge. Spanning the Vltava River, which runs through Prague, Charles Bridge is one of the most beautiful, most interesting, and historic in all of Europe.

Just outside Prague is the small village of Lidice, scene of a German massacre in 1943. In retaliation for the assassination of the German governor of Prague, the Germans shot all the men and women of Lidice, buried them in a common grave, and sent the children of the town off to camps in Germany. They then levelled the town to the ground with bulldozers. After the war, the Czechs erected a monument in the former town and built a new Lidice nearby. A trip is a reminder of man's inhumanity to man—and a good one at that.

Not far from Prague are Carlsbad and Marienbad, two famous watering-spots of the past and two excellent vacation towns of the

present. The famous spas of Carlsbad and Marienbad are just as good as ever.

South of Prague is the small city of Ceske Budejovice (in German, Budweis), one of the beer capitals of Czechoslovakia. Besides beer, there is history in Ceske Budejovice. It is called by many the Florence of Czechoslovakia and is considered one of the most beautiful Renaissance cities in Eastern Europe.

Not far from Ceske Budejovice is Hluboka, a perfect reproduction of England's Windsor Castle in the heart of Southern Czechoslovakia. The grand tour of Hluboka is interesting and great fun, as you have to shuffle around the castle in over-sized house slippers.

In the vicinity, too, is the town of Ceske Krumlov, one of the most beautiful little towns I have ever seen. The main attraction in Ceske Krumlov is a castle, but as far as I'm concerned, the whole town is the attraction.

Having covered the western part of the country, let's move east to Slovakia.

Slovakia, comprising over one-half of the country in area, is, I think, one of the more beautiful and varied tourist areas in Europe.

Bratislava, its capital, is, in effect, a river town on the Danube. High above Bratislava sits its castle, commanding a superb view of the city and the river. On a clear day, you can't see forever, but you can see Austria—not far away.

For skiers looking for something new, exciting, beautiful and cheap, why not try the High Tatras of Eastern Slovakia. The Tatras are called the Alps of Eastern Europe, the Tatra area, Little Switzerland. In 1969, the World Skiing Championships will be held in the Tatras, bringing this area to the attention of the ski world. The High Tatras are a year-round vacation resort.

In addition to visiting the main tourist attractions of Czechoslovakia, may I also suggest, after my own experiences, that you consider visiting one or two of the small towns. It is in the small towns and cities that you will have the best chances of meeting and talking with people.

I don't know if any, or how many, of you will actually visit Czechoslovakia. If you do, you'll enjoy it and you'll remember it.

And if you do, will you do me one favor: speak with the people. Try to get to know them. Your efforts will pay off one thousand fold—for you, for America, and for Czechoslovakia. In these days of rapid travel and instantaneous communication, person-to-person and face-to-face contact is still one of the most effective means of fostering international understanding, and each of us has the opportunity to be our nation's unofficial ambassador to the world.

#### A CORPORATE PATRIOT: THE DOW CHEMICAL CO.

#### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than any other American company, the Midland Dow Chemical Co., headquartered in Midland, Mich., has been a chief "whipping boy" by certain groups regarding its manufacturing of napalm for use by U.S. military forces in Vietnam. Dow Chemical has been maligned, criticized, belittled, and set upon.

In recent days, the courage of this company has been tested again. And, once again, Dow leadership placed their country above an easy way out. Other

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES IN THE POMPANO, FLA., AREA, 1968-69 SEASON—Continued

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point, at packinghouses]

Date, 1968-69	Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1			Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, "lower" in 10 lots			8-lb. carton
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	
Jan. 30, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 31, 1969	3.40			3.00			
Feb. 3, 1969	4.00			3.00			1.70
Feb. 4, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Feb. 5, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Feb. 6, 1969	4.50			3.50			
Feb. 7, 1969	4.50			3.50			
Feb. 10, 1969	5.00			4.00			
Feb. 11, 1969	5.00			4.00			
Feb. 12, 1969	5.00			4.00			
Feb. 13, 1969	5.00			4.00			
Feb. 14, 1969	5.00			4.00			
Feb. 17, 1969	3.50			4.00			

<sup>1</sup> Harvest curtailed due to low temperatures.  
<sup>2</sup> Offerings very light; too few to quote prices.  
<sup>3</sup> Mostly.  
<sup>4</sup> Few.  
<sup>5</sup> Too few sales.  
<sup>6</sup> Holiday.  
<sup>7</sup> Few sales; mostly.  
<sup>8</sup> Insufficient.

<sup>9</sup> Few sales.  
<sup>10</sup> Too few to quote.  
<sup>11</sup> Not permitted.  
 Source: Daily reports of Fruit and Vegetable Market News Branch, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; Vegetable Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, Jan. 16, 1969.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
 DAVID PACKARD**

Mr. GORE, Mr. President, last month when the Senate was considering confirmation of the nomination of Mr. David Packard to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Melvin Laird, advised the Senate that he would issue an order that matters affecting the Hewlett-Packard Co., of which Mr. David Packard was the largest stockholder and proposed to continue so to be, would be diverted to some other official for decision, so that, as Senators understood it, Deputy Secretary Packard could not participate in a decision affecting the Hewlett-Packard Co., which company has vast multimillion-dollar contracts to furnish electronic equipment to the Defense Department.

On yesterday, according to press reports, Secretary Laird announced the assignment of Deputy Secretary David Packard to a key role in the decision upon the deployment or nondeployment of the anti-ballistic-missile proposal.

I know of no matter that will come before the Defense Department that will so vitally affect the prosperity and value of the stock of electronics companies, including the Hewlett-Packard Co., as this one. This leads me to wonder whether Secretary Laird did, in fact, issue such an order, and if so, what the contents of the order were.

This is not to imply, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from Tennessee thinks that Secretary Packard will give preference to his personal interests in making such a decision. That is not the question. It was not the question with respect to the confirmation of his nomination. Indeed, on page S837, the RECORD shows that in the debate I made the following statement:

This is not to question the honesty and integrity of Mr. Packard. That is not the question. It is not to allege or even to suspect wrongdoing. That is not the case.

In dealing with the question of conflict of interest, in considering the nomination of an appointee to a high Government position, we are not dealing with wrongdoing. We are dealing with public confidence. We are dealing with appearances. We are dealing

with circumstances which, conceivably, could constitute a conflict on the part of the official between his personal interest and the public interest on the one hand, or circumstances which, on the other, would give rise to suspicion and loss of confidence on the part of the people.

Mr. President, many people will wonder, unfortunately, how objective a judgment can be and will be, by one whose career, whose success, whose involvement, whose environment have been surrounded by success in and association with the very heart of the industrial-military complex on a question involving deployment of anti-missile-missile systems.

I repeat, this is a question of appearances. It does not look good, and it will not look good to millions of Americans. It is not a question of wrongdoing, but a question of circumstances that can give rise to doubt or suspicion, circumstance that could shake the confidence of many people in the Defense Department.

Public officials should abstain from appearances of evil, as well as from evil itself.

Incidentally, it was only last week that Miss Willie Mae Rogers, formerly of Jackson, Tenn., was asked, according to published reports, to give up her livelihood, a job with a magazine, in order to remove her conflict of interest with respect to a position of public trust for which she had been selected.

**NATO ALTERS POLICY AFTER CZECH  
 INVASION**

Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. President, the invasion of Czechoslovakia last August was a sobering demonstration that freedom and communism are incompatible.

The citizens of the free world who believed that there was a new spirit of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the West had their illusion dispelled. The era of detente was revealed in Czechoslovakia as little more than a glittering delusion for a harsher reality, and in Eastern Europe detente still meant detention and the bars of the Iron Curtain remained intact.

After the invasion of Czechoslovakia, I called on the floor of the Senate for a revitalizing of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In those remarks on September 5, 1968, I said in part:

Mr. President, the deliberate, indefensible attack on Czechoslovakia has shown each of the premises (of detente) to be wrong or misinterpreted. The conclusion drawn from them was a miscalculation. Russia has not been forced to follow peaceful ways.

It is these premises, nonetheless, that have guided the detente mentality of our relations with the Soviet Union in recent years. Always fearing to offend, we pursued foreign relations and national security from a position of self-effacing courtesy rather than a position of strength and firmness.

It is under the protective umbrella of detente that we have allowed NATO to deteriorate, that we have redeployed military forces in Europe, and that we have considered substantial troop reductions.

It is under the protective umbrella of detente that our nation has announced and pursued a program and policy of building bridges from West to East.

On August 20, 1968, it became fatefully obvious that the umbrella was illusory. The premises on which our detente policy was based were swept away when Warsaw Pact troops crossed the borders of Czechoslovakia.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the Atlantic Assembly meeting in Brussels in November of last year, I felt that a new spirit had been generated in NATO. The Assembly adopted a number of resolutions demonstrating a renewed determination to maintain a strong military deterrent in Europe and a willingness to accept a more equitable sharing of the costs of a strengthened NATO force.

President Nixon's decision to visit West Berlin and the capitals of our allies in Europe this month, shows his clear determination to rebuild our neglected relations with our European allies and to strengthen NATO. This courage and conviction of our President is another welcome sign that as the United States enters, in the words of President Nixon, the "era of negotiation," it will do so with a clear view of reality and from a position of strength.

Mr. President, a feature article appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES DADE COUNTY, FLA., 1968-69 SEASON

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point]

Date, 1968-69	Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1				Greens, 40-lb. cartons, U.S. No. 2			Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 65 to 80 percent U.S. No. 1			
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7
Dec. 23, 1968	8.00	5.00	2.75-3.00	2.90	5.50	3.00-3.50	1.50-2.00				
Dec. 24, 1968	8.00	5.00	2.25-3.00	2.90	5.35-5.50	3.00-3.35	1.50-2.00				
Dec. 25, 1968 <sup>3</sup>											
Dec. 26, 1968 <sup>4</sup>	7.00	4.00	2.00	7.00-8.00	4.50-5.00	2.25-2.65	1.00-1.35				
Dec. 27, 1968	7.67	4.67	2.60	8.75	5.17	2.96	1.56				
Average											
Dec. 30, 1968 <sup>5</sup>					3.65	2.25-2.35					
Dec. 31, 1968	5.00-5.50	3.50	3.50	5.00-6.00							
Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>6</sup>											
Jan. 2, 1969		3.50	1.75			2.25-2.35	1.35-1.50				
Jan. 2, 1969	4.50-5.00	3.50	1.75	6.00	3.35-3.50	2.25-2.35	1.25-1.40				
Jan. 3, 1969	5.00	3.50	2.33	5.67	3.50	2.30	1.38				
August											
Jan. 6, 1969 <sup>7</sup>											
Jan. 7, 1969 <sup>8</sup>											
Jan. 8, 1969 <sup>9</sup>								6.00	5.00	3.50	1.75-2.00
Jan. 9, 1969	7.00	5.00			3.35-3.65	2.25-2.65					
Jan. 10, 1969 <sup>10</sup>											
Jan. 13, 1969 <sup>11</sup>				9.00	4.65-5.00	3.35-4.00					
Jan. 14, 1969	7.00-8.00	5.00-6.00			4.65-5.50	3.35-4.00					
Jan. 15, 1969	7.50	5.00-6.00			5.00-5.35	3.50-4.00					
Jan. 16, 1969	7.50-8.00	5.50-6.00			5.00-5.35	3.50-4.00					
Jan. 17, 1969	7.50	5.50-6.00									
Jan. 20, 1969 <sup>12</sup>											
Jan. 21, 1969	7.00	5.00-6.00				5.00	3.35-4.00				
Jan. 22, 1969	7.00-8.00	6.00-7.00				5.00-5.35	3.35-4.65				
Jan. 23, 1969	6.00-7.00	5.00-5.50				5.00	3.50-4.00				
Jan. 24, 1969	7.00	5.00-6.00				5.00	3.50-4.00				
Jan. 27, 1969 <sup>13</sup>											
Jan. 28, 1969 <sup>14</sup>							3.50-4.00				
Jan. 29, 1969		16.00					4.00				
Jan. 30, 1969		16.00					3.50-4.00				
Jan. 31, 1969		16.00									
Feb. 3, 1969 <sup>15</sup>							2.40				
Feb. 4, 1969		16.00					2.40				
Feb. 5, 1969		16.00					2.40				
Feb. 6, 1969		26.00					4.50				
Feb. 7, 1969		17.00									
Feb. 10, 1969 <sup>16</sup>						5.35	2.65				
Feb. 11, 1969	8.00	6.00-7.00				4.65-5.35	2.40				
Feb. 12, 1969	7.00-8.00	26.00				2.35	4.00				
Feb. 13, 1969	8.00	6.00				4.65-5.00	4.00				
Feb. 14, 1969	8.00	6.00					4.00				
Feb. 17, 1969 <sup>17</sup>											

1 Prices not established.  
 2 Mostly.  
 3 Holiday.  
 4 Most booked open; prices to be established later.  
 5 Prices generally not established.  
 6 Very few.  
 7 Weekend rains; no packing, insufficient.  
 8 Offerings light; prices to be established later.  
 9 Few.  
 10 Insufficient quantity (slightly stronger tendency).

11 Offerings light; prices not established.  
 12 Prices generally unsettled.  
 13 Offerings increasing; prices mostly not established.  
 14 6 x 7 and larger.  
 15 Prices generally unsettled and billed open bases—f.o.b. prices established Tuesday.  
 16 Prices to be established later.  
 17 Best mostly.

Source: Daily reports of Fruit and Vegetable Market News Branch, C. & M.S., U.S.D.A.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES IN THE POMPAÑO, FLA., AREA, 1968-69 SEASON

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point, at packinghouses]

Date, 1968-69	Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1			Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, "lower" in 10 lots			8-lb. carton
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	
Dec. 16, 1968 <sup>1</sup>							
Dec. 17, 1968 <sup>2</sup>							
Dec. 18, 1968	6.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00-3.25	
Dec. 19, 1968	6.00	5.00	3.50-4.00	4.50-5.00	4.00	3.00-3.25	
Dec. 20, 1968	6.00	5.00	3.50-4.00	4.50-5.00	4.00	3.00-3.50	
Average	6.00	5.00	3.80	4.80	4.00	3.17	
Dec. 23, 1968	550-6.00	4.50-5.00	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	3.00-3.50	2.00-2.50	
Dec. 24, 1968 <sup>3</sup>							
Dec. 25, 1968 <sup>4</sup>	5.50	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	
Dec. 26, 1968	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.50-3.75	3.00		
Dec. 27, 1968	5.25	4.25	3.00	3.75	3.00	2.00	
Dec. 30, 1968	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.50-2.75	2.00	1.50	
Dec. 31, 1968	3.50	3.00	2.00		2.00	(*)	
Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>5</sup>							
Jan. 2, 1969	3.50	2.50-3.00	1.50-2.00	2.50-2.75	(10)	(10)	
Jan. 2, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00		2.00		
Jan. 3, 1969	3.62	2.90	1.90	2.75	2.00	1.50	
Jan. 6, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 7, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 8, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 9, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 10, 1969	3.50-4.00	(11)	(11)		(11)	(11)	
Average	3.57	2.97		3.00			
Jan. 13, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 14, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 15, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 16, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 17, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 20, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 21, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 22, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 23, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 24, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 27, 1969	4.00-4.50			3.00-3.50			1.90
Jan. 28, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 29, 1969	4.00			3.00			

Footnotes at end of table.



Mr. Silber comments, in part:

Just as the Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia in 1948 helped make the Marshall Plan a reality, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 shoved Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty out of the minds of Western diplomats.

Article 13 would open the way for any of the original signatory countries to withdraw from the alliance after 20 years—after April 4, 1969. Now none is expected to withdraw.

The situation today is comparable to the post-World War II period which gave birth to NATO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this informative, well-reasoned article by Mr. Silber be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

**"TANKS AND TERROR" WAKENED WEST: NATO ALTERS POLICY AFTER CZECH INVASION**  
(By Howard Silber)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in an unhappy state last summer. The 15-nation alliance appeared to be dissolving in a pool of indifference and false security.

France had withdrawn its military forces from the NATO high command as President Charles de Gaulle continued to pursue his go-it-alone policy and his determination to weaken American influence in Europe.

The United States, traditionally the principal supporter of NATO, was pumping more of its resources into Southeast Asia, and was faced with an unchecked outflow of gold. So the Pentagon was withdrawing some 35 thousand troops from Europe.

Britain decided to pull about six thousand troops from the continent as part of its economic campaign.

There was bickering. France, which continues its political participation in the alliance, never missed an opportunity to fling barbs at the United States. Denmark and Norway were increasingly critical of the military dictatorship in Greece. Portugal, because of its African policies, was all but ostracized.

**BLISSFUL THEME**

But, in spite of the surface disharmony, the alliance was busily pursuing its new policy of combining detente with defense. The blissful theme was co-existence with the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact partners.

The sweetness-and-light attitude was manifested last June when the NATO foreign ministers, meeting at Reykjavik, Iceland, invited the Warsaw Pact nations to negotiate mutual and balanced military force reductions in Europe.

Then, on the night of August 20, 1968, United States and West German defense radar operators suddenly found their "views" of large areas behind the Iron Curtain blocked.

Communist aircraft were dropping curtains of chaff, the metallic ribbons which resemble Christmas tree tinsel, to mask activities. Czechoslovakia was being invaded.

By breakfast time on August 21 it was clear to most NATO leaders that the Soviet Union and others of the Warsaw Five were not willing to accept detente.

Detente, an almost untranslatable French word, is described by Harlan Cleveland, United States Ambassador to NATO, as the process of building bridges.

"Only when the Western Europeans and their transatlantic NATO partners began to talk in earnest about bridge-building, did it begin to dawn on the leaders of Russian communism that detente was bound to be deeply disruptive to the status quo in Europe," Cleveland said.

"The more the Eastern Europeans learn about Western Europe, the more they want some of that freedom, too. The more the East Germans learn about the miracle of West Germany, the more the Easterners want some of that Western prosperity.

**TANKS AND TERROR**

"Since the Soviets didn't want change," Cleveland declared, "they decided that real detente was too dangerous.

"And in August in Prague they made it plain with tanks and terror that the efforts of Dubcek's regime to build a 'socialist humanism' at home and freer relations abroad went well beyond the narrow limits of Soviet tolerance for change in Eastern Europe."

To say that the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the resulting presence of Soviet forces across the border from Bavaria was the catalyst which reversed the dissolution of NATO might not be the whole truth.

But disintegration does appear to have been halted. NATO is adding to its military strength. NATO countries are taking a fresh look at their alliance. With the possible exception of France, there is a renewed belief in the need for a closeknit, powerful Allied military force in Europe. More men and more money are being invested.

No longer is there any real doubt here that NATO, which will observe its twentieth anniversary April 4, will move into its twenty-first year. There was serious doubt until last August 20.

Uncertainty had spread to Washington, where it was nourished by the arguments of two influential members of Congress, Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, and Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, who wanted to withdraw all American troops from Europe. August 20 put an end to the argument.

Just as the Soviet take-over of Czechoslovakia in 1948 helped make the Marshall Plan a reality, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 shoved Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty out of the minds of Western diplomats.

Article 13 would open the way for any of the original signatory countries to withdraw from the alliance after 20 years—after April 4, 1969. Now none is expected to withdraw.

The situation today is comparable to the post-World War II period which gave birth to NATO.

When the United States and other countries of the West were doing everything possible to return to the ways of peace, the Soviet Union of Josef Stalin remained on a wartime footing.

**STRONG REACTION**

In late 1946, Allied forces in Europe had been reduced to 880 thousand. But the Soviet Union had more than four million men in uniform. Two years later, the Kremlin had control of 390 thousand square miles and more than 90 million people outside Russia. Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia had come under Soviet domination.

The reaction of the West strong.

NATO was formed by 12 countries—the United States, Canada, Belgium, France, The Netherlands, Britain, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Italy, Luxembourg and Iceland. The 12 agreed that "an armed attack against one or more of them . . . shall be considered an attack against them all." Turkey and Greece joined the alliance in 1952. West Germany was admitted in 1955.

The treaty was implemented in 1950 when the NATO Council of Ministers announced plans to create "under a centralized command, an integrated force capable of deter-

ring aggression and insuring the defense of Western Europe."

The command was established in April, 1951, with Supreme Headquarters-Allied Powers Europe at Rocquencourt near Paris.

**FIFTY-FOUR DIVISIONS**

After de Gaulle announced his decision to withdraw France from the NATO integrated military command, SHAPE was moved to a new 32-million-dollar facility in a French-language rural district about 30 miles southwest of Brussels. NATO's own separate administrative headquarters is at the edge of Brussels.

The various units committed to NATO remain under the control of their own governments. Only during periods of emergency would the forces shift to the command of United States Army Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander.

NATO lists about 54 army divisions, 24 of them in or near West Germany. There are believed to be about 125 Warsaw Pact divisions arrayed against the West.

But not all divisions are alike. NATO divisions have about 50 per cent more men than their Communist counterparts.

The quality of NATO units varies. Some of the Greek and Turkish outfits are considerably weaker than units of Norway's small but excellent army and air force. By the same token, NATO military men speak much more respectfully of the Soviet military than of the armies and air forces of other Warsaw Pact countries.

The emphasis today is on better and consequently stronger NATO forces.

Ambassador Cleveland warned that "if the Soviets are ready, NATO had better be ready." He pointed out that "every NATO ally has lately been below NATO standards of manning, equipment and training."

**SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES**

After August 20, every major NATO defense participant agreed to attempt to meet the standards requested by General Lemnitzer.

The NATO mobile force, one of the command's biggest sticks, is to be enlarged. The NATO-committed tactical air forces, which were largely prepared for the use of nuclear weapons, are being converted more rapidly for non-nuclear roles.

Reforger I and Crested Cap, the United States Army and Air Force redeployment exercises which were highlighted by war games near the border between West Germany and Czechoslovakia, were part of the NATO muscle-flexing program.

Last year, the major participants in NATO spent about 4.5 per cent of their gross national product on defense needs. The United States committed about 10 per cent. Much of that, of course, went to meet the burdens of the Southeast Asia war. Last November the European Allies pledged substantial increases.

**HAND STILL OFFERED**

What about detente? Is the concept obsolete in the face of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and NATO's resulting body-building program?

Cleveland said he is still hopeful that bridges can be built and used.

"The Soviet action in Czechoslovakia was a deep wound to the agreed Western policy of pursuing detente between East and West," he observed. "During the last 10 days of August every NATO country hastened to dampen contacts, postpone political visits and generally defer the building of East-West bridges.

"The Minnesota Band did not visit the Soviet Union, and the Red Army Choir was not heard in England. The Mayor of Moscow was shipped hurriedly out of The Hague. Ministers in half a dozen Western countries who had been preparing trips designed to bolster their personal contributions to peace suddenly discovered urgent business at home.

"Diplomatic parties celebrating Polish Army Day, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the like, were boycotted by all but minor Western officials.

"The Italian Fair in Moscow went on, but when, in a show of business-as-usual, the top Soviet leaders turned up as visitors, they found that no Italian official of comparable rank had made the trip."

Cleveland said that "on August 20, NATO's hand was outstretched, holding a proposal to talk seriously with the Eastern allies about arms control in Europe.

"The desire for detente is so deep," he continued, "that this welcoming hand will probably not be latched into a fist. But the staff work on 'balanced and mutual force reductions,' the building of models, the development of concrete proposals are bound to be accorded a low priority within Western governments and in NATO until the Soviets give some sign that they are thinking about them, too."

#### LESSON IN FEAR

The Ambassador said "the most far-reaching lesson of the brutal action in Czechoslovakia is that Soviet leaders are afraid of detente, afraid of the contagion of competition with the West—still, after 50 years of communism, afraid of bringing out the best, which means the freest, in their own people."

In short, said Cleveland, "it takes two to tango and the Soviet Union is still a wall-flower."

Until Russia agrees to dance, NATO is prepared to maintain a strong defense umbrella over the 520 million people of the West.

#### RE-REFERRAL AND CORRECTION OF BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have S. 121, a bill relating to the recognition of Vincent J. Burnelli for his contributions to the growth of aeronautical science and technology in the United States, re-referred from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to the Judiciary Committee.

This has been cleared with the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and it meets with his approval.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I also ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, the award to Mrs. Hazel Burnelli, widow of Vincent J. Burnelli, a typographical error be corrected at line 9 to provide the sum of \$100,000 in lieu of \$10,000 which appears in the bill as a typographical error.

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

#### THE REORGANIZATION OF THE OEO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President today has issued a statement making known his intentions with regard to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the war on poverty.

Some in my State will recall that I made it clear in my campaign last fall that I would have to oppose rigorously even a new President from my own party if he set out on a course which I thought damaging to the antipoverty programs which are so critical in solving the crisis of the cities.

Accordingly, I reviewed the President's statement today with some anxiety and great care. Having analyzed the statement, I can now say that I believe many of the previous fears have proved to be unfounded and that statesmanship and foresight characterize the President's message. Indeed, the President's statement is far more important for its positive approach and tone than for the relatively few organizational changes it makes.

With regard to these organizational changes, or spinoffs of programs to other agencies, the statement is far more important for what it leaves intact than for what it takes away.

In other words, I think it may be properly said that this statement is vital not only for what it does, but also for what it says. And it is also vital for what it does not do.

The President's statement today gives much needed stability to the antipoverty program and puts these fears that have been raised at rest. The heart of the statement is, I believe, the commitment of the new administration to retain the central community action program and to seek an immediate extension of the present authority for the OEO for an additional year beyond its June 1969 expiration date. If there is one thing that the OEO and the community action program have lacked it has been a sense of some life expectancy and confidence in their own future. This they now have.

The President proposes to send up more detailed legislative recommendations to Congress in the late spring, to take effect at the beginning of fiscal year 1971. But, by coupling that with a 1-year extension of the present authority, he gives Congress the opportunity to act with deliberate speed without, at the same time, interrupting program operations.

In this statement, the President announces his intention to delegate the Headstart and Job Corps programs as of July 1, 1969, to the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, respectively. There will be people who will seize upon this act as deleterious to the war on poverty.

But this is no more than the original plan called for in the war on poverty, for it was then thought that mature programs would be spun off to established agencies for continued operation and that the innovation would continue to be left in the Office of Economic Opportunity. There is no truer adage in the Federal Government than that which states that program operations drive out planning and innovation. So if we want the OEO to innovate—and we certainly do—then we have to take mature programs and put them in other agencies.

I would further remind critics of what President Nixon is about to do that they did not object when President Johnson took the much more serious step of delegating the antipoverty program's manpower training efforts to the Department of Labor some years ago, when it was not nearly as ready for transfer as these programs are now.

I raise two items of caution in regard to the President's message.

First, I am concerned with his instruction that "preparations be made for the transfer" of the comprehensive Health Center program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Health Center program, incidentally, has been a very special care of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). That program is not yet well enough established, in my judgment, and involves the need for extensive community organization support. I would hope that the President, notwithstanding his message, would reconsider and still leave it in the OEO for a time.

Second, I would hope that the assignment to the Vice President's Office of Intergovernmental Relations of the working out of antipoverty roles for State and local officials will not hamstring the independence of the OEO. Under the Green amendment, Congress made it possible for State and local governments to assume a much greater role in community action programs; and I do not believe that any greater legislative authority is necessary in this regard.

Finally, I point out that the President has wisely protected the role of the community action agencies in continuing operation of Headstart. I am very pleased to note that the community action agencies which have any such programs in hand like Headstart will be permitted to continue to operate them.

Mr. President, the real payoff in the entire message, in my judgement, is the degree of stability and recognition which it gives to the OEO. For example, the President wishes to give the OEO a seemingly expanded important role in the area of community-based economic development.

He also promises, which I believe is clearly extremely important, I should like to read this into the RECORD:

From the experience of OEO we have learned the value of having in the Federal Government an agency whose special concern is the poor.

He also indicates very clearly—and this should be very reassuring to the program—that to do the job which he expects to have done by the OEO takes money. He recognizes that, and that is critically important.

Mr. President, the President not only provides an innovative role for the OEO but also points out that it is a natural home for economic development activities. I join with the President in that regard, and also in his determination to which I pledge my own very best efforts, to tighten up on management and integrity. As the President says, when money is lost to the program because of default or even inefficiency, that is the worst blow to the poor, because they are deprived of that money hence, the critical importance of keeping a tight rein in respect of management and other techniques.

So I close, Mr. President, as I opened: I believe that the fears of many that President Nixon and the new administration would dismantle the antipoverty program have proved to be baseless. I

equipment, supplies, and living organisms into space was among that same set of goals. We have gone far beyond simply sending living organisms into space. Our astronauts, whom we honor today, demonstrated that man has a serious and significant role in the operation of these vehicles as well as their development.

This same Space Act in 1958 called for the establishment of long-range studies of the potential benefits to be gained and the problems involved in the utilization of the aeronautical and space activities for peaceful and scientific purposes. Our astronauts have continued to demonstrate the openness and peaceful intent of our national space effort and serve as an example of what may be done by these astronauts to further science in this new environment.

In 1958 the National Aeronautics and Space Act called for the preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology and in the application thereof to the conduct of peaceful activities within and outside the atmosphere. The Apollo program has pursued this course with dedication. Yet we find that in this moment of great achievement we are in danger of losing this leadership. It is to be hoped that the example of the men whom we honor today will spur us to rededicate ourselves to leadership in space.

As part of the obligation of the Space Act of 1958, NASA was called upon to make available to the agencies directly concerned with national defense discoveries that have military value or significance, and to civilian agencies established to direct and control non-military and space activities information as to discoveries which have value or significance to that agency. NASA has gone far beyond this. The technology which allowed Astronauts Borman, Lovell, and Anders to orbit the moon and return safely to earth has found many and diverse applications in our industry. Many of the contributions of our national space effort will, over the next few years, find their way into the daily lives of the American people. Again our astronauts represent not only the achievement of the day, but the potential for the future.

Our Space Act of 1958 also called for the cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in peaceful application of the results. The successful Apollo 8 mission was truly an international effort. People from around the world participated in the successful flight. The people of the world rode with Astronauts Borman, Lovell, and Anders throughout this complex undertaking. One can only hope that this and other international programs of NASA will grow and provide the basis of better understanding between nations in the future.

Finally, the National Space Act of 1958 called for the most effective utilization of scientific and engineering resources of the United States with close cooperation among all agencies of the United States in order to avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities, and equipment.

The Apollo program and the most recent flight of Apollo 8 continue to show

that the United States can successfully undertake large, complex technological programs with continuing benefit to our country and to the world. As the Nation reaches the peak period of activity in the Apollo program, it is important that we conserve these scientific and engineering resources of our country and continue to utilize them effectively for the future benefit of our country and the world. As Astronauts Borman, Lovell, and Anders set an outstanding example for all of us in the flight of Apollo 8 we should all be reminded that the support and utilization of these resources are a must if we are to continue to be successful as a technologically progressive nation.

Surely we honor these outstanding men today in recognition that they represent not only the NASA industry team, but the entire Nation in their quest of excellence as a people.

#### CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND NATO

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Telegraph in London on November 18 published a perceptive editorial concerning the impact of the Czechoslovakian invasion and occupation on NATO. It also deals realistically with the question of nuclear weapons and such guarantees to Western Europe. Here is the text:

#### NATO'S LATE AWAKENING

Tremble, ruthless aggressors in the Kremlin, with your vast conventional superiority, your obedient masses of brain-washed cannon fodder, your nuclear parity, your servile satellites and your strategic central position. Heterogeneous, under-manned, under-trained, pinch-penny and now, it seems, half-awake NATO, after years of neglect and facile optimism, has at last given you a stern and long-overdue warning. If you touch Yugoslavia, Austria, or perhaps Rumania, or even Albania, then by golly that would—er, well, "create an international crisis with grave consequences."

Better late than never. This might mean that from now on the Russians will not be allowed to practise aggression with one hand and *détente* with the other. But public opinion in the NATO countries should know, as it is to be hoped that the culpable NATO Governments know, and as both the Russians and the countries they are threatening certainly know, that NATO is powerless to give any effective aid. It is an illusion to think that NATO's great but dwindling air and naval superiority in the Mediterranean might somehow be brought to bear. Russia's strength on land, and in land-based aircraft, would be overwhelming at the crucial points. Furthermore, along the whole line of confrontation with NATO, from Norway to Turkey, Russian conventional preponderance is so great that she could in retaliation smash through to the West's vitals in a few days in many places simultaneously.

Would America then risk nuclear war, in which she and the West would be devastated as much as Russia, for Yugoslavia and the others? Would the various European members of NATO wish her to do so? The answer is clearly, no. It is, in fact, no more than a

possibility that America would use nuclear weapons in retaliation for a clear-cut aggression against Berlin or West Germany.

So, after we all went through, we are back again where we were in the spring of 1939, only worse. Then our guarantee to Poland was credible, and she accepted it. Now we would not embarrass Yugoslavia and the others by offering them a meaningless alliance. Then, by dint of blood, sweat, toil and tears we were able to hold out until the strength of the free world could victoriously be brought to bear. Now, if there were war, it would probably all be over in a few days. So what is to be done? Bring NATO forces up to maximum efficiency within the severe limits of their inadequate size; make all possible provision for emergency home defence forces (instead of disbanding them as the British Government has done) so as to leave the soldiers free for military duties; and re-arm while America's nuclear umbrella deters the Russians from interfering with the process.

#### THE OTHER FACE OF CONSERVATION

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extraordinary statement on conservation by Mr. Wendell Bever, the able and articulate director of the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, who shortly will be taking office as a regional director for the National Wildlife Federation, which was recently published in the November issue of *Outdoor Oklahoma*.

This excellent article points out some of the problems in conservation of our natural resources now afflicting this land and urges some intelligent remedies therefor. The article follows:

#### THE OTHER FACE OF CONSERVATION

(By Wendell Bever)

I am an angry man! I've had 25 years to build a full head of steam. I detest the word "compromise" with a passion. We've used the word as a vehicle to sell wildlife down the river.

Tell me, how do we compromise pure water, clean air and wild creatures?

I am impatient! Impatient with conservation lip service, impatient with the attitude, "Let's wait till next year," and impatient with laws that provide the authority but no teeth or funds.

I am irritated. Irritated with just plain people who stand to gain or lose the most.

We got a problem, friend. Take a long, hard look!

Oklahoma is losing 100,000-plus bobwhite quail each year and South Dakota is trying desperately to shore up a sagging pheasant population. In Saskatchewan and the north-central states, the ability of the prairie marshes to produce ducks decreases about 80,000 birds each year.

In Wyoming and Montana, antelope show a precarious trend and may be living on borrowed time. South Dakota's pheasant population once numbered a whopping thirteen million birds and today, about three million.

Pesticides, herbicides, bulldozers, plowshares, drainage ditches, reservoirs and even such things as woven wire fences are playing havoc upon our wild environments.

Some of the best saltwater ecologists in the country tell us the Mississippi River

drains the chemically polluted waters of thousands of tributaries into the gulf. Here many of the more stable chemical compounds threaten to break the basic food chain necessary to maintain the gulf as one of the world's great natural fish traps.

Some say it's already beginning to happen. North America's largest cesspool, Lake Erie, is well known to all of us. Why not the gulf?

Most of us are acutely aware of the dangers of a poison when consumed by living creatures, but how many of us have ever stopped to consider the even greater threat—the changing of whole environments. A poisoned critter can get well but destroy his home and nothing will save him—except a zoo!

We farm the land clean. We no longer tolerate the sunflower, the thistle or pigeon grass. With clean farming we create a new environment of hundreds of thousands of acres of single kinds of crops—perhaps wheat, corn, soybean or cotton. We create an ideal situation for that particular insect that specializes on certain types of crops.

Because the threat of damage is increased so profoundly we flood our fields with chemical sprays—sometimes once, sometimes eight to ten times a year. We keep the detrimental insect problem in hand, but along with him we destroy the beneficial insects also.

The young of bobwhite quail, or pheasants, or grouse, simply cannot survive without the supercharged protein foods that insects alone can provide. Thus, even though we find only minute traces of an insecticide in the young bobwhite, he may ultimately die.

Insecticides and herbicides accomplish two things—they eliminate insect life at a critical time of year and they transform a habitat made up of many parts into a habitat made up of a single part.

Wildlife cannot survive in a single-purpose environment anymore than it can survive in your living room.

In Wyoming and other western states, chemical sprays are being used to convert hundreds of thousands of acres of sagebrush to prairie grasses—the death knell for antelope, sage grouse and even the mule deer.

In the Rocky Mountains a subtle change is in the making. From New Mexico to Canada, mule deer and elk are being subjected to the old squeeze play. In one mountain range after another, populations are beginning to level off, and some ecologists are disturbed by the marked decline in ability of some former great game ranges to carry even a static population.

In the Rocky Mountains we plant productive old burns to pine, skipping the natural brushlands which normally follow. And we wind up with sawdust and 2 by 4's—but no game. Oklahoma annually plants 200,000 acres of native rangelands to bermuda grass—the perfect formula for eliminating about 100,000 bobs each year.

Even the wily trout has a problem. In the Black Hills of Wyoming and South Dakota, 2,600 miles of trout stream has declined to less than 200. And in other states, dwindling stream flows give evidence of future problems.

As long as we raise more people, we work the lands harder—always trying to close the food gap—and we never will. In the meantime, Mister Bobwhite and his wild companions dwindle and dwindle until one day it's, "Do you remember the good old days when . . . ?"

Mister Sportsman, we are in trouble. Do you know the culprit? The problem rides under the guise of "good conservation," the dollar sign and a booming population of people.

Don't hit the panic button! Not yet. Don't pressure your game department to restrict hunting and fishing seasons. This doesn't help. It actually compounds the problem by creating an illusion that by saving wildlife we've found the solution. This kind of misconception just clouds the issue. Look at the facts!

All of those wild birds, animals and fish are declining because of free use of pesticides, environmental pollution, clean farming, drainage and going hog-wild on the manipulation of water. Even such things as forest management and the control of fire have in many instances created more wild-life problems than they help to solve.

Have we got problems? You can't imagine. Hunters take a harvestable surplus which has almost no effect, other than beneficial, upon wildlife. It is true that some big game seasons are designed to reduce populations and this is necessary.

But, remember, most range and forest management plans are designed to grow trees and grass—not wildlife. A hundred animals or a hundred fish, there is still a surplus to be harvested. Sportsmen should stop fighting ghosts and learn who the real enemies are.

Study the Prairie State of South Dakota. Look at a good example of the problem.

Just a few years ago this state carried 300 pheasants per square mile within the better range. The population skid started in the 1940's and plunged to a low of about two million birds by 1965—the lowest level in 30 years. The decline was classed as a public disaster.

What happened?

Upheaval in the game department. Accusations and counter-accusations.irate citizens, irate legislators. You name it, everything that could happen did happen.

You can't drop from thirteen million birds to two million without blaming somebody, even if it's the wrong man or animal. It just 'ain't' done in our great society. But who to blame?

Since the game department was the handiest, they were raked over the coals just on general principles. Because the little red fox eats a pheasant once in a while, he got a good going over too. And, of course, the old standard—the cotton-picking hunting seasons were just too liberal.

Finally, after a long drawnout hassle, we came to the real culprit. And a feeble voice of the minority out of hundreds of thousands of sportsmen, tourist promoters and land-owners suggested that, perhaps, clean farming with its multitude of chemical sprays just "might" be the problem.

Might be? Hell, it was the problem! It always has been! There are enough data and facts floating around to sink a battleship!

As Director of a game department, it isn't easy to keep my composure when confronted with people who contaminate or change the environment with one hand and yell bloody murder about limits being too liberal or seasons too long on the other.

It's time we recognized that, all over the United States, with all kinds of wildlife, the clean, antiseptic, manicured and single-purpose environments—all under the guise of good wildlife conservation—is destroying wildlife conservation—is destroying wildlife ten times more efficiently than rifles or shotguns ever did.

In the US we spent 20 years poisoning every prairie dog in sight. Then we scratched our collective heads wondering what happened to the Black-Footed ferret—a beautiful, lithe little animal that depends almost wholly on the prairie dog as its basic food source.

Can you live without food?

Throughout much of Texas and north through the Dakotas to the Canadian line, programs are being designed by federal, as well as private interests, to change a varied habitat of shrubs, trees, forbs and grasses to pure waving stands of introduced and domestic grasses. It's a beautiful sight to a whiteface cow but the death knell for antelope, deer and sage grouse.

Further west, in our Rocky Mountains, old forest fire burns with their unsightly dead snags, nothing but grasses, chokecherry, kinikinnick and aspen glades offend the eyes of forest managers.

So, what do we do?

We bulldoze the dead trees littering the ground into neat windrows and we plant evergreens to speed up nature's processes. At the end of a few years a beautiful stand of pine develops—the chokecherry and aspen can no longer compete and they fade out of the picture.

From game range to pulpwood in a decade. Was it a good trade?

It's a simple function of economics, It's a sight easier to place a price on a board foot of pine than a cubic foot of water or a ruffed grouse.

We no longer manage "wild" forests, we farm them. In time, perhaps, we may even farm game birds and animals. Perhaps the word "wildlife" will have little meaning in that future decade.

It's a well-documented fact that modern and scientific wildlife management, paid for by the hunters, has restored more wildlife than has ever been lost, but only in those areas where the habitat is suitable. Unfortunately, we are losing habitat a whale of a lot faster than we can adjust or find solutions.

Wildlife has always needed crusaders—people willing to stand up and be counted. It's so easy to say "a little bit of pollution or habitat destruction won't hurt." But remember, tens of thousands of "little bits" can add up to a catastrophe.

Few people realize the tremendous effect upon the environment that man is intentionally causing. We no longer manage timber stands in our national forests. We literally farm them with tremendously efficient and sophisticated tools that can treat thousands of acres in a day. The true wild environment is fast disappearing and I dread to see its going.

The United States contains some two-thirds billion acres of public lands for the recreational use of its citizens. I've got a saddle horse and a pack mare and each year I see a little bit of these 770 million acres. A couple of years ago it was the Gila Wilderness area in southern New Mexico, and last year the Popo Agie River in the Wind River Range. And each year I find the land a little less wild.

Only in the most distant muskeg or lonely mountain ranges of northern Canada do we find the stillness and loveliness of the true untrammelled wilderness. The wild country is a symbol of man's earliest ancestry when he stepped from the pages of the past. What sportsman really wants to let go of this heritage?

We face a problem, friend. We can't afford to argue economic values and exchange a bobwhite with an acre of bermuda grass. We simply cannot continue to compromise wildlife—again and again.

The list of species in trouble grows annually and the problem compounds itself. Is it because wildlife is not worth saving? If we accept the idea that we can't favorably equate a bobwhite with a pound of beef or a pheasant with a bushel of corn, then perhaps we are lost.

The cure concerns a universal problem. It is not local but national in scope. It is deeply involved with a sky-rocketing human population, abroad as well as at home. As the world of people grows, the more we try to feed them and this means more intensive land-use at home.

If we are successful in keeping more people alive, then we must place greater and greater demands upon our basic resources to feed more people in the future. And this means less wildlife. We are fitting people into cities like sardines in a can and the general agreement is that 'expansionism' is good for us.

Is it?

Are we really interested in 'quality' existence? Are we on a run-away course of more and more people crammed into compart-