

SENATE—Friday, November 11, 1977

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 1, 1977)

The Senate met at 10 a.m. on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until Tuesday, November 15, 1977, at 10 a.m.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1977

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 6 seconds a.m.) the Senate recessed until Tuesday, November 15, 1977, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHILADELPHIA BREAKS GROUND FOR ISAAC D. LEVY MEMORIAL PARK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce that groundbreaking ceremonies for the new Isaac D. Levy Memorial Park were held recently in the city of Philadelphia.

The \$470,000 park, located next to the monument to the 6 million Jewish martyrs, was a gift to the city by Dr. and Mrs. Leon Levy, noted philanthropist. The brothers were cofounders of the Columbia Broadcasting System television network.

The Levys donated the funds for the park in memory of Dr. Levy's brother, Isaac, a philanthropist who contributed to many charities in the Philadelphia area and in Israel. Isaac Levy died 2 years ago.

Participating in the groundbreaking ceremony were Mayor Frank L. Rizzo, City Council President George X. Schwartz, Deputy City Representative Kenneth S. Mugler, Fairmount Park Commission President Robert W. Crawford, Dr. and Mrs. Levy, and Robert P. and Lynn Levy, Isaac's nephew and niece, respectively.

At the ceremonies, Mayor Rizzo called the park "a fine tribute to a great civic leader." The Mayor called Isaac Levy a man who "has had a tremendous impact upon Philadelphia" and a person whose memory "will never be forgotten."

The city purchased two parcels of land with the Levys gift and will construct the park on the site of an abandoned two-story garage and parking lot.

Isaac Levy served for more than 25 years on the Philadelphia Park Commission, and, at his death, was its vice president.

He was one of the founders of the CBS Television Network with his brother, Leon; a founder of WCAU, Radio, in Philadelphia; the original owner of the Yellow Cab Co.; and a one-time owner of the Philadelphia Eagles.

Throughout his life, Isaac Levy contributed to many charities in Philadelphia and in Israel. Among them are the William S. Paley Library at Temple University, projects of the University of

Pennsylvania, the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, and the Police Athletic League.

The new park is scheduled to be completed in early spring, 1978.

POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL F-16 AIRCRAFT FOR IRAN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some correspondence I have had with the State Department regarding the possible sale to Iran of 140 additional F-16 aircraft.

In 1976, Congress approved the sale of 160 F-16 aircraft for Iran. Iran now seeks an F-16 inventory of 300 planes. The State Department indicates their reply that in making a decision on the second Iran request they will take into account both the AWACS aircraft sale and the denial of the sale of 250 F-18L aircraft.

The decision on this pending request will be our indicator of the ability of the U.S. Government to start a downward trend in arms sales.

My correspondence with the State Department follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1977.

HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that there is presently under discussion in the State Department a proposal to sell Iran an additional 140 F-16 aircraft to bring that country's inventory of the F-16s to 300. I had been given the impression by executive branch officials that this sale would be denied.

I would like to know whether in fact, a decision has been made on this request, whether if the sale has not been denied and may be approved, its approval is related in any way to the denial of Iranian participation in any development of an F-18L aircraft and whether or not any potential second F-16 sale will be affected by the Congressional approval of the pending proposed sale of 7 AWACS aircraft.

I would appreciate an early response to this inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Europe and the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1977.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of September 26, 1977 concerning Iran's request to purchase the F-16 aircraft.

It is correct that the Government of Iran has requested permission to buy 140 F-16 aircraft, in addition to the 160 already agreed to. The fact that the total Iranian request was for 300 F-16s was noted by the Administration witnesses during last September's hearings about the sale of the 160.

The Administration has as yet made no decision on the Iranian desire to purchase an additional 140 F-16s. A review of the request is underway within the Executive Branch.

The President's decision not to agree to the Iranian request to buy 250 F-18L aircraft, which the Iranians wanted as replacements for their F-4s, was based on the President's arms transfer policy, specifically that portion which states that advanced weapons systems must be operationally deployed with United States forces before a commitment can be made for foreign military sales. In considering our decision on the sale of additional F-16s, the denial of the F-18L will be a factor, among many others, to be taken into account.

The AWACS aircraft which the Government of Iran has requested to buy will be a major component of that country's air defense system. As such, the Executive Branch will take the AWACS into consideration in reviewing any additions, such as the F-16, to that defense system.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. BENNETT, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

U.S. BUSINESSMEN ENDORSE RETURN OF CROWN OF ST. STEPHEN

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, Mr. Erwin Tomash, chairman, Data Products Corp. of California and chairman of the U.S. section of the Hungarian-U.S. Economic Council, wrote the following message about the President's decision to return the Crown of St. Stephen to the people of Hungary:

The Hungarian-U.S. Economic Council, representative of a broad cross section of American businesses active in Hungary, thoroughly endorses President Carter's deci-

sion to return the Crown of St. Stephen to that country. We believe this unilateral gesture is consistent with the recent improvement in Hungarian-U.S. relations, as it is with the American tradition of respect for rightful ownership and national sovereignty.

We, as other Americans, hope to see further improvements in Hungarian-U.S. relations in the months ahead. Clearly this move contributes to the momentum in this direction.

WATERWAY USER CHARGES: AN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DILEMMA

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over waterway user charges is not a cut-and-dried issue by any means. Two academicians quickly discovered that fact when they set out recently to research an objective study of the issue.

It was difficult to remain neutral, they conceded at the end of their article in the summer 1977 edition of the highly respected Transportation Journal, published by the American Society of Traffic and Transportation. The authors started out "strongly committed to advocating user charges prior to writing this article."

When they had the facts before them, however, they lost some of their conviction for ending a 200-year-old national policy.

"On balance, we still support the passage of user charges," wrote James C. Johnson, associate professor of marketing and transportation at St. Cloud, Minn., State University and formerly of the University of Tulsa, and Donald L. Berger, an M.B.A. candidate at the University of Tulsa. However, they concluded, "the gusto of our position has been diminished by additional understanding of the intricacies involved in this controversy."

These "intricacies" explain the necessity for moving slowly in the implementation of any waterway user charge program ending established toll-free waterways policy. H.R. 8309, which was passed overwhelmingly by the House last month, meets this test. Title II provides for a fuel tax starting at 4 cents per gallon and increasing to 6 cents per gallon—a tax which will add first 10 percent and then 15 percent to the cost of waterways fuel.

At this time, we do not know what the impact of this tax will be on farm incomes, interior regions, industrial employment, international trade, energy conservation, or general inflation in the economy. These and other effects will be monitored under title III of H.R. 8309, another reason why this is meritorious legislation.

I fear that many do not appreciate the complexity of the waterway user charge issue. The Transportation Journal article presents both sides of this question in a matter which is more balanced than much of the literature on the subject.

The Johnson-Berger paper provides the background commentary for a better understanding of some of the issues involved in the controversy over user charges. For that reason, I insert this article, "Waterway User Charges: An Economic and Political Dilemma," in the RECORD:

WATERWAY USER-CHARGES: AN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DILEMMA

(By James C. Johnson and Donald L. Berger)

INTRODUCTION

A transportation user-charge has been defined by the Department of Commerce as, "... any charge made to beneficiaries or users of services and facilities directly related to transportation and furnished in whole or in part by the Federal Government. Such charges must be paid for use of such service or facility to recover part or all of the capital, operating and maintenance cost of such service or facility."¹

Eight successive United States Presidents from Herbert Hoover to Gerald Ford have favored inland waterway user-charges. Nevertheless, waterway carriers continue to use the federally built and maintained 25,000 mile waterway system toll free. The issue is not trivial, because it is estimated that greater than \$10 billion has been expended by the federal government for construction, operation, and maintenance of the inland waterway system which has a minimum channel depth of 9 feet.² In the fiscal year 1977, the federal budget was \$153 billion for new construction of shallow-draft navigation canals and \$351 million to operate and maintain the existing system.³

The absence of user-charges on the inland waterway system is a controversy which has spawned heated debates with impassioned arguments and pleas used by each protagonist. Those arguing in favor of the imposition of user-charges have stated:

A U.S. Senate special study group on transportation concluded "Waterway transport has served our Nation well since pre-Revolutionary days. If the test of a reasonable user charge should reveal that under modern transport conditions it is uneconomical in some areas, then it has no more right to continued preservation in those areas than the muzzle-loaded flintlock rifle, which won us our freedom, had the right to remain our infantryman's main weapon."⁴

A Harvard University transportation study group noted, "Water transportation, however, qualified as the infant perpetual of the transportation industry since it is the oldest of the major transportation forms and has shown as yet little indication of ever assuming its full cost burden, particularly on inland waterway operations."⁵

Economist Ann F. Friedlaender has charged, "Water resource and navigational developments have traditionally been based as much (if not more) on political grounds as on economic grounds. Consequently, examples of uneconomic investments are legion."⁶

In June, 1976, Arthur Lewis, Chairman of the U.S. Railway Association, made the following observation regarding the Ford Administration's proposed waterway user charge, "We doubt seriously that public laws will continue to favor the railroads' competitors as they have in the past."⁷

Defenders of the present toll-free waterways have been equally vociferous supporting their positions:

The National Waterways Conference, a trade organization devoted to maintaining toll-free waterways, has argued, "Waterways confer benefits on the entire public—benefits which are widespread in scope and generally

diffused in the economy. Indeed, there is no comparable Federal program which generates such an enormous magnitude of benefits in relation to its cost. It would be improvident in the extreme to jeopardize through user charges a program that has served the Nation so well."⁸

Congressman Hale Boggs of Louisiana has charged: "To upset a policy which has been in continuous effect since 1787 would have a profound impact on the American economy. Over-night, competitive balance would be upset. Agriculture would be affected, because waterborne grain influences the location of key poultry and cattle producing areas, but water-oriented industries would be hardest hit. In recent years many billions of dollars have been invested annually in waterfront sites. Any tax or toll on water transportation would bring economic hardship."⁹

William J. Hull, a vice-president of Ashland Oil, Inc., has observed: "Imposition of user charges would 'commercialize the waterways and thereby deprive the Congress of the ability to utilize water resource programs in pursuing broad objectives of public interest.' Then, only those programs with almost immediate, marketable benefits could pass the user-pay-all criterion. No longer would water resources project approval be geared either directly or indirectly to national interest implications. Willingness, or ability to pay would become the paramount consideration."¹⁰

Professor Marvin J. Barloon has argued, "Toll-free water transportation often serves to hold down general freight rates. . . . Many industries which never utilize water transportation save large amounts on their freight bills as a direct result of reduced 'water-compelled' rates. In general, such rates are not restricted to the river valleys, and they result in consumer savings, too. . . . Toll-free water transportation, therefore, is doing yeoman's duty in combating increases in the cost of living. The anti-inflationary aspect of low-cost water carriage is beneficial to all American consumers—not just those who live in river towns and cities."¹¹

This article will succinctly examine the historical background of toll-free waterways, then the basic arguments pro and con waterway user-charges will be noted. It will conclude by noting the findings of an 800 person survey dealing with the imposition of waterway user-charges.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Advocates of toll-free waterways note that the historical precedent for their position predates the American Revolution.¹² In 1764 the Treaty of Paris between England and France stated that the Mississippi River should be free and open from its source to the sea without any discrimination based on nationality. The treaty ending the Revolutionary War, signed in Paris in 1783, provided that navigation on the Mississippi River would be free forever to citizens of Great Britain and the United States.¹³

A landmark statement regarding waterways is contained in the Northwest Ordinance, passed by the Continental Congress in 1787. This legislation dealt with governing the Northwest Territory and Section 4 stated:

"The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence, and the carrying places between the same, shall be common highways and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of said territory as to citizens of the United States, and those of other States that may be admitted into the confederacy, without any tax, impost, or duty therefor."¹⁴

After the U.S. Constitution became operative, one of the first acts of Congress on August 7, 1789 was to adopt the 1787 Northwest Ordinance without change.¹⁵

Footnotes at end of article.

In 1824, Congress passed the first of a long series of combined "rivers and harbors" bills.¹⁶ The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1882 is significant because it contained a specific statement by Congress prohibiting tolls on all federal waterways. It stated:

"That no tolls or operating charges whatsoever shall be levied or collected upon any vessels, boats, dredges, craft or other water craft passing through any canal or other work for the improvement of navigation belonging to the United States."¹⁷

Four years later, in 1886 the Supreme Court issued a basic decision regarding inland waterway policy. In *Huse v. Glover*¹⁸ the high court interpreted the "forever free" clause of the Northwest Ordinance. The court noted that "unimproved" waterways must remain toll-free, but that if a state should improve a waterway, the state shall have the right to be reimbursed for the expense incurred. Although states could legally collect user-charges, and by implication so could the federal government, the United States Congress held steadfast to its toll-free policy. The 1909 Rivers and Harbors Act again reaffirmed that no tolls or operating charges shall be levied on the inland waterway system.¹⁹

Although at the present time Congress still has not enacted user-charges on the inland waterway system, there has been considerable agitation for this outcome. In 1968, Congress established a seven member study group, known as the National Water Commission (NWC). Its charge was to perform a comprehensive assessment of federal water resource programs and to recommend policy changes to Congress. The NWC study encompassed five years and an expenditure of \$5 million. In June, 1973, the NWC findings were made public. It called for the imposition of waterway user-charges and lockage fees such that, "within the bound of administrative feasibility, the user-charges for individual waterways, or classes of waterways, reflect differences in the cost of operating or maintaining them."²⁰ The report favored user-charges which started at a "low-level" and gradually increased over time. This report has been bitterly controversial. Senator J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.) described the NWC Report as "outrageous" and "incredible." Representative Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.) referred to them as "silly."²¹ A spokesman for the National Waterways Conference declared, "any low-level entering wedge would be widely and correctly understood by the shipping industries as merely the first step in a process of forthcoming escalation to eventual crushing levels."²²

Former President Ford was an active supporter of waterway user-charges. In 1974 and 1975 his administration introduced bills calling for user-charges that varied depending on the amount of federal money used to construct, operate, and maintain the waterway segment involved. A high cost segment such as in the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River System, between the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, Oklahoma and the Mississippi River, would increase transportation charges an average of \$16.75 per ton.²³ In August, 1976, the U.S. Senate defeated the James C. Buckley Amendment to the pending Tax Reform Act. This amendment, which was defeated 71-17, called for the imposition of a 4 cents per gallon fuel tax used by inland water carriers. This vote was of historic importance, because it is the first time that either house of Congress directly voted on the user-charger issue. Nevertheless, the controversy is sure to continue, because 5 of the 10 senators on the project-authorizing Public Works Subcommittee voted in favor of the user-charges.²⁴

The Ford Administration did not strongly support the Buckley Amendment, because it was still formulating its program. There were three viewpoints to be reconciled. The Office of Management and Budget supported a program to recover 50 per cent of the shallow-draft operation and maintenance costs. The user-charge would vary on each segment depending on the federal costs incurred on it. Another study group, the U.S. Water Resources Council, recommended collecting 10 per cent of all shallow and deep-draft navigation costs. It did not specify the type of user-charge mechanism. The Department of Transportation (DOT) advocated collection of 10 per cent of all inland, coastal and deep-draft federal costs by means of a fuel tax—6 cents per gallon on diesel fuel and \$1 per barrel on residual fuel oil—and a tonnage fee on ocean freight. Former DOT Secretary William T. Coleman attempted a "trade" to hasten the acceptance of user-charges. He proposed that if the inland water carriers accept limited user-charges, the Ford Administration would support the construction of an improved lock and dam (Number 26) at Alton, Illinois. The water industry's reaction was negative.²⁵ It was generally conceded that the Ford Administration would develop a unified user-charge program during the fall, 1976, and then it would vigorously work for its enactment into law.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST USER-CHARGES

Upon distillation, there are six basic arguments against the imposition of inland waterway user-charges. The first is that it violates the historical precedent of toll-free waterways, which predates the American Revolution. Since this point has been previously discussed, it will not be reiterated here.

The second factor is the equity argument. It states that the imposition of user-charges at this time would be a breach-of-faith with those industries that in good faith located on waterways because of the low-cost transportation available. "It is small wonder that, during the entire history of the country countless water-dependent industries and communities have been built up along the navigable rivers in unquestioning confidence that the toll-free principle would not be violated. . . . Waterway user charges would change the rules disastrously—very late in the game."²⁶

Stability of the overall price level is the third argument against user-charges. It is noted that toll-free waterways allow America's basic industries—steel, aluminum, oil, coal, chemicals, and farm products—to operate at maximum efficiency because they heavily utilize low cost water transportation. The start of user-charges would therefore increase the transportation costs to these basic industries, and therefore the ultimate effect would be higher retail prices. In addition, low cost water rates force railroads to lower their charges to be competitive. These are known as "water-compelled" rates. With user-charges, the railroads would be able to increase significantly many of their water-compelled rates.

A corollary to the above argument is that the benefits of toll-free waterways are so diffused to the general public that the federal government ought to pay for them. The logic of this statement would be similar to national defense outlays, that is—everyone benefits from this function, therefore it is a legitimate federal governmental activity.

American consumers in almost every section of the land pay less for countless things they buy: electric power, generated from low-cost water-borne coal; automobiles and refrigerators, made from iron and steel transported by water; gasoline and fuel oil, which accounts for one-third of all waterway commerce; anti-freeze and tires, whose chemical components travel via barge; clothing and

other fabrics, woven from synthetics produced from industrial chemicals; foodstuffs made from corn, wheat and other barged-in grains; building materials, including lumber, cement and gypsum; etc. The list is almost endless.²⁷

A fifth argument states that the proposed user-charges would have a destructive impact on inland waterway carriers. One water carrier publication flatly declared, "Let's not forget that tolls at levels commonly proposed would kill off most waterway transportation and close large sections of the system."²⁸

The final basic rationale against user-charges is that the federal government subsidizes other modes of transportation—so why shouldn't inland water carriers also have their "special" program? The air carrier industry has traditionally been "promoted" by federal governmental policy and many observers believe that the motor carrier industry does not pay its "fair-share" of highway construction and maintenance costs. The 1976 Rail Assistance Act provides for numerous federal assistance programs for the railroad industry. One estimate is that this act will cost the federal government \$20 billion in the next decade.²⁹ Only the oil pipeline industry has received no recent federal subsidy programs. Therefore, an "even-handed" policy demands that the inland water carrier industry also receive some form of federal subsidy.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF USER-CHARGES

Reduced of rhetoric, four major arguments are put forth favoring inland waterway user-charges. The first states that without applicable user-charges, each mode's true economic costs-of-production are not reflected in its price structure to the shipping public. The result is that allocation function normally provided by the price structure is in disequilibrium. Those carriers that do not pay user charges are over utilized, because of their relative cost advantage vis-a-vis carriers whose price structure includes the full cost-of-production. Professor James C. Nelson has observed, "the transport pricing system is expected to perform its role of dividing traffic efficiently, but cannot do so because all real resource costs of producing transport have not been included in the final prices of some competitive modes having significant portions in the market."³⁰

Another argument is that the users of governmentally provided transportation facilities should directly pay for these facilities. John L. Weller notes, "The principle that users of publicly-provided transportation facilities should pay charges fairly apportioned to their use and the costs they occasion is difficult to contest; in the light of demands on public budgets in the years to come, the principle probably will not escape the attention of the taxing authorities."³¹ Charles Luna, President of the United Transportation Union, points out that the highway system in the United States has greater utilization by the general public relative to the waterway system, nevertheless only the former has a user charge—primarily a fuel tax.³²

The third reason for user charges is that it helps to reduce waste in government—especially "pork barrel" projects. A Brookings Institution study group concluded:

"User taxes also reduce the amount of waste which occurs in the development of transport facilities, for the beneficiaries who urge the provision of transportation facilities know they must pay the bill, and they are therefore more prudent in the type and extent of the proposals they submit. For example, the uneconomic expansion of inland waterway facilities would not continue at the present rate if those who espoused them knew that they would be held responsible for their support."³³

The final argument notes that inland water carriers can generally afford to pay the proposed user charges without substantial disruption to their freight tonnage. The one exception involves petroleum products, which likely would switch to pipeline transportation. A Harvard University study team carefully analyzed the cost structures of the various transport modes and concluded that with the exception of petroleum products, "it seems highly probable that any reasonable schedule of water user tolls would have little effect on the optimal traffic allocation."³¹

THE RESPONDENTS "SPEAK-OUT"

Methodology

On March 25, 1976 eight hundred survey instruments with cover letters were sent to the respondents. One half of the sample was randomly selected from the 1975 membership roster of the National Council of Physical Distribution Management and from the 1975 membership roster of the American Society of Traffic Transportation. Only shipper executives were chosen from these lists and special care was taken to insure that no respondent received more than one survey instrument. The other 400 survey members were randomly selected from the 1975 membership roster of the American Marketing Association. Only marketing executives with the following types of titles were selected: manager of marketing services, vice president—marketing, director of corporate marketing planning, marketing manager, director of marketing operations, etc. The former group can be abbreviated as *transportation executives* (TE) and the latter as *marketing executives* (ME). Of the 800 survey instruments sent, 358 were returned in time to be included in the analysis of the data. This response rate of 44.8 per cent was extremely high and very gratifying to the authors. As would be expected, the TE's were more interested in the user-charge controversy, and therefore, their response rate was higher (53.8 per cent) than that of the ME's (35.8 per cent).

The nonnarrative information obtained from the returned survey instruments was analyzed by the Statistical Package For The Social Sciences, and the remainder of this article summarizes the findings of the study.

Characteristics of respondents

Of all the respondents, 81.9 per cent worked for manufacturing firms, 4.0 per cent were processing, 3.3 per cent were wholesaling, 2.4 per cent were retailing, and 8.3 per cent were "other." Regarding number of employees, 82.8 per cent worked for firms with 500 or more employees and 17.2 per cent had less than 500 employees. The majority of the respondents were employed by relatively large firms in terms of total sales. Approximately 80 per cent of the respondents worked for firms with \$50 million or more in annual sales and the other 20 per cent had sales of less than \$50 million.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Each respondent was asked if he or she was aware of the controversy regarding the federal establishment of user-charges on the inland waterway system. As would be expected, transportation executives indicated that 87 per cent of their ranks were aware of the controversy, while only 32.8 per cent of marketing executives had similar knowledge. Following this question, a one page, single spaced description of both sides of the controversy was presented. The authors' carefully protested this description of the controversy with numerous persons aware of this quandary. Each was asked to comment on the fairness and objectivity in which each side of the controversy was presented. This description was re-written until it was unanimously held by the readers to be neutral in content. This situation was confirmed by the following test. After analyzing the data it was checked to see if there were any signifi-

cant statistical differences in the answers to the survey instrument between those respondents who were previously aware of the controversy vis-a-vis those that were introduced to it via the survey instrument. No significant statistical differences were found.

The next question asked—should user-charges be collected on the inland waterway system? Both groups of executives were strongly in favor of the imposition of user-charges. ME's were 82.6 per cent in favor and TE's voted 86 per cent for the user-charges. The respondents were then asked—assuming user-charges are to be collected by the federal government, they should be equal to what costs? Three alternatives were available to be checked. The first was that the user-charges should generate only a portion of the annual maintenance and operating costs of the inland waterway system. This alternative, which is the one generally before Congress, was advocated by 38.3 per cent of the ME's and 50.3 per cent of the TE's. The second alternative called for the user-charges to equal the annual maintenance and operating costs. This alternative was less popular, with 32.5 per cent of ME's supporting it and 29.6 per cent of the TE's. The third choice was that the user-charge should be equal to the annual maintenance/operating costs and they should cover the annualized portion of the initial capital outlay required to complete the waterway project. This proposal was the least popular, with 29.2 per cent of ME's and 20.1 per cent of TE's supporting it.

Perception of the strongest advocates of user-charges was the subject of the next question. Each respondent could check as many of the following as applicable: the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Transportation, the railroad industry, the motor carrier industry, the airline industry, and university transportation professors. The ME's perceived two groups to be the strongest advocates—the railroads (48.3 per cent checked this response) and the motor carriers (44.8 per cent). TE's unequivocally perceived the railroads as the strongest advocates, with 75.8 per cent of the respondents so noting. Second with 37.7 per cent was the motor carrier industry and a close third with 33.0 per cent was the Department of Transportation.

An intriguing question asked the respondents to rate the importance of the user-charge controversy according to one of three alternatives: a very important national issue, an issue of "medium" importance, and a national issue of minimal overall importance. As would be expected the first alternative was selected by 26.4 per cent of TE's and only 9.8 per cent of ME's. The second alternative—an issue of "medium" importance—was the most common response by both groups of executives. It was selected by 49.6 per cent of the ME's and 51.8 per cent of the TE's. Marketing executives were more inclined to view the controversy as being of minimal importance, with 40.7 per cent of the respondents so indicating. Only 21.8 per cent of the TE's took a similar position.

The next question hypothesized, assuming that user-charges are established on the inland waterway system, they would have what effect on the consuming public? Three choices were possible: an adverse effect, a positive effect, and no effect. ME's were about evenly distributed between an adverse effect (43.6 per cent) and no effect (41.00). Only 15.4 per cent perceived a positive effect by the imposition of waterway user-fees. TE's held approximately the same position—40.2 per cent said an adverse effect, 24.6 per cent a positive effect, and 35.2 per cent said it would have no impact on the public.

The final question asked if user-charges of some magnitude will exist by 1980. The authors' were surprised by the unanimity of the responses to this question. Eighty-one per cent of the ME's and 83.2 per cent of the

TE's stated that user charges would be a fact-of-life in 1980. When asked to comment on why they took this position, believers in the inevitability of user-charges made the following typical comments:

Taking taxes to subsidize waterways is like giving drugs to an addict. If waterway transportation is economical, let them prove it in a free market situation. I resent the government taking our money to subsidize other transportation companies—some of whom may be used by our competitors.

I believe the railroad trend toward nationalization will continue, in the meantime huge additional subsidies will be required. It will be politically expedient to place additional costs on competing modes—this also includes motor carriers.

Electorate will continue to become more informed about large public expenditures that will affect their taxes. More monies will be required to support the maintenance and improvement of the inland waterway system and the taxpayers will insist that the carriers who benefit from it must support its upkeep.

It is inconsistent with current federal source to go untapped indefinitely—Besides I believe the Congress will recognize the competitive imbalance created by the current waterway exemption and move to correct it in the near future.

The present situation with respect to curbing federal budgetary expenditures will exert pressure on user-charges.

Government monies should no longer be used to give one form of transportation an advantage of economic value over other modes. We need a transportation policy that will engender progress and development in all modes on an equal basis.

Respondents who thought that user-charges would not exist in 1980 issued the following typical comments:

The political feeling is too strong against user-charges due partly to local governments seeking federal programs to improve inland waterways.

I believe the waterway lobby in Washington is too powerful to permit Congress to enact a law assessing user-charges. Further, the corn and grain interests (farmers) would and have fought tooth and nail over the years to prevent user-charges.

The same "clout" that got the canal to Catoosa (Oklahoma) will keep it "priced right."

I believe that the political power of the Congressmen and Senators in waterway States will provide enough clout in committees to keep effective legislation from being passed before 1980.

Believe this to be a political issue. User-charges would tend to decrease waterway usage and thus make it more difficult to justify improvement and expansion.

CONCLUSION

The waterway user-charge controversy is an incredibly complex issue. Persuasive arguments can be put forth for either side of this quandary. Frankly, the authors were strongly committed to advocating user-charges prior to writing this article. On balance, we still support the passage of user charges—but the gusto of our position has been diminished by additional understanding of the intricacies involved in this controversy.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Charges for Private Use of Federally Provided Transportation Services and Facilities," U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Transportation (May, 1953), pp. 8-9.

² Roy J. Sampson and Martin T. Farris, *Domestic Transportation* (3rd ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1975), p. 448.

³ *The Budget of the United States Government: Fiscal Year 1977: The Appendix* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), pp. 302 and 306.

* *National Transportation Policy*, A report to the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate by its Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in the United States, Report No. 445 (June 26, 1961), p. 206. This report is commonly referred to as *The Doyle Report*, because the staff director of the study was General John P. Doyle.

⁵ John R. Meyer and others, *The Economics of Competition in the Transportation Industries* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 244.

⁶ Ann F. Friedlaender, *The Dilemma of Freight Transport Regulation* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1969), p. 108.

⁷ Albert R. Karr, "Uncle Sam Engineers A Route for Railroads; Destination: Recovery," *The Wall Street Journal*, (June 29, 1976), p. 16.

⁸ Marvin J. Barloon and National Waterways Conference, Inc., "Why Not Waterway User Charges?" (1975), p. 16.

⁹ *Congressional Record*, 89th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 972-973.

¹⁰ William J. Hull, *Waterway Commerce, National Priorities, and User Charges* (Washington, D.C.: National Waterways Conference, Inc., 1975), p. 37.

¹¹ Barloon, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

¹² For a complete discussion of early waterway transportation, see: Caroline E. MacGill, *History of Transportation in the United States Before 1860* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1917).

¹³ *The Doyle Report, op. cit.*, p. 197.

¹⁴ H. S. Commanger, *Documents of American History* (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1963), p. 131.

¹⁵ William J. Hull, "The Origin and Development of the Waterways Policy of the United States," mimeographed by the National Waterways Conference, Inc., (October 28, 1965), p. 6.

¹⁶ Hull, *Waterway Commerce, op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹⁷ 33 USCA Section 5.

¹⁸ 119 U.S. 543.

¹⁹ Jack Miller, "Waterways and National Transportation Policy," distributed by the National Waterways Conference (1965), p. 3.

²⁰ *Waterway Commerce, National Priorities, and User Charges* (Washington, D.C.: National Waterways Conference, Inc., 1975), p. 19.

²¹ Carlo J. Salzano, "Barge, Towing Industry Hits NWC Report Pledges Fight Against River User Charge," *Traffic World* (September 24, 1973), p. 26.

²² "Coming: Stiffer Waterway Rates" *Distribution Worldwide* (June, 1976), p. 52.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *National Waterways Conference, Inc. Newsletter* (August 20, 1976), p. 1.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3-5.

²⁶ *It's the Consumer Who'll Pay* (Washington, D.C.: National Waterways Conference, Inc.), p. 7.

²⁷ "Why Not Waterway User Charges?," (Washington, D.C.: National Waterways Conference, Inc., 1975), p. 14.

²⁸ *It's The Consumer Who'll Pay, op. cit.*, p. 7.

²⁹ Karr, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

³⁰ James C. Nelson, "Toward Rational Price Policies," in Ernest W. Williams, ed., *The Future of American Transportation* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 116.

³¹ John L. Weller, "Access to Capital Markets," in Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

³² Charles Luna, *The UTU Handbook of Transportation in America* (New York: Popular Library, 1971), p. 126.

³³ Charles L. Dearing and Wilfred Owen, *National Transportation Policy* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1949), p. 359.

³⁴ John R. Meyer and others, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

NO CELEBRATION FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on November 7 the Government of the U.S.S.R. marked its 60th anniversary by celebrating Soviet National Day. This is a particularly appropriate time to remind the Soviet Union that the Congress of the United States remains deeply committed to the struggle for Soviet Jews who have been denied religious freedom and the right to emigrate.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has signed the Helsinki Accord, Mr. Speaker, that Government refuses to recognize the universal freedom to emigrate. To this day, Jews and other Soviet minorities face one obstacle after another when they dare to seek an exit visa.

Many of these activists are treated in an insulting and abusive manner. Countless numbers have lost their jobs, and face daily harassment at the hands of Soviet police; some languish in jail as "prisoners of conscience," when their only crime was to hope to live in freedom in Israel.

The most recent example is Anatoly Sharansky. He has been separated from his wife for 4 years now by a cruel and arbitrary Soviet policy which forced her to leave for Israel without Anatoly. Now, he is jailed, facing trumped-up charges of treason.

Mr. Speaker, just recently a group of Jewish activists in the Soviet Union issued a courageous appeal for freedom. They cited arrests, surveillance, disconnected telephones, house searches, blackmail, beatings, and scurrilous articles in the press as examples of the continuing harassment against Soviet Jews struggling for their right to freely emigrate to Israel.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the final portion of the activists' plea, and hope that as the Soviet Government celebrates its 60th anniversary, we soon will be able to celebrate the freedom of these brave people who have been denied rights guaranteed to them by treaties recognized by both our governments:

ACTIVISTS' PLEAS

"At the very moment that we are finishing our appeal, we received more frightening news from Kiev. In a central Kiev newspaper 'Evening Kiev' an article appeared signed by an agent provocateur accusing another Jewish activist Vladimir Kislik of specially heavy crimes. The appearance of such accusations prior to the Belgrade Conference demonstrates to the world that Soviet authorities are not inclined to change their emigration policy."

Signed: Solomon Inditzky, Isabella Novikova, Mark Kovner, Vladimir Slepak, Alexander Lerner, Rima and Yevgeny Yakir, Dina and Yosef Bellin, Felix Kandel, Mark Novikov, Vladimir Shakhnovsky, Mark Belinkov, Leonid Mennes, Lev Ulanovsky, Ida Nudel, Irina Brailovsky, Grigory Goldstein, Isai Goldstein, Elizabeta Byekova, Shalva Krikhveli, Solomon Ginsburg, Emanuel

Kvaleadze, Arnold Kogan, Mark Lublensky, Alexander Gvinter, Semion Yantovsky, Zacher Tesker, Victor Elistratov, Boris Chernobilsky, Ilya Tsitovsky, Boris Faigan, Alexander Magedovich, Pavel Krivinos, Naum Kogan, Grigory Krasko, Yanna Goods, Lev Grainberg, Sergel Tuzhilin, Irina Gildenhorn, Chana Yellinson, Mark Glumel, Alexander German, Boris Briter, Valery Fairmark, Aron Gurevich, Valery Lifshitz, Larissa Vilenskaya, Oscar Mendilev, Abraham Nizhnikov, Yevgeny Kreston, Lev Ovsischer, Natalia and Grigory Rosenshtein, Yosef Ahs, Edward Nizhnikov, Alexander Astronov, Yuli Kosharovsky, Yevgenia Nesomnyaschaya, Anatoly Shvartsman, Mikhail Kremen, Sergel, Luzer, Valery Sorin, Yevgeny and Yosef Tsirlin, Victor Maximenko, Benjamin Bogomolny, Arkady Mai, Yevgeny Liberman, Yelena Seidel, Yakov Rakhlenko, Mark Spenser, Dmitri Shiglick, Boris Brodsky, and others.

OMNIBUS RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACT OF 1977

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Omnibus Right to Privacy Act of 1977. The bill is based on the recommendations of the Privacy Protection Study Commission. The Commission was established by the Privacy Act of 1974 to examine individual privacy rights and recordkeeping practices by institutions. Since the Commission made its report on July 12, 1977, Representatives KOCH and GOLDWATER, both members of the Commission, have introduced 12 separate bills implementing many of the Commission's recommendations. The Omnibus Right to Privacy Act of 1977 incorporates these 12 bills in a slightly revised format.

The bill covers these areas: First, creation of a Federal Information Practices Board; second, revision of the Privacy Act of 1974; third, Government access to records about individuals; fourth, confidentiality of social service records; fifth, confidentiality of medical records; sixth, amendments to the Fair Credit Reporting Act dealing with consumer credit, commercial credit, depository institutions, and insurance companies; seventh, amendments to the tax record confidentiality provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; and eighth, revision of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

Adoption of these recommendations would not only affect the Federal Government's recordkeeping practices, but States, schools, hospitals, banks, and insurance companies would also be subjected to new controls on the collection, use, and disclosure of information. It is apparent that Congress must proceed carefully and deliberately in considering legislation that would result in such extensive changes.

I am introducing this omnibus privacy bill to focus attention on the work of the Privacy Commission and to stimulate discussion about the need for increased privacy protections. I am not endorsing any or all of the Commission's recom-

mendations at this time. It is too early in the legislative process for final judgments. In the next session of Congress, my Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights will begin detailed examination of this legislation. I hope that other committees with jurisdiction over privacy-related issues will follow our lead.

THE ARGO MERCHANT LEGACY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1976, the Liberian tanker *Argo Merchant* came aground some 30 miles off the island of Nantucket, Mass. Several days later, the ship broke up and spilled 7,500,000 gallons of oil into the Atlantic, making it the largest oil pollution incident in the history of the United States.

We still do not know the extent of the environmental damage caused by that spill. The owners of the *Argo Merchant* have not been forced to pay for the consequences of having faulty equipment on board and an inadequate crew. We still do not have in place the comprehensive oil spill liability legislation or the oil tanker safety bill which would help us prevent similar incidents in the future.

Following are two excellent articles dealing with the legacy of the *Argo Merchant* spill. The first was written by the distinguished former Governor of Massachusetts, Frank Sargent, and the second appeared in the *New Bedford Standard Times*, a newspaper renowned for its balanced presentation of environmental and energy-related issues. I hope that these will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the *Boston Globe*, Oct. 20, 1977]

THE "ARGO MERCHANT" LEGACY

(By Francis W. Sargent)

Remember the "Argo Merchant," the tanker that ran aground and broke up off Nantucket last December, dumping 28,000 tons of oil into the sea?

Well, this week, 10 months later, the first of what will be a series of court cases opened in New York. It provides a behind-the-scenes look at the world of the faceless oil promoters and greater reason for New England to be wary of the problems involved in tankers, refineries, and off-shore oil development.

And what problems they are.

The court case is all about whether the company that insured the \$2 million cargo of oil can recover its loss from the owners of the ship. They turn out to be a group of American investors who cleverly arranged their affairs so that their only assets were the ship itself. When it sank, they say, so did the company they'd formed to run it; so don't ask them to compensate anybody for anything.

Banging on the courtroom door are both the Federal government and the states of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, also looking for damages resulting from the oil spill. And way down the line of aggrieved parties are area conservation and fishermen's groups. They, too, claim loss and demand satisfaction.

What's to be learned from just this single week of court claims and counter-claims, suits and cross-suits, charges and denials?

That the public is the loser when the name of the game is oil, whether it's an ancient rustbucket that falls apart and spills its cargo or a modern, up-to-date offshore oil rig that blows out on Georges Bank.

It's not just that nailing down liability is tough when businessmen use legal hiding places to evade financial responsibility. It's not just that the government gets there before you, pressing its claim for lost equipment and the cost of expensive manpower working on the cleanup or salvage.

It's that there is just no way to measure the public loss when something goes wrong in the oil business off our coast.

How do you put a dollar figure on the damage done to fishing grounds off Massachusetts and Rhode Island when 28,000 tons of oil are dumped into the sea?

What's the price tag on the recreational value of the shoreline and beaches that would be ruined if an ocean current shifted and the tide rolled in carrying millions of gallons of oil?

And, even if we could know our loss today, right this minute, how could we calculate the loss to the future, to the next generations who will lose the benefit of what's left unspilled today?

All concerned also admit that our present technology can't cope with oil spills in waters as rough as those off our coast, and that the chances are one in eight that a spill off New England would inundate our shoreline with tons of oil.

We're dealing with an area that is the source of 20 percent of the world's fish protein. We're dealing with a recreation and tourist area second to none in the nation. And we're dealing with resources even more important to future generations than they are to our own.

The *Argo Merchant* trial in New York should remind us that, when we're dealing with Big Oil, we're playing against a stacked deck.

[From the *New Bedford Standard Times*]
GOOD OLD SAM CLUBS STEPS IN WHERE COD-FISH FEAR TO TREAD

Mobil Corporation is distributing an imaginative gimmick entitled "Incredible Energy Mysteries" and modeled after the long-gone pulp magazines of America. The company explains, "We have two motives in preparing our own pulp 'magazine.' Each article, which ran originally as a newspaper advertisement, is we hope, fun to read. But each also contains some dead-serious ideas."

"Case No. 5" in this booklet is entitled "The enigma of the missing disaster." In brief, a fictitious police chief (who would have had to be from this area), is explaining his problem to "Sam Clubs, private eye."

"A few months back, an oil tanker called the *Argo Merchant* fetched up on a reef east of here. Broke open and lost all her cargo," said the chief. "All of a sudden, the town looked like it was about to play host to the end of the world. Newspaper fellers came by the carload, and radio fellers, and television folks with the big fancy-painted trailer trucks full of electronic stuff . . .

"Then, quick as they came, all them strangers just packed up and left. Every day since then, big crowds of people like this come here to the beach just to wait for that oil to come in and ruin our fishing grounds, kill the birds, and spoil the summer business."

Sam Clubs replied, "You don't need me, Chief ('to get folks to stop comin'). Just show the people this." And Clubs produced a March 31 United Press-International story out of Washington, the lead of which said, "The 7.7 million gallons of oil spilled from

the tanker *Argo Merchant* caused 'minimal' biological and esthetic damage, a government report said today." The news story attributed the report to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

So Sam Clubs, departing, "smiled a crooked smile" and commented to himself, "Kinda makes you wish the press could get as excited about the end of a big story as it does about the beginning, doesn't it?"

Good old Sam Clubs should have stuck with the thing for a while:

June 29 (Ottawa News Service): "In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Environment and Atmosphere, John W. Farrington of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution said most of the data needed to assess the immediate environmental impact and fate of the (*Argo Merchant*) oil was not collected by either the Environmental Protection Agency or NOAA or other agencies. He blamed lack of funds, equipment and adequate assisting personnel for much of the chaos."

June 30 (Ottawa News Service): "Massachusetts Lieutenant Governor Thomas P. O'Neill III told a meeting of the Outer Continental Shelf Advisory Board on Offshore Oil Development there is evidence that *Argo Merchant* oil is being cycled through the Georges Bank-Nantucket Shoals ecosystem. He declared, 'Our Massachusetts environmental people feel there has been no detailed analytical report of findings as to what the long-term effects will be.' O'Neill said a misleading NOAA press release 'minimized the long-term effects.'"

July 4 (Associated Press): "The General Accounting Office said that any long-range damage may be impossible to quantify. Virtually none of the 7.5 million gallons of oil spilled has been recovered. Recent surveys indicate the possibility that 27,000 square miles of the Atlantic Ocean, including parts of the rich Georges Bank fishing grounds, may have been affected by the *Argo Merchant* spill."

It is also noteworthy that in May, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution biologist Howard Sanders reported a "threefold" reduction in the number of bottom-dwelling animals near the spill site. "It would be irresponsible to predict a catastrophe," Dr. Sanders said, "but people without scientific data have said that the spill had no effect. I'm not happy with these bland self-assurances."

And as of July 27, animal pathologist Robert S. Brown, one of four University of Rhode Island scientists researching the spill, concluded, "Apparently the acute effects that we noticed (in February) have diminished, (but) there could be long-term effects that we might not see for years."

Kinda makes you wish that Sam Clubs wouldn't jump to conclusions, doesn't it? When the codfish confirm that early NOAA report, we'll begin to look for the "end of the big story."

COMMUNITY RENEWAL TEAM OF GREATER HARTFORD

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford (CRT), Hartford, Conn., the Nation's oldest existing community action agency, will be celebrating its 15th anniversary this month. CRT will hold open house, at most of its city-wide facilities, during the week-long celebration

beginning Monday, November 28, climaxing with a banquet on Sunday, December 4, 1977.

CRT was organized in the summer of 1962 under the name "Task Force for Community Renewal." This was more than 2 years before President Lyndon B. Johnson made his famous war on poverty State of the Union message, setting the stage for the national birth of community action agencies. CRT was organized by Carleton Sharpe, Kenneth Meinke, Arthur Lumsden, Harold Conway, and Robert Satter, representing the five founding groups: The Hartford Court of Common Council, Hartford Board of Education, Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Greater Hartford Community Council, and the Hartford Labor Council (AFL-CIO). On December 4, 1962, the organization adopted the name "Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford."

James G. Harris, Jr., executive director of CRT and founding secretary states:

In 1962 I received the first operation funds for CRT, a check for thirty-five thousand dollars (\$35,000) from the Hartford Court of Common Council. Due to trust, faith and hard work, by a lot of people, today we have a budget of over six-million dollars, employ over three hundred persons (300), and service over one hundred thousand (100,000) individuals who live within the twenty-nine (29) towns that make up the Greater Hartford area. The war on poverty is far from over. CRT is grateful to the community, the private business sector and government for allowing us to carry out our task as "People Helping People to Help People."

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD will join me in wishing continued success to CRT in the year ahead.

HEARTFELT TRIBUTE TO MR. AND
MRS. IRV TERRY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are not often given the opportunity that I shall have on November 16, 1977, to share in the homage being paid to two cherished people, Mr. and Mrs. Irv Terry of Los Angeles, who have lived their lives as the most decent, honorable, and civilized of American citizens. Their uncommon goodness cannot be extolled by a single event, but it is a warm, heartfelt tribute to Esther and Irv Terry that they will be honored at the Guardians of Courage dinner on Wednesday evening, November 16, to be held at the Beverly Hilton in Los Angeles. And, it will be an uncommon and rare privilege for me to share this evening with them in the presence of their family, friends, and many of the city's notables.

Esther and Irv Terry did not need to be asked "what you can do for your country." The long years of community activities; their philanthropic work, national and local; their effective and pro-

ductive interests in the political affiliation of their choice; the many charitable causes they sponsored—all were done with a nobility of spirit that is equated with President Kennedy's declaration of faith in the American people.

With the same pride and faith in their native land, the Terrys embraced the land that gave them their heritage—Israel. They have worked to make this once barren piece of earth flourish and prosper, and to keep peace in the land. They have been diligent in their efforts to improve the quality of life by volunteering limitless time and energy to improve education and health care services in Israel. Irv serves on the board of governors of Haifa University and is a member of the Board of American Friends of Tel Aviv University. He is also a patron of the University of Judaism and very active in the United Jewish Welfare Fund Statement Committee. These are only a few of their accomplishments for Israel.

It is so perfectly appropriate for Esther and Irv Terry to be honored with this year's Guardians of Courage Award. They exemplify everything that this organization works for—principally its boundless concern in actively aiding Israel's largest hospital, the Chaim Sheba Medical Center, at Tel Hashomer, which serves all in need, soldier or civilian, tourist or resident, Arab or Jew.

In America or in Israel, Esther and Irv Terry have lived their lives for humanitarian causes. Their goodness and faith are infinite. They could live no differently, and those in our own country and in Israel as well whose lives they have touched have known a deep and abiding kindredship.

The Terrys are valued friends and my warm and endearing congratulations are theirs on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO BILL AND BEE
LACKEY

HON. DAVE STOCKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention two outstanding citizens in my congressional district who are being honored this next week for their dedication to the Republican Party as well as service to Van Buren County, Mich. I bring them to your attention because they deserve to be noted at a time when political participation continues to decline, and because they have faithfully performed tasks which to many others would be too mundane to be worth conscientious time and effort.

Bill Lackey has lived in Van Buren County all his life, and his wife, Bee, is originally from Cook County, Ill., where she got her start in Republican politics. Together they have served as active Republicans in Paw Paw, Mich., since 1964. Bill is currently chairman of the township planning board, and serves on the Region Four Planning Commission as

well as other county positions. Bee is past chairman of the Republican Women's Club, past chairman of the county Republican Executive Committee, and has served on the Cancer Board, the Tri-County Board for Child and Family Services, and has been a 4-H leader. Bee often says she has worn out six pairs of tennis shoes and three telephones doing party work.

Healthy, two-party competition is essential to sound government, and I want to join the many friends who gather this next week to honor Bill and Bee Lackey for their consistent service to the Republican Party, particularly by their printing of the "White Elephant," the Van Buren County Republican Party paper, as well as most of the other printing services the party has required. They deserve special recognition for taking the responsibilities of citizenship seriously.

HOSTAGE RELIEF ACT—TO ALLOW
ERA RESCISSIONS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the name of fairness and sound constitutional practices, I invite my colleagues to cosponsor my bill, H.R. 9812, the Hostage Relief Act of 1977.

This legislation is designed to release the hostages, those States who have and would reverse ratification of a constitutional amendment during the accumulation process and prior to the final approval of 38 States.

This is particularly important in the event of serious consideration of legislation to arbitrarily extend the time for approval of ERA as proposed by House Joint Resolution 638 introduced by Representative ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN.

Support for my bill will be a blow for liberty and against the doctrine of legislative entrapment. It simply provides that any State legislature which rescinds its ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution shall not be considered to have ratified the amendment.

The blatant attempt to rig the ratification of a constitutional amendment by arbitrary extensions of time and refusal to accept reversals of legislative action is shocking and reckless. This case is well made in the following article by columnist George F. Will in the November 14, 1977, issue of Newsweek:

STACKING THE DECK ON ERA

It is, perhaps, fitting that advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment want to rig the ratification process. The amendment itself radiates impatience with essential constitutional values, such as respect for the political process and representative institutions.

On March 22, 1972, Congress sent ERA to the states to be ratified or rejected by March 22, 1979. Many states ratified with unseemly speed. But opposition soon crystallized, and the campaign for ERA slowed, then stalled. Thirty-five states have voted for it, three short of the required three-fourths; and three of the 35 have voted to rescind ratifica-

tion; and there may be more states inclined to rescind than to ratify. Faced with failure, ERA supporters want to change the rules in the ninth inning. They want Congress to allow another seven years for ratification, and they want votes to rescind ratification declared void. This attempt to stack the deck is evidence that ERA lacks the kind of support the Constitution requires for amendments.

The Constitution places a substantial burden on those who would alter it, for the same reason it requires large majorities for treaty ratifications and impeachments; some important decisions should not rest on slender majorities. The essence of this nation's constitutional morality is that amendments should be proposed sparingly, and should succeed only if a predetermined period of deliberation produces a consensus that is (in the Supreme Court's words) "sufficiently contemporaneous" to reflect the will of three-fourths of the states "at relatively the same period." The Court has said Congress is responsible for seeing that the states vote an amendment up or down "within some reasonable time after the proposal." A reasonable span is long enough for ample debate but short enough that the states' decisions will be "contemporaneous."

FOURTEEN YEARS?

The first ten amendments were ratified in 27 months. The average time for subsequent amendments has been nineteen months. No ratification has taken even four years. The most recent amendment, lowering the voting age, took less than four months. Yet ERA advocates demand at least fourteen years.

When the Senate passed ERA its report said a seven-year limit (part of every amendment in the preceding 50 years) "assures that a ratification reflects the contemporaneous views of the people." It is not clear that Congress can now change the limit. Neither the text nor the history of Article V of the Constitution clarifies the proper extent of Congress's powers in the amending process. ERA advocates say Congress can suddenly revise the ratification rules under which states thought they were operating. But it is more plausible that Article V establishes a process wherein Congress is divested of all power over an amendment once it is submitted to the states. Surely Article V should be construed in the way that makes a "contemporaneous" set of state decisions necessary for amendments. So even if, in the silence of Article V, Congress can assert the unprecedented power to fiddle with ERA's deadline it would be wrong to do so.

If (and it is a big "if") the 95th Congress need not respect the traditional seven-year limit that the 92nd Congress affirmed, surely one session of a state's legislature should not bind all subsequent sessions from reflecting about and reconsidering ERA as time allows as long as the question is before the nation. ERA supporters dislike this idea because the longer ERA has been debated, the weaker support for it has become.

RUSH TO RATIFICATION

Many ratification votes were perfunctory, even irresponsible. ERA floated through the U.S. House (354-24) and Senate (84-8) with majorities of the sort that do not normally occur when complexities are considered. Most of the 22 states that rushed to ratify it in 1972 did so without any hearings. Hawaii passed it the day it left Congress. Nebraska, scrambling to be second, passed it the day after Hawaii, but did it wrong and had to pass it again six days later. Within three months twenty states had passed it, cavalierly (in several senses of that word). Idaho, Nebraska and Tennessee have rescinded ratification.

ERA advocates say all ratifications, however stale or slapdash, are irrevocable. They

say any legislature should be able to reconsider rejection of ERA for thirteen straight years (Illinois and Florida have defeated ERA repeatedly), but no legislature should ever be able to reconsider ratification. Under that rule, a few late-ratifying legislatures could ram into the Constitution an amendment which, by then, at least three-fourths of the states might disapprove. That rule mocks the idea of "contemporaneous" consensus, which can only be guaranteed by permitting states to rescind.

Dragging out ratification over fourteen years, and dragging states into a "consensus" by disregarding their desire to rescind, produces a sham consensus.

Some, perhaps most, ERA supporters regard it as primarily a "symbol" of a vague national "commitment." Without dwelling on the inadvisability of cluttering the Constitution with symbols, it is important to note that ERA is a symbol of the poverty of "progressivism."

ERA says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

COURTS VS. INSTITUTIONS

What would it do? That would depend on the judges construing it. Would women be subject to military conscription? Could they be restricted from combat? Could there be different treatment of the sexes to protect women with regard to alimony and other divorce matters? Could the sexes be treated differently in insurance and pension plans because of actuarial evidence about sex-related differences regarding health problems and life expectancy? No one can answer these or hundreds of similar questions in advance of the flood of litigation ERA is designed to trigger. ERA means either that no legal distinctions based on sex are constitutional, or that such distinctions must be justified by important reasons. If ERA means the former, it is absurd. (Women *must* be conscripted *equally*? They cannot have lower insurance premiums because of longer life expectancy?) Obviously it means the latter, and would confer upon the judiciary power to write a detailed code governing treatment of the sexes, removing from representative institutions the making of important judgments about society's values.

ERA is part of a pattern. Today "progressives" rely on litigation rather than legislation. They pursue goals (forced busing, abolition of capital punishment, abolition of restrictions on abortion and pornography, expanded rights for defendants in criminal trials) in courts, not in the political process. The attempt to rig the ratification of ERA, like ERA itself, is characteristic of a political movement that is anemic and impatient and reckless, too weak to win in representative institutions and unwilling to accept defeat.

Further complaint regarding the attempt to undermine our constitutional processes is effectively made in the following letter to a fellow Member of Congress by John Remington Graham, associate professor of law at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minn.

NOVEMBER 1, 1977.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I write concerning the proposed resolution, which, if passed by Congress, would extend the seven-year limit originally set for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment by the several States. In the strongest terms, I urge you to vote against the measure.

Whatever one might think of the merits of the proposed amendment, the extraordinary method to secure adoption suggested

by proponents is unfair and unconstitutional.

All learned authorities agree that a constitutional amendment must be passed within a reasonable time of proposal, or fall altogether by reason of staleness. A wise policy of Article V of the United States Constitution is that ratification by the requisite three-fourths of the several States should reflect the will of the people across the country at approximately the same time.

An instance from our history will illustrate the point. In 1789, Congress proposed one amendment to regulate enumeration for direct taxes and representatives, and another amendment to regulate the compensation of federal legislators. Neither proposal passed. No informed constitutional scholar would maintain that they could be passed today, unless Congress should propose them anew. They have died from inaction.

Because of the difficulties of accurate measurement of what constitutes a reasonable time for ratification, Congress has adopted, on several occasions, the regular practice of prescribing a seven-year limit for ratification. The resolution of March 22, 1972, proposing the Equal Rights Amendment, is a part of that tradition.

It is, of course, no secret that the proposed amendment is highly controversial. Initially, most persons thought the language to be harmless. But now the debate is virulent and heated, as greater numbers of citizens have begun to appreciate what is at issue. Women are certainly more sharply divided than men. It is not healthy for a body politic to become embroiled in endless disputation when attention and energy is needed for other questions.

At the time the Equal Rights Amendment was proposed, those in favor acquired an ascertained, unconditioned, and, therefore, vested right to secure passage in seven years, while those against had a similar right, likewise vested, to defeat the measure within seven years. If, during the seven-year period, the time should be extended, the antagonists would be prejudiced, or, if the time were lessened, the proponents would suffer. It is not possible to help one side, by extension or diminution of the preestablished time, without hurting the other side. Moreover, since the proposed resolution gave both sides a then-present right, any subsequent change of terms would necessarily be *ex post facto*. The inescapable conclusion is that a resolution extending the time would retroactively deprive opponents of a vested right, the same as a resolution lessening the time would retroactively deprive proponents of a vested right. It is beyond dispute that a statute which takes away a vested right retroactively is unconstitutional.

Consider a panoramic, less-technical view of the controversy. When proposed, most people were told, and consequently believed, that the Equal Rights Amendment would simply mean equal pay for equal work and such like. One State after another ratified. Passage appeared certain. Then it was learned that the measure was actually radical and destructive, an attempted erasure of all sex distinctions in the law, even those necessary to human liberty and happiness. The common citizen began to rebel. The States began to rescind earlier ratifications. In double-think fashion, proponents answered that, while States could ratify after earlier rejections, they could not rescind earlier ratifications. After the last season of legislative sessions among the several States, the Equal Rights Amendment appeared to be in real trouble. Now proponents seek extra time by retroactive deprivation of vested rights. The record amply demonstrates that proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment, in the name of liberation, have sought to undermine even-handed fairness. I think

they have played politics with our constitutional processes long enough.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN REMINGTON GRAHAM,
Associate Professor.

There is great need for stopping any efforts for arbitrary extension of time for ratifying the ERA and for passage of my legislation which would end the political practice of holding States hostage to one-time action on ratification of a constitutional amendment.

My bill H.R. 9812 states:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any State legislature which rescinds its ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall not be considered to have ratified the amendment, if the amendment has not, before the date of the enactment of this Act, been adopted as part of the Constitution, and if any period within which the ratification of the amendment by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States is required by the Congress to be completed has not expired. Such rescission may be made before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but shall be valid for purposes of this Act only if made before the first date on which the amendment is ratified, without being rescinded, by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

OFFSHORE DRILLING BILL IS IMPORTANT TO COASTAL REGIONS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of October 31 which cites the failure of the House to consider this year the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1977.

As a ranking member of the committee which authored this bill, I am disappointed that we will not have an opportunity to vote on it before we adjourn, because the legislation would provide much-needed protection for the prompt, yet safe, exploitation of our offshore resources. Because the bill would lead to increased competition and safer operations in offshore drilling, it is an important piece of legislation for our Nation and its coastal regions.

I am hopeful that on our return in January, Congress will move promptly to enact the reforms contained in this bill.

The editorial follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Oct. 31, 1977]

SETBACK FOR OUR REGION

Much to the surprise of state officials in our region, a bill controlling offshore oil and natural gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf off the New Jersey and Delaware coasts has been scuttled—at least for this year.

Intense lobbying by the oil industry may be the major reason why the House Rules Committee saw fit to put a roadblock in front of this key measure. Some industrial spokesmen had contended that the bill would place too many unnecessary and unaccept-

able restrictions on the development of our offshore energy resources.

So the result is that long-sought changes in the Federal Government's oil and natural gas leasing program will be delayed. And, if congressional sources are right, the revisions may not be seriously considered in Congress for some time.

For New Jersey, Delaware and other coastal states, that's a major cause for concern. The bill tried to deal with many of the legitimate objections the states had with the marine drilling program. But now, it appears that the states may be left without the kind of protection they had sought from the Federal Government.

It gave the coastal states a right to review and comment on all drilling plans in their region. That included the right to examine statements by drillers on where they plan to operate, how the oil will be transported and what facilities would be needed on-shore. That's especially important in our region, which is dependent to a large degree on its vulnerable tourist and fishing industries.

The bill didn't give states veto power over drilling projects that some local officials and environmentalists had sought. But it did give assurances that any objections the states may have to specific drilling plans will be carefully considered by the U.S. Department of the Interior before it leases oil and natural gas drilling rights to private concerns.

The bill was also important because it would have imposed penalties on oil companies for spills and authorized the Interior Department to cancel leases if drilling in a specified area posed harm to the environment.

Marine drilling, of course, is a necessity if we are to lessen our dependence on overseas suppliers. But offshore exploration requires prudence and vigilance because of the dangers that are involved. Proceeding without caution wouldn't serve the interests of people in our region.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK VITALE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, the State of Israel will bestow a most coveted award, the Sword of Haganah, on Frank Vitale for unselfish dedication and service to his community and fellowmen everywhere.

Frank Vitale is a successful family businessman. His dedication spans well beyond the realms of his own daily business interests. He has expended tireless energies to advance the community. He has served with distinction as Federal grand jury foreman, chairman of the advisory committee on the Bank of America, and chairman of the music advisory commission of the city of Los Angeles. His civic leadership has made a difference for business and the arts in Los Angeles.

His admirable qualities as a leader received national recognition when he served on the National Recovery Act Board under President Franklin Roosevelt and the people to people program of the U.S. Exposition in Moscow and the Russian Exposition in New York under President Dwight Eisenhower.

Never has Frank Vitale limited his devotion or commitment to a worthy cause.

His compassion for his fellowmen transcend all faiths and heritages, and was given special recognition in 1975 by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Frank Vitale embraces and works diligently for those projects in which he believes. He fully understands the urgent need of Israel to bolster her economic development and has unselfishly donated not only time, but money to achieve this goal. His humanitarian gestures and generosity are matched by few, but will be saluted by many Saturday night at the ninth annual State of Israel tribute dinner in Los Angeles. This will be a unique tribute to Mr. Vitale, a Catholic, who will receive one of the highest awards given by the State of Israel. I wish to join in this salute and commend Frank for his distinguished and unrelenting devotion and service to his community and the State of Israel.

WHAT THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK 26TH DISTRICT ARE THINKING ABOUT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1976, I submitted by postal patron mailing to the homes in my 26th District of New York, my annual questionnaire. The results have been tabulated, and after reviewing the statistics, I would like to share them with my colleagues, my constituents, and the public.

More than 4,000 residents of Rockland, Orange, and Ulster Counties took the time and effort to complete these questionnaires and return them to my office.

I have attempted to boil down the results in a concise manner, and I include these results at this point in the RECORD. Because of the comprehensive nature of our questionnaire, I have not listed all the results here, but have selected a sampling of some of the major questions.

CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS THE ECONOMY

Do you think the government can improve the economy?

	Percent
Yes	91
No	9

To combat inflation the government should—

	Percent
Curb excessive spending.....	46
Apply wage/price controls.....	32
Balance the Federal Budget.....	22

WELFARE

Do you favor the transfer of all welfare programs to the federal government?

	Percent
Yes	62
No	38

Do you favor legislation requiring a more equitable distribution of federal welfare funding among heavier populated states?

	Percent
Yes	83
No	17

CRIME

Do you favor reinstatement of the death penalty for crimes of violence?

	Percent
Yes	81
No	16

EDUCATION

Do you support busing to achieve racial balance?

	Percent
Yes	15
No	85

Would you favor eliminating the real property tax as the prime source of school financing?

	Percent
Yes	79
No	21

Would you support tax relief for parochial school tuition?

	Percent
Yes	43
No	57

ENERGY

Which of the following energy sources should receive top priority by the U.S.?

	Percent
Development of new sources	44
Energy conservation	22
Nuclear	17
Greater use of coal	16

Should the government levy a tax on cars with poor gas mileage?

	Percent
Yes	53
No	47

Should conservation be encouraged through increased gasoline taxes?

	Percent
Yes	17
No	83

HEALTH

Do you favor a National Health Insurance Program?

	Percent
Yes	67
No	33

Should the U.S. give food to nations which do not control their population growth?

	Percent
Yes	27
No	73

Would you favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortions in all circumstances, except when the mother's health is in danger?

	Percent
Yes	32
No	68

VETERANS

Do you support legislation which would eliminate the 10-year limitation for vets to use their educational benefits?

	Percent
Yes	49
No	51

Should veterans pensions be affected if social security payments increase?

	Percent
Yes	29
No	71

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Should the U.S. and Cuba—

	Percent
Resume trade relations	33
Begin Trade relations	20
Maintain the status quo	46

Should the U.S.-Panama Canal treaty be renegotiated with a view toward reducing U.S. control over the Canal?

	Percent
Yes	25
No	75

Should the U.S. withhold aid to those nations cooperating with terrorists?

	Percent
Yes	95
No	5

UNITED NATIONS

Do you think the United Nations is—

	Percent
Effective in maintaining world peace	9
Effective in non-political fields (health, technology, science)	32
Ineffective	58

MISSING IN ACTION

Should the United States provide economic assistance to Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes	10
No	90

Should we pursue negotiations with Vietnam to obtain a full accounting of our MIA's?

	Percent
Yes	89
No	11

DEFENSE

Defense spending should—

	Percent
Increase	28
Decrease	29
Maintained at current levels	43

Do you favor a reduction of U.S. troop strength in Korea?

	Percent
Yes	41
No	59

Do you support funding of the B-1 Bomber?

	Percent
Yes	54
No	46

Do you favor the all-volunteer army concept?

	Percent
Yes	70
No	30

GOVERNMENTAL REGULATIONS

Should federal employees be entitled the right to strike?

	Percent
Yes	30
No	70

Should federal employees be allowed an active role in politics?

	Percent
Yes	60
No	40

IN TRIBUTE TO EARL W. HONERLAH

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding civic leader in my district, Mr. Earl W. Honerlah, recently passed away and I would like to take this opportunity to pay a small tribute to him.

As business agent for the San Mateo County Carpenters Union Local No. 162, and a lifelong resident of San Mateo, Calif., Earl Honerlah looked out for the welfare of thousands of fellow workers and their families and was dedicated to making the peninsula one of the Nation's finest places to live and work. His accomplishments and contributions are numerous. Thanks to his efforts many are now benefiting from the San Mateo County Boys Club and the San Mateo

County Crippled Children's Easter Seal Society. In both cases he assisted not only with his skills but his enthusiasm to help make the community a better place for everyone.

Mr. Honerlah served as secretary-treasurer of the San Mateo County Building and Construction Trades Council from 1972 to 1975 and also vice president for many years of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California. Through the years he was an active leader of the Scouts in San Mateo County and was a member of the Native Sons of the Golden West, Redwood City Parlor 66 and the Masonic Lodge No. 226.

As a leader in the protection and advancement of workers' rights, a leader in the community, and a friend to literally thousands, he will be greatly missed.

THE CHAOS IN CURRICULA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the steady decline in scholastic aptitude of high school and college students.

This is a very dismal and foreboding trend and, in my judgment, it signals a need to return to the basics—reading, writing, arithmetic, and good old-fashioned discipline—in our Nation's educational institutions.

Along these lines, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article entitled "The Chaos of College Curricula," which appeared in the October 30 Washington Post:

THE CHAOS OF COLLEGE CURRICULA: DEGREE MUST REFLECT A CORE OF KNOWLEDGE

(By Ernest L. Boyer)

The safest thing one can say about a college diploma today is not that it signifies some commonly accepted educational achievement, but rather that its holder probably has been around the campus for about four years. Beyond that, everything is uncertain.

This is because on the vast majority of campuses, required courses have been dropped, and the ones which remain reveal a staggering incoherence of purpose, often expressed as "distribution requirements."

Under this system—if it can be called a system—a humanities requirement might be met by a course in film appreciation (12 nights of the Marx Brothers and the aesthetics of "Casablanca"), contemporary literature, modern dance or poetry reading. A social science requirement can be met by a course in Latin American history, by watching "The Adams Chronicles" on television, or by making tape recordings of grandma flipping through the family photo album ("oral history"). At some colleges a natural science requirement may be met not only by traditional courses in physics, biology or chemistry, but also by doing work for a season in the Galapagos.

While the college curriculum in this country has properly become rich and varied, that is no justification for random course selection by students. Educational institutions are supposed to have some significant purposes of their own, some goals beyond creating catalogue listings that read like mental menus. The colleges' sense of purpose

was seriously shaken by the campus turmoil of the 1960s and early 1970s, and the problem has been compounded by financial fears on many campuses today. But unless educators are willing to tell the emerging generation that they have little idea about what matters anymore, colleges and universities must seek to redefine the threads of common experience that bind us together.

To do this, campuses would have to re-create some common core curriculum. This, it should be emphasized, does not mean that we need a national curriculum, and such a suggestion from the U.S. commissioner of education certainly is not intended to indicate that the federal government should legislate the contents of education. Colleges and universities themselves must make these decisions.

Some already have begun doing so. At Harvard, an investigation of undergraduate education has led to proposals for a new core curriculum. At Stanford, a committee that has spent several years looking at reform of undergraduate education recently recommended a course requirement in Western civilization. At Amherst, a faculty committee is recommending a new structure for the undergraduate curriculum. But most campuses have not begun this process of rediscovery.

THE CURRICULUM "CAFETERIA"

In the academic world, as elsewhere, beliefs tend to swing too sharply from one extreme to the other. In the early days of American higher education, Harvard College prescribed for all its fuzzy-cheeked, teenage students a tight, inflexible curriculum that was considered divinely ordained. Exceptions to the academic rules were rarely sought and even more infrequently granted.

As knowledge continued to expand, as college doors began swinging more widely open, and as we began to learn more about individual students' differences, notions about what should be taught also changed. More courses, more electives and more student independence were introduced to keep pace with the intellectual, social and economic ferment in our midst.

The idea of some sort of common core did, of course, persist. There were experiments at Columbia University, the University of Chicago and St. John's College, and Harvard produced a report on general education that served as a kind of bible for most colleges and universities after World War II. But the seemingly irreversible sweep was toward a free elective system, the kind of curriculum "cafeteria" which many students speak of today.

But a curriculum that suggests students have nothing in common is just as flawed as one that suggests students are all alike. We need a core curriculum not to protect the disciplines, not to worship a set of books, but because as individuals we also hold important things in common. What we need is to find a middle ground.

What are the common experiences that could become a new common core of liberal education? I would offer one of many possible sets of ideas.

First, we share a common heritage, and we need to focus on the traditions of the past. Colleges have a central obligation to help the human race remember, for better or worse, where it has been and how it got there.

Obviously, to talk about our heritage has a familiar ring. But a notion need not be rejected just because it is familiar, and if our schools and colleges do not help keep the past alive and help introduce students to the people and ideas and events that have contributed consequentially to human gains and losses, we will not only have lost our past, we will have lost our future, too.

The goal, of course, would not be a simple survey course, not a breathless rush through history. Nor do I propose some eclectic mud-

dle. Rather, the goal should be to choose a few seminal events with care, to study them with intensity, and to understand how they have helped shape our world.

I would, however, inject a special word of caution: A chief danger of any study of the past is that we come to believe that our current view of things is the only accurate one and an improvement over past accounts. Thus, a component of the core curriculum's approach to our heritage should be concerned with change, with sets of events viewed from different vantage points.

One might study, for example, how the conventional wisdom about American involvement in Indochina changed from 1950 to 1975. One might compare versions of communism in the 1920s and 1970s. One might trace how the ideas of empire, colonization and "manifest destiny" were born, implemented and radically revalued. One might look at a particular historical moment from the perspective of black people or of women or of non-Western cultures.

But we not only share a common past; we also share the challenges of a common present. It has always seemed curious that most past experiments in general education (the Great Books, for example) have focused exclusively—almost compulsively—on the past and have been remarkably inattentive to the crucial common experiences in the contemporary world. A new core curriculum should also examine our existence here and focus on those circumstances that shape our lives.

We need a communications course, for instance. Language is what makes us a unique species, and all students should be required to master the written and spoken word. They also should understand how we use and misuse symbols, how we communicate not just with words but with mathematics and music and computers and dance.

Courses in communications should strive for "comprehensive literacy"—the ability to spot the hidden suppositions behind a message. Students should, for example, learn how to deal critically with advertising and propaganda. By looking at television news, they might elaborate a notion of "tube literacy". This emphasis on language is essential not only because it is the connecting tissue of our culture, but because it becomes the tool for other learning.

THE MEANING OF WORK

We also need a course on institutional literacy. All of us are caught up in a world of social institutions. We are tied into schools and banks and towns and cities and clubs, into the entire structure of contemporary life. No education has done its job if it does not clarify for students how these structures came to be and where they fit into the broader social context.

The guiding logic here is to recognize our common membership in our social structures, to clarify their functions, and to understand how organizations can and should be changed in light of changing social needs. The core curriculum should convey key sectors of American life: government and law, business, finance, the economy and the private non-profit realm. Case studies would be particularly useful adjuncts. If their angle of approach were determined by an insistent issue in the news—"ungovernability," human rights, national health insurance, balance of payments, the charitable deduction—so much the better.

We also need a course on the meaning of vocation. We all give purpose to our lives in large part through productive work. Our schools and colleges have been negligent in their failure to confront this essential fact.

We hear a lot of talk these days about "liberal versus vocational" education, and it is suggested that our collegiate traditions are demeaned if they lead directly to a job. Such a view not only distorts the present, but it

denies the past. Education has always been a blend of inspiration and utility.

Last fall I was on sabbatical at Cambridge University in England. It is a bucolic spot, with gardens, ivy-covered walls and quiet academic courts, all far removed from the corridors of commerce and from the clang of industry—or so it seemed. Yet during my stay I read "The Masters" by C. P. Snow, a novel that probes academic politics by describing the process by which a Cambridge college selects a master.

In the appendix Snow talks about the history of Cambridge University. He tells how students came to study with their tutors 600 years ago. They slept in dirty lofts and went hungry many times. They faced poverty for months, and for one simple reason: Jobs lay ahead, "jobs in the royal administration, the courts, the church, jobs teaching in the schools." The training was in fact vocational, Snow declared, "and jobs lay at the end."

Harvard College was founded not only to defend the Christian faith but also to prepare young men for jobs: the ministry, law, medicine, teaching and professions pursued by the privileged.

In more recent years our arts and sciences majors—so far removed from charges of vocationalism—have been, in fact, quite practical in their thrust, with students going on to graduate school or specialized job training. The unspoken assumption has always been that our graduates would get productive jobs, and the greatest embarrassment for any academic department is to discover that its graduates cannot get "placed."

Schools and colleges must be honest enough to affirm that the realities of earning a living have always been part of the liberal arts tradition. It is true that some work is not vocation and that some jobs are not uplifting, but degrading. But the problem of relating work to higher education cannot be so easily dismissed. Many useful, challenging and crucial jobs have emerged in recent years, yet schools and colleges still confer prime legitimacy on those jobs that have been around the longest and that we like the best.

Because of tradition, lethargy, ignorance and snobbery, mindless distinctions are made between what is vocationally legitimate and illegitimate. Such distinctions have led to equally mindless choices about what can and cannot be offered at the arts and science colleges.

It is all right, some say, to prepare to be a doctor, but it is less all right to be a nurse. It is all right to be an engineer, but to be a computer programmer is off limits. Teaching college is just great, but teaching elementary school is something else again. To dig the ruins of the past is a respectable objective, but to work with ruined lives in an urban jungle—a much more demanding task—is not so worthy. To read what has been written in the past is fine, but to aspire to write about the present—as a journalist perhaps—is not quite legitimate at many arts and science colleges.

What logic is used by those who make distinctions such as these, by those who—through the curriculum they offer—determine for their students which work is honorable and which is not?

The relationship between quality education and the world of work will not be solved just by tacking some vocational courses onto the traditional curriculum. Rather, it is time for education to confront the subject of vocation as a profoundly serious course of study and to make the study of work itself a part of the curriculum. What have been the historical, philosophical, religious and social attitudes toward work around the world? How does work relate to the fundamental value choices that every student must confront?

Above all, schools and colleges should be places where students come to understand that, for most of us, work is an expression of who we are and where we fit. "I work, therefore, I am" may overstate the case, but it speaks to our current condition.

This is not to urge that colleges become vocational. Rather, it is to suggest that we simply begin to rediscover the true meaning of liberal education.

EXPLORING THE FUTURE

Finally, the core curriculum should respond not only to the past and present, but to the future as well. Robert Heilbroner observes in "The Human Prospect": "There is a question in the air, a question so disturbing that I would hesitate to ask it aloud did I not believe it existed unvoiced in the minds of many. The question is: 'Is there hope for man?'"

I do not propose a single, apocalyptic vision of the future. What I do propose is a core curriculum that looks at the heritage we share, reflects on fundamental common experiences of the present, and then focuses on those alternatives for the future that in a thousand separate and unsuspected ways are being shaped today.

Such a core course would spend some time looking at the "history of the future." In many ways societies are held together by their images of the future. It is important to consider the images that earlier cultures have possessed as well as to look more closely at utopian literature, science fiction, scripture, millenarian tracts and other sources of such images.

Who are the social prophets of our time? What images of the future does our society possess? What are its central dogmas and how do these compare with the forecasts offered by the emerging profession of futurology? How does the process of policy planning translate future alternatives into current choices?

We are at a pivotal time in human history, and educators must approach their responsibilities with a sense of confidence and of urgency. The human race continues to expand at a rate of 200,000 people a day, or 73 million more people every year. And every day more than 800 million people face gnawing hunger, living literally from hand to mouth. Tensions over resources grow more acute, and the quality of our environment is threatened. Where will we get our food, and how can it be appropriately distributed? What about our energy supply, and how can it be equitably shared? How can we reduce the poisons in the atmosphere? Can we have a proper balance between population and the life-support system of this planet. How can we live together, with civility, in a climate of constraint? These are a few of the transcendent issues that today's young people must begin to think about with great care.

Recently, at a seminar in the Persian city of Persepolis, John Gardner said: "Our planet is but a speck of dust in the universe, and our life on it is but an instant in the long stretch of astrophysical time. Still, it is the only planet we have, and our life on it holds great possibilities of beauty and dignity and meaning. Yet, if it were asked of us how we spend our time on our speck of dust, we would have to say, 'We spend a good deal of it fighting one another and laying waste our earth.'"

"Surely," Gardner went on to say, "all of us here believe that we can do better."

It just may be that, as we better educate ourselves and make the human spirit more sensitive, we will touch the life of every student and together make our common future more secure.

PHILADELPHIA EXPANDS PROGRAM TO CARE FOR BURN VICTIMS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I am able to inform my colleagues that the city of Philadelphia has taken a major step forward in providing additional care for victims of severe burns in the Delaware Valley area.

Mayor Frank L. Rizzo has announced the establishment of a skin bank at St. Agnes Hospital's Burn Center, which will operate in cooperation with the medical examiner's office, Department of Public Health.

Mayor Rizzo stated that the establishment and operation of the Philadelphia Skin Bank during its first 3 years will be funded by a \$262,929 grant from the Philadelphia General Hospital Research Fund. After this initial period, it is expected that the skin bank will become financially self-sufficient.

Mayor Rizzo said:

Philadelphia is extremely fortunate in having two excellent burn centers in our metropolitan area.

Both St. Agnes Hospital and the Crozier-Chester Medical Center have saved many lives which otherwise would have been lost without the knowledge and dedication of the professionals who staff these vital life-saving centers.

The centers are administered by the Burn Foundation of Greater Delaware Valley, which the city administration has supported since its inception in the early 1970s.

Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo is a trustee of the Burn Foundation and one of its most ardent supporters. The centers provide specialized treatment for severe burn cases, resulting in a 50 percent less than average stay in a regular hospital, better control of infection and greatly reduced mortality rates.

Deputy Health Commissioner Lawrence J. Devlin, who developed and established the mechanisms for the Philadelphia Skin Bank, stated that there are only 25 skin banks in the entire country.

"Physicians use skin grafts from the patient's own body to heal deep burn wounds, but there is usually not enough unburned skin in victims who have sustained severe injuries to cover their wounds," Devlin stated.

Over the past decade, scientists have developed methods of saving the skins from cadavers and preserving it by freezing in liquid nitrogen. These cadaver skin grafts—allografts—are used alone or in conjunction with the patient's own skin—autografts—to close burn wounds.

Dr. Frederick DeClement, director of the St. Agnes Hospital Burn Center, has been designated as the director of the Philadelphia Skin and Tissue Bank.

Dr. Marvin E. Aronson, the city's medical examiner and Dr. DeClement will seek skin donors by obtaining consent from the next-of-kin of cases seen in the medical examiner's office, as well as from the next-of-kin of individuals who have died in area hospitals.

The skin allografts will be available for first priority use by patients in these two Philadelphia burn centers. Excess supplies will be provided to other Philadelphia hospitals on request as a second priority; and finally, any hospital in the area or State, as supplies permit.

Medical burn treatment experts advise that deep burn wounds must be treated as fast as possible, usually within 24 hours of injury. The burned portions of the skin and muscle tissue are surgically removed, and the wound is then closed using autografts and allografts. Both types of skin grafts enable the body to heal the wound and grow new skin to eventually close the burn wounds.

W. O. WALKER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. W. O. Walker, the nationally renowned publisher of the Cleveland Call and Post newspaper, celebrated his 81st birthday. At the same time, the citizens of Cleveland received the startling news that the indefatigable journalist would be selling the Call and Post in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I have come before the House on many occasions to share with you and my colleagues many of the triumphs and highlights of Mr. Walker's career. I must admit that it is with considerable regret that I come before you today to announce the sale of this pioneering paper which is one of the leading black publications in the Nation. Nevertheless, I am heartened to add that the active octogenarian is not contemplating full retirement and will stay active in the management of the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, to mark this occasion I would like to submit for the RECORD an article on Mr. Walker which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer newspaper. Even though many of my colleagues are well versed on Mr. Walker's accomplishments, I am certain that they will find this account of his life to be both interesting and inspirational. May I also ask my colleagues to join me in recognition of Mr. Walker's outstanding service to his profession, his community, and his country. I, for one, will continue to seek his wisdom and advice for many years to come.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to you the Cleveland Plain Dealer article entitled "Passing the Torch," which appeared in the Wednesday, September 14, edition:

PASSING THE TORCH—PUBLISHER TO SELL CALL AND POST SO HE CAN REST
(By Richard C. Widman)

One of Cleveland's longtime leaders and opinion makers is laying plans to ease his burdens.

William O. Walker, who will be 81 on Sept. 19, is negotiating with his top executives to sell them his business.

Walker is publisher and editor of the Cleveland Call and Post which, with its Columbus and Cincinnati editions, has a total circulation of 34,000. It thus ranks as one of Amer-

ica's most successful black newspapers, Walker said.

But the newspaper published in this city's poor black community has not made him a millionaire, Walker said.

It is not riches that have persuaded the octogenarian to cut back on his 70-hour work week.

The simple answer, as the publisher explained in an interview, is that Walker wants a rest.

Although he will continue to guide the newspaper's policy, Walker will be able to enjoy longer weekends in his relaxing role as a country squire—an unusual role for a black man.

Few urban blacks own country places.

Walker is neither black nor white, he says, but a Negro—a race like the Caucasian and the others, but different in the ways that only a Negro is different. He may or may not have the same tastes as a Caucasian.

Walker is a businessman and a journalist. Many businessmen and journalists have retreats.

Walker's is 28 acres near Chardon in Glauca County, purchased 16 years ago.

He and his second wife, the former Naomi Russell of Columbus, whom he married 22 years ago, spend nearly every weekend there during the warm months, closing it during the winter. The Chardon area is subject to heavy snowfall.

There is an attractive summer cottage furnished comfortably, stylishly, no obvious extravagance.

Walker was state director of industrial relations during a former term of Republican Gov. James A. Rhodes, the first black person to hold an Ohio cabinet post.

Many of Walker's friendships and certain attitudes stem from that experience. It might be said Walker has found his own kind in the Republican business types.

He is a strong believer in self-help.

There is a guest house. "For our city friends who like to rough it with us," Walker explained.

There is a building housing Walker's 12-horsepower garden tractor and gardening tools.

He is proud that he does all of the gardening himself and keeps the buildings freshly painted.

He grows sweet corn, beans, tomatoes, cabbage and collard greens.

Walker is a native of Selma, Ala., which, long after he left it, was the place where blacks seeking their rights marched behind the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The cottage and guest house are in a clearing dominated by enormous locust, maple and willow trees, and one apple tree that bears in late August.

There also are a few grape vines and blackberry bushes. They did not bear this year, perhaps victims of last winter's severe weather.

Locust trees are not native to America. They were imported in the last century to furnish wood for fence posts.

Walker's locust, since it is so large, dates the farm. The tree must be one of the originals.

Walker mows every foot of the clearing himself, with an attachment on the tractor.

"I keep the lawn mowed and the garden planted," he said. "And I let the rest grow up in weeds for the rabbits, and the foxes and squirrels. I've got every rabbit in the county here!"

"I think that if you're going to live out here, you should do the work yourself. I grew up in the city, but my mother loved gardens and flowers, so maybe that is where I get my desire to spend time out here. I don't play tennis, or golf, or anything like that, so this is my recreation."

Walker hastens to add, however:

"I'm perfectly comfortable in the city and I'm perfectly comfortable in the country. I like both.

"We take what is called a 'Quaker rest' out here. That means, 'Thee gets tired of one job, thee does another'. Of course, I work physically harder out here than I do at the newspaper."

Walker seems to enjoy the findings of a group of Kent State University students who studied the area and determined the Cuyahoga River begins on the Walker farm.

It is an ironic note that a black man from the South owns the sources of a river that nourishes the lowlands settled by a white easterner, Moses Cleaveland.

There is a pond in the clearing, adding to the feeling of tranquility.

The pond is perfectly managed. Walker said there is some algae in it from time to time—the death of ponds since it clogs the water and exhausts the oxygen—but not much.

The pond is prolific with aquatic life. Walker fishes for the largemouth bass and catfish, and serves them to guests.

His best bass is a four-pounder, a good fish. But the best catch, a trophy eight-pounder, was by a guest.

Walker may have legal title to the pond, but the real owner is a pesky beaver.

"We call him the troublemaker," the pretty, demure Mrs. Walker complained. "He keeps plugging up the drain, no matter how many times we clear it out. And he's flooding the lawn!"

But the Walkers are fortunate to have the beaver, a symbol of wildness, as such a close neighbor. The beaver was extinct in Northeast Ohio.

A row of lounge chairs is arranged on the lawn that slopes from the cottage to the pond. In the evening the Walkers and their guests "sit out" and watch the beaver at work plugging the pond as the sun sets and the flickers tap on the trees, searching for insects.

The Walkers drink very little but might graciously serve their guests a bloody Mary—the tomato juice from Walker's own garden.

Walker takes one of the chairs and reflects on his life as a journalist and businessman. And as a Negro.

The identities are linked.

Walker might not have been a newspaper publisher had he been a white man. Had he been white, he might not have been able to carve a career serving a black audience.

But had he been white, and a newspaper publisher, his career might have been more financially profitable.

And his opinions and leadership might have carried more weight in Cleveland.

As it is, he is nationally known as a spokesman for black people and twice was selected as a presidential emissary to foreign lands.

"Last week I was in Washington with 30 other editors to meet with President Carter," he noted. "I represented the black press."

Walker's use of the word "black" is of the vintage of Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael and other black rights activists, an accommodation, he said, to the "younger generation."

After "black" became fashionable, the Call and Post persisted in identifying its readers as Negroes.

There was more to it than a quarrel over nomenclature.

The young radicals claimed that Negro was a name given to black people by the whites, a leftover from the days of slavery.

And they contended the older blacks who called themselves Negroes, who argued for a rational approach to the civil rights question, were "Uncle Toms."

The older "Negroes" countered that the young radicals were wrong in thinking that they had all the answers, that radical tactics would only alienate those people they were trying to win their rights from. But their views were not fashionable and many were silent.

Those who accommodated but largely remained mute about the dispute may have won in the long run.

The Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichaels are gone. The William O. Walkers are still on the scene. As Walker said about his newspaper:

"I'm ready to share the responsibilities.

"I am proud of having made a contribution to black progress, to opening doors for black people.

"When I came to Cleveland in 1932, at the height of the Depression, the employment situation for blacks was bad. Consequently, I helped organize the Future Outlook League, which had as its theme, 'Don't spend your money where you can't work.' It was the forerunner of what Dr. King was to try later.

"We picketed Woolworth's, Ohio Bell and one of the banks.

"As a result, we opened up more than 1,000 jobs for blacks and set a pattern that has kept Cleveland in the forefront of black employment in the nation. John O. Holly, director of the Future Outlook League, even went to jail for the cause.

"The Call and Post was in the forefront of the battle to free the Scottsboro Boys, to open the then City Hospital to black nurses and doctors. Now all hospitals are open to blacks.

"We also fought to open the corporate offices, banks and other businesses to blacks.

"We were the first to fight, in 1941, to get the Cleveland Railway to hire black motor-men."

But times have changed, the publisher-editor said.

"We at the Call and Post are as active as ever, but we're living in a different climate now, in those days we fought for any job. Now we fight for a better job.

"Part of our basic philosophy is to encourage blacks to rise to the heights of their abilities. We felt a black running for mayor would be an incentive for blacks to run for higher offices and that his candidacy would be a challenge to the black community to raise its sights and the white community to erase its racism."

Walker referred to the successful candidacy of former Mayor Carl Stokes whom the Call and Post backed with an unprecedented editorial campaign that has not been repeated for any other black candidate.

"Stokes' candidacy," Walker said, "was a shock to many blacks because they thought it was an impossibility to achieve it, that it was folly. Therefore, many blacks in the community were not behind Stokes' candidacy. We had a lot of trouble with them.

"We were Republican, but Stokes' candidacy transcended politics."

The southern boy who worked his way north and through a series of northern newspapers as reporter, editor and owner has seen significant changes in newspaper publishing, especially black newspapers.

Despite a comfortable home in Shaker Heights and a country estate, he insists publishing has not made him rich.

"I don't think anybody ever got rich publishing a black newspaper," Walker said.

Advertising is the life's blood of a newspaper.

"No newspaper can survive without advertising," Walker said. "When I started in this business 56 years ago black newspapers relied entirely on local ads for wholly black products, such as cosmetics and grooming aids. We didn't get national ads, or ads from the major local stores.

"But it all opened up to the black press in the last 15 years. Now we are getting ads from all the top department and chain stores in Cleveland, and plenty of national ads from the food companies and soap companies and car manufacturers."

Like most Clevelanders, but better informed than most because he benefits from

his newspaper's information sources, Walker has strong opinions about Cleveland's problems, where the fault lies and what should be done:

"There's nothing wrong with Cleveland that a revival of the liberal spirit will not cure.

"Cleveland is cosmopolitan, but the various minorities in the city have tended to be parochial. Neighborhoods have come to be enclaves that prevent the amalgamation of people into a cohesive unit resulting, for example, in the Polish people being opposed to the blacks.

"The politicians capitalize on the prejudices of the minorities. In the current mayoralty campaign they are even pitting the East Side against the West Side.

"If we can understand each other's cultural backgrounds and economic goals, and become united, the city will overcome the faults that have too often made the city the butt of jokes."

Walker also scores some of the people who are the recognized leaders of Cleveland.

"Cleveland has lacked strong leaders who could give the city an image," he said. "Since Newton Baker, the city hasn't had that kind of nationally known figure to give it an image. Pittsburgh had the Mellons, Detroit the Fords.

"What is there you can point to that Cyrus Eaton, for example has done for Cleveland? His Pugwash conferences were way up in Newfoundland. For that matter, what have the Boltons and their family done for Cleveland? And they've been here for generations."

Concerning Cleveland's loss of industry and jobs, Walker's opinions sum up those of many leaders here:

"The political leaders of the city are not as close as they should be to the industrial interests. If they had been closer, the problems could have been worked out to keep industries within the boundaries of the city.

"Our city politicians have been indifferent. Only Gov. Rhodes has spoken out to encourage the lessening of taxation and other inducements to bring more business into Ohio.

"The city should be developing the abundant vacant land inside the city for industrial sites, promising tax benefits and all the utilities needed, as well as police and fire protection. The city certainly has enough land to meet the needs if it would only adopt an industrial site development program."

A publisher and block community leader, Walker has long argued that jobs are the key to equal rights and prosperity for black people.

"Jobs are the only way black people are going to get off relief and other government subsidies," Walker said. "I greatly deplore appeals to people to get on relief, rather than work. That's why I'm behind President Carter's welfare reform program."

In the evening twilight, Walker reflects on his early days in journalism and what it has meant to him.

"We were all bohemians in the early days. Newspapers could not have survived in those days without tramp reporters and printers. I was in Pittsburgh, Norfolk, Washington and then Cleveland.

"I am sorry for a newsman who has worked on only one newspaper. To move around adds to a reporter's background, gives you another dimension on life.

"I was the only black reporter to interview the Scottsboro Boys in the Birmingham jail.

"One of my prize interviews, when I had my own paper in the mid-1920s, was with Clarence Darrow. He impressed me greatly. He was an informal person, who sat with his coat off while I interviewed him.

"I also interviewed Heywood Brown, the columnist and founder of the Newspaper Guild. He was very bulky, a nice fellow to talk to.

"My richness comes in my experience as a black publisher. It has offered me a life of associations with people and issues that is worth more to me than money.

"Newspapering is one of the most rewarding things that has ever happened to me. Where else could a black boy out of Selma, Ala., get to visit with the president and travel around the world."

For those who will some day follow in Walker's footsteps, he has this advice:

"The role of the black press should be militant. Any group of people that is down must fight to get up. We have not been able to throw off all the stigmas of slavery.

"So the black press must be the voice in the wilderness speaking out for more opportunities for black people."

REPRESENTATIVE PULLEN RECALLS FIRST SIGHT OF THE WALL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Illinois State Representative Penny Pullen, in addition to being a responsible member of the State legislature, is an active participant in the Atlantic Alliance of Young Political Leaders.

Representative Pullen was one of 23 U.S. delegates who attended the conference of the Atlantic Alliance held in Brussels. In addition to visiting Brussels, she had the opportunity of traveling to West Germany where she saw the Berlin Wall.

She dramatically recalls the effect of first seeing the wall in an article carried in the Park Ridge, Ill., Herald of October 13. As I believe her observations are certainly worth noting, I wish to insert her remarks at this time:

THE BERLIN WALL—A SOBERING SCENE

(By Representative Penny Pullen)

(NOTE.—Representative Pullen returned last week from a 10-day trip to Europe where she attended the conference of the Atlantic Alliance of Young Political Leaders as one of America's 23 delegates. This column, which "wrote itself," she said, was done while on a home-bound jet.)

I have now seen The Wall, and I'll never be the same.

A peaceful wall built by peaceful soldiers to keep the happy citizens of East Berlin secure in their prosperous paradise. And beyond, a peaceful expanse of lush green grass, adorning a peaceful minefield.

It is chilling. It is shocking. It is inhuman.

The 23 laughing, sightseeing American tourists—all young politicians of varying experience and background—clamber off the bus and walk to a small platform, passing a little souvenir stand. They climb the 10 or 15 steps in a brisk wind. At the top, the chattering stops.

How stark. The Wall, so near—almost within reach. The grassy field known as no-man's land. The second wall hundreds of yards away, just at the edge of government buildings. The guardhouse 30 to 40 feet in the air. The guards can see us. They have no choice but to see tourists gawking at their death-watch all day, every day. What are they thinking? Surely they know what we are thinking. Surely they are ashamed.

After a few moments of silence, the young guide points to a small rise in the green field. "That's where Hitler's chancellery was." But it's only a hillock now. The Wall is today.

We don't want to leave. We've not yet reached the depth of emotion we can sense in us. It is as if our standing there looking and feeling can somehow help the people who must be over there somewhere. If that's all we can do, we want at least to stay and do that much.

But three more groups are waiting. And we lumber down the steps, a little hesitantly, drifting off in thought, then wanting to be together, looking around for each other, visiting the souvenir stand with thoughts of how crass was its existence and, arriving, realizing that here was not simply an array of Souvenir of Berlin keychains but an arsenal of truth: poignant posters of black and white photos taken at The Wall, books about it, post cards of it, items to help us tell others what cannot be adequately expressed.

We have now seen The Wall. And it will never be the same. For in speaking of it and living with its memory, we do more to help the people over there than simply standing and looking and feeling. Each of us 23 Americans will do our part to dismantle that wall, stone by stone.

ALLEGATIONS TRUE OR FALSE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 28, 1977, the front page of the Wall Street Journal carried a story concerning allegations that have been made against Congressman EDWARD DERWINSKI of Illinois. According to the Journal story, Congressman DERWINSKI "is suspected of having told the South Korean Government that a Korean Central Intelligence Agency agent stationed in New York was about to defect to the United States. Federal officials last month barely got to the defector ahead of the Korean CIA and he is currently under Justice Department protection."

The Journal article then went on to state:

The government's evidence against Rep. Derwinski—and, in particular, the way it was collected—is a tightly held secret. But with President Carter's approval, Attorney General Griffin Bell has authorized the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department to begin grand-jury proceedings aimed at Mr. Derwinski.

I am not going to address myself to the allegations made against my good friend and esteemed colleague. I believe, as he does, that justice will run its course and that his reputation for personal integrity will emerge from this incident without a blemish.

But a major question has been raised. How is it possible that the decision of the Carter Justice Department to bring grand jury proceedings against a U.S. Congressman appeared on the front page of a major newspaper even before the Congressman himself was aware of the decision? I do not question the motives of the newsmen involved—they showed commendable professional ability in getting the facts. But how did they get their facts in the first place? The question is not an idle one, because if we can find out just who leaked this infor-

mation to the press we might better understand just how and why the charges against Congressman DERWINSKI came to be made in the first place.

Did the information about possible grand jury proceedings come from the Justice Department? If so, a grave violation of Congressman DERWINSKI's rights has been made by the very department that is "aiming" a grand jury at him. He has become a victim of trial by headline. Does the Carter Justice Department have certain "tightly held secrets" that it leaks only when it is in the interest of the administration?

We all know that in the court of public opinion, a report of a grand jury investigation that has the personal approval of the President of the United States already damages the reputation of the target of that investigation. Could it be that there are reasons other than a search for justice that have led to this grand jury investigation?

I ask this question because in the same story the following statement appears:

Still, the special scrutiny the U.S. government is giving to Mr. Derwinski's role could change the political complexion of the Korean investigation. Until now, Democrats in Congress have absorbed nearly all the political punishment. The one indictment issued so far and those being contemplated by the Justice Department all involve former Democratic lawmakers. Hence, partisan Republicans seem sure to wonder whether the Carter administration is picking on a colleague to even the score a bit.

This speculation in the Journal story is what has prompted me to discuss this subject today. It is of interest that the Journal reminded its readers of the Democrat's "punishment" from the spreading Korean investigation. You do not have to be "partisan" to ask if there is some connection between the charges made by a Democrat administration against a Republican Congressman and the fact that the Democrats are being punished by media reports of the involvement of some Democrats in their Korean scandal.

The Wall Street Journal suggests that such a question is being raised. I think it is a legitimate question and deserves to be answered. And there are other questions as well:

If the leak to the press did not originate with the Justice Department, where did it come from? Could it possibly have come from a member or a staff aide of the House Subcommittee on International Organizations of which Ed DERWINSKI is ranking minority member? Why has there not been an investigation, in both the Justice Department and the subcommittee to determine who leaked this story to the press?

When we see the President of the United States and his Attorney General and the public integrity section of the Justice Department demand a grand jury investigation, and when the name of the target of that investigation is leaked to the press, we can only ask the question that must always be asked in cases like this: Who stands to benefit by all this? Certainly the Democrat Party,

which controls the White House, the Justice Department, and the congressional subcommittee, the same Democrat Party which has found itself embarrassed by disclosures having to do with the Koreagate scandal.

Who leaked this information to the press? Why was it leaked? I do not know. But I would certainly like to find out. I therefore put the following questions to Attorney General Griffin Bell and Subcommittee Chairman DON FRASER: Have either of you gentlemen investigated the leak to the press? Are you going to pursue this violation of Ed DERWINSKI's rights? Or are you going to simply let this kind of thing go on unquestioned and unchallenged? Republicans have rights, too. I will leave to the process of justice the facts of the allegations made against my colleague. But in all conscience I must ask whether he is being made a victim of selective leaks for political purposes.

PRESIDENT CARTER AND THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION: ARTICLE V(A)

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the policies, plans, and operations of the Trilateral Commission have become a subject for considerable public discussion and some controversy. The influence of organized special interest groups over Government is an issue of growing concern among American citizens. And it is heartening that the operations of this powerful, well-organized and internationally active special interest group of financiers, industrialists, academics, and politicians working to influence our Government's foreign and domestic policies to their own benefit are beginning to come under public scrutiny. The pioneering critical examination of the Trilateral Commission was written by a leading conservative political journalist, Gary Allen. Mr. Allen has reviewed the new wave of exposure being given to the Trilateral Commission's activities in the November 1977 issue of *American Opinion*. Mr. Allen has examined some of the new data on the Trilateral Commission which I commend to all of my colleagues as an aid in understanding the present administration's policies:

THEY ARE CATCHING ON

Remember the bad old days when practically nobody but John Birchers believed there could be such a thing as a political conspiracy? Remember what it was like when most Americans thought that C.F.R. stood for California Freight Rates? And when your uncle asked if Bilderbergers were an exotic sandwich? Remember how people used to laugh and point when you talked about a small group of powerful men which ran both major political parties? And remember how your "Liberal" neighbor would bait you at cocktail parties with snide remarks like,

"Tell us again how those international bankers are plotting to take over Glendale"?

For those of us who recall how infuriating and frustrating all of that was, as Gabriel Heater used to declare: There's good news tonight! The good news is that Americans are catching on. Little lights are clicking on in the brains of "Liberals," Conservatives, Radicals, and Libertarians. Hallelujah, at last! And it means that we might just get out of this mess with what remains of American liberty.

Of course, it would be naive to think that everyone who thinks seriously about political affairs is now going to see the Conspiracy and see it whole. We did not learn all we know about it in a day, and others won't either. As students of contemporary history begin to catch on to the Big Game, they will view it from the grandstand of their previous background, learning, ideology, and prejudices. For example, when a Marxist wakes up to the fact that the fix is in on international politics, he doesn't become an instant *laissez-faire* capitalist. While the virtuous will pray that he will soon become a disciple of Adam Smith, our awakening prospect will for a time continue to view the Conspiracy through the pink bifocals of Karl Marx.

The fact that the Conspiracy being run by our Establishment *Insiders* is daily more obvious to people of all sorts of ideological persuasions is a major breakthrough. And the straw which seems to have cracked the camel's clival was the election of Jimmy Carter. The Rockefellers have manipulated the foreign policies of every American President since Franklin Roosevelt; but Mr. Carter has been so obviously a creature of David Rockefeller that many are no longer willing to deny that there is conspiracy involved.

Ironically, it may have been Watergate which caused the camel to notice the load in the first place. While readers of this magazine were made aware very early that Henry Kissinger was as much a Rockefeller entity as the Chase Manhattan Bank, most Americans were either ignorant of the fact or ignored it. When the *S.S. Watergate* went down, sucking with it the entire Nixon Administration except for Henry Kissinger, a lot of people noticed. Following the Confirmation Hearings on the selection of Nelson Rockefeller to be Vice President, the connection between the gutteral, word-garbling German and the Standard Oil family began to be more widely mentioned in the media. When a new Administration from the "rival" party came down the main aisle, and it turned out that Mr. Carter was yet another confection from Standard Oil, stomachs began to turn.

Like the age of Aquarius, to aerate a simile, the dawning took a little time. Most of the mass media, being politically "Liberal," hoped that Jimmy Carter was the "Liberal" he hinted he was; many uninformed Conservatives, delighting in his anti-government rhetoric, hoped Carter was the Conservative he also hinted he was. Your correspondent pointed out last year in a little pre-election book called *Jimmy Carter/Jimmy Carter* ('76 Press, \$1.00) that this was one bandwagon that ran on Standard oil not peanut oil. But the public was not ready to listen. Soon after the election, however, as Carter began surrounding himself with Rockefeller Trilateralists, articles started to appear in a wide variety of publications on the theme you first read in these pages over a year ago.

Penthouse for September chased the story with a vengeance. The article, entitled "The Making of a President: How David Rockefeller Created Jimmy Carter," was by Robert Manning, and featured an illustration of David as the world's money pope placing a crown on the head of a kneeling, smiling

Jimmy Carter. As part of his chronological review of how Carter was moved from peanuts to President, Manning discussed David Rockefeller's founding of the Trilateral Commission, a coterie of the financial and political elite of North America, Europe, and Japan. Robert Manning tells us:

"George Franklin, North American secretary of the Trilateral Commission, told Penthouse in an interview that the Trilateral Commission 'was entirely David Rockefeller's idea originally. He was getting worried about deteriorating relations and growing competition between the U.S., Europe, and Japan.' "Spring 1972: At the Bilderberg meeting (an exclusive semisecret group of Western corporate and political leaders that has met annually for twenty-five years to discuss global problems), Michael Blumenthal (then head of Bendix Corporation, now Secretary of the Treasury)—according to George Franklin—'thought things were in a very serious condition, and couldn't a private group bring together the industrialized countries?' According to Franklin, Blumenthal's repeating of Rockefeller's idea then drew an enthusiastic response from the next eight speakers."

Manning continues, telling us how King David chose Cartsheba. It was, he writes, "Autumn 1973: Carter and Florida Gov. Reubin Askew dine at the Tarrytown estate of David Rockefeller. Present at the dinner is Brzezinski. 'Zbig' (as he is known) later said that 'we were impressed with Carter.' Dr. Peter Bourne, Carter's deputy campaign manager, said that 'David [Rockefeller] and Zbig had both agreed that Carter was the ideal politician to build on.'"

Soon thereafter Zbigniew Brzezinski, running the Trilateral Commission for David Rockefeller, revealed the sort of Madison Avenue campaign which would be used to sell the next Rockefeller puppet to the gullible public. Thus, "October 1973: In a prophetic interview, Brzezinski said, 'The Democratic candidate in 1976 will have to emphasize work, the family, religion, and, increasingly, patriotism, if he has any desire to be elected.'"

Yes, "Carter was the ideal politician to build on." And he has acknowledged his debt to the Trilateral Commission. Manning reports, "Fall 1975: Carter's campaign autobiography, *Why Not The Best?*, is written. Of the Trilateral Commission, Carter wrote: 'Membership on this commission provided me with a splendid learning opportunity, and many of the other members have helped me in my study of foreign affairs.' Ah yes. Then, "June 1976: Carter delivers his first major foreign-policy speech before the Foreign Policy Association. The speech begins: 'The time has come for us to seek a partnership between North America, Western Europe, and Japan . . . These countries already have a significant world impact, and they are prepared to play even larger global roles in shaping a new international order.'"

Noting that Jimmy Carter paid off for the Rockefeller Insiders like a slot-machine rigged to hit the jackpot, Manning of Penthouse lists seventeen top members of the Carter Administration who were moved directly into government from the elite, and very small, Trilateral Commission. The author then concludes, "Before Carter's election, his adviser Hamilton Jordan said: 'If, after the inauguration, you find Cy Vance as secretary of state and Zbigniew Brzezinski as head of national security, then I would say that we failed.' Well, perhaps Jordan feels that he's failed. But there can be no doubt today that David Rockefeller and his Trilateral Commission have succeeded in seizing control of America's foreign policy."

The Penthouse article is very straightforward and businesslike. Whether the author

is a conspiratorialist of the Left or Right is not discernible from any shading of language, though the Penthouse publisher is often said to be a Libertarian. The important thing is that Penthouse has a circulation of nearly six million.

Attacking on the same theme, the September issue of *Owl* magazine, also with a circulation of more than a million, carried an article by Craig Karpel entitled "Who Runs Jimmy Carter?" The subtitle reads: "Imagine a Powerful International Study Group with Only the Most Limited Taste for Democracy and the Blessings and Backing of David Rockefeller."

Karpel begins his feature story quoting Jimmy Carter's acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention, in which candidate Carter hypocritically and cynically denounced the "unholy, self-perpetuating alliances [that] have been formed between money and politics . . . a political and economic elite who have shaped decisions and never had to account for mistakes nor to suffer from injustice. When unemployment prevails, they never stand in line looking for a job. When deprivation results from a confused welfare system, they never do without food, or clothing, or a place to sleep. When the public schools are inferior or torn by strife, their children go to exclusive private schools. And when the bureaucracy is bloated and confused, the powerful always manage to discover and occupy niches of special influence and privilege."

Then Karpel points out that at the time Jimmy Carter gave that speech he was himself a member of David Rockefeller's elitist Trilateral Commission, made up of "the world's most influential and powerful bankers and businessmen." Though the delegates were ignorant of it, that was hardly the best-kept secret of the decade. In fact Craig Karpel reports: "A delegate to the Democratic National Convention attempted to deliver a speech revealing Carter's relationship to David Rockefeller, Zbigniew Brzezinski and the Trilateral Commission, but was cut off as he spoke."

Indeed he was. The speech was given by Alex Garnish of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, to nominate antibussing candidate Gary Benoit for Vice President. Your correspondent, covering the convention on assignment from *American Opinion*, had taken a few hours off to help Mr. Garnish write it. Which makes it very hard indeed to forget how the conventioners jeered and hooted as Alex described in detail how the Rockefellers had all but created Jimmy Carter in order to capture the Democratic Party. Many of those same people would not hoot and jeer today.

Stopped in the middle of his carefully prepared speech and told that he must quit talking about the relationship between Carter and the Rockefellers, Alex Garnish stood embarrassed before millions of television viewers and an enormous hall full of delegates and national press. Craig Karpel comments:

If this speech had been delivered, it would have electrified the convention. It would have explained the Carter "phenomenon" to millions of voters and changed the course of a close election. For all the televised yawning about how totally orchestrated, how thoroughly predictable the Democratic Convention was, nobody could have anticipated Garnish's outpouring of disconcerting truth. But when the unexpected finally happened, when somebody actually started speaking lines that weren't in the script, the media assumed that Garnish must be a kook and a crank; they never bothered to find out what he had planned to tell his fellow delegates—let alone to determine whether his charges were true.

The major thrust of Mr. Karpel's piece strikes at a report, issued by the Trilateral Commission, which complains that many nations of the world (but especially the United States) are becoming too democratic. Conservatives, anxious that the Constitution remain preeminent in an American republic, see appeals to democracy as a means of using the mob to prepare the way for rule by the most ambitious and tyrannical crooks. What the Trilateral Commission is complaining about here, however, is that the Trilateralists are still limited in what they can do to us because of continuing widespread public support for the principles of the Constitution. Karpel informs his audience:

Jimmy Carter has presented himself to the American people as, variously, a populist, a conservative, a liberal, a born-again Christian and an aficionado of Bob Dylan. In reality, he was chosen to be President by the quasi secret coordinating council of the financial and corporate elite of the United States, Western Europe and Japan. Contrary to his public positions, Carter is expected by this council to preside over the implementation of its basic program: the reduction and limitation of democracy at home and accommodation with undemocratic [read: Communist] regimes abroad.

In 1974, the Trilateral Commission issued a report titled "The Crisis of Democracy." As quoted in *Owl*, this formal document begins by describing the "democratic surge of the Sixties" as follows:

"The predominant trends of that decade involved the challenging of the authority of established political, social and economic institutions, increased popular participation in and control over those institutions, a reaction against the concentration of power of Congress and of state and local government. . . . The democratic surge of the Sixties raised once again in dramatic fashion the issue of whether the pendulum had swung too far in one direction—i.e., in the direction of liberty and democracy."

The report of the Trilateral Commission concludes that the pendulum has indeed swung too far. "The vigor of democracy in the United States in the Sixties thus contributed to a democratic distemper, involving the expansion of Governmental activity on the one hand and the reduction of Governmental authority on the other hand."

Karpel notes that the *Random House Dictionary* defines "distemper" as: (a) . . . a specific infectious disease of young dogs . . . 2. a deranged condition of mind or body; a disorder or disease 3. disorder or disturbance, esp. of a political nature.

The Trilateralists are worried that their victims, in a "democratic distemper," might in their liberty choose to rebel against the dictatorship these Establishment Insiders are seeking to impose. The report continues:

"Finally, a government which lacks authority and which is committed to substantial domestic programs will have little ability, short of a cataclysmic crisis, to impose on its people the sacrifices which may be necessary to deal with foreign-policy problems and defense. . . ."

"The implications of these potential consequences of the democratic distemper extend far beyond the United States. For a quarter century, the United States was the hegemonic power in a system of world order. The manifestations of the democratic distemper, however, have already stimulated uncertainty among allies and could well stimulate adventurism among enemies. If American citizens don't trust their Government, why should friendly foreigners? If American citizens challenge the authority of American Government, why shouldn't unfriendly governments? . . . A decline in

the governability of democracy at home means a decline in the influence of democracy abroad."

The would-be dictators are laying it out pretty straight, aren't they? Now comes the section which Craig Karpel calls "the most ominous paragraph of all," continuing:

"*As Smith once remarked,*" the report continues in sober Roman type, which is italicized here, "that the only cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy. Our analysis suggests that applying that cure at the present time could well be adding fuel to the flames. Instead some of the problems of governance in the United States today stem from an 'excess of democracy.' . . .

" . . . democracy is only one way of constituting authority, and it is not necessarily a universally applicable one. In many situations, the claims of expertise, seniority, experience and special talents may override the claims of democracy as a way of constituting authority. . . . The arenas where democratic procedures are appropriate are, in short, limited."

If the Conservative reader will substitute the term "democratic republic" for "democracy" he will understand what the Trilateral Commission is concerned about here. What concerns the money barons who put Jimmy Carter in the Oval Office is the possible limitation and reversal of the power of government over the people. And the battle is being fought chiefly in the United States, where the Commission believes growing popular resistance to federal power is likely to "undermine its authority." According to the elitist Rockefeller Insiders: "Democracy is more of a threat to itself in the United States than it is in either Europe or Japan, where there still exist residual inheritances of traditional and aristocratic [read: dictatorial and authoritarian] values. . . . In the United States, the strength of democracy poses a problem for the governability of democracy in a way which is not the case elsewhere."

The Trilateral Commission ends its report, received with enthusiasm by Trilateralist Jimmy Carter, with several recommendations of ways "to restore a more equitable relationship between governmental authority and popular control," including:

Centralized economic and social planning
Centralization of power within Congress . . .

A program . . . to lower the job expectations of those who receive a college education

Such limitations on freedom of the press as "prior restraint" of what newspapers may publish in unspecified "unusual circumstances," the assurance "to the government [of] the right and the ability to withhold information at the source," "moving promptly to reinstate the law of libel as a necessary and appropriate check upon the abuses of power by the press," and press councils enforcing "standards of professionalism," the "alternate [to which] could well be regulation by the government."

Doubtless neither Hitler nor Stalin could have proposed dictatorship in such genteel and cultured terms. And Karpel thinks the Trilats, as they call themselves, are too futuristic to be compared to old-time tyrants. He quotes an observer at the Commission's meeting in Japan in 1975 as saying: "It looked like one of those meetings of S.M.E.R.S.H. they always have in Ian Fleming movies. You know—the one where they carve up the world and say 'James Bond must die!'"

The Owl article makes no bones about the fact that David Rockefeller runs this show,

and that David wants a New World Order "with the anti-Communism dropped." Craig Karpel says "Rockefeller subscribed to the view expressed by U.S. industrialist John Diebold in the fall 1973 issue of Foreign Policy in an article titled 'Multinational Corporations: Why Be Scared Of Them?'" There Diebold maintained that "the logical and eventual development [of the multinational corporations] . . . would be the end of nationality and national governments as we know them." Karpel reports: "David Rockefeller considers himself to be a citizen of the world. His bank's and his family's business interests are worldwide. . . . He does not spend any time futzing around in Albany or Washington like Nelson. To David Rockefeller, the national interests of the United States are parochial and particularistic, the sentimental pre-occupation of smaller minds than his. . . ."

Karpel theorizes that Rockefeller intends Brzezinski, first head of the Trilateral Commission and now Jimmy Carter's National Security Advisor, to be the man to institute the New World Order. Carter was picked to become the visible President so that Brzezinski could run foreign policy.

Why the unknown peanut merchant from roasting Plains? Karpel explains: "Rockefeller and Brzezinski's most important consideration was the need to induct a Presidential candidate into the foreign-policy establishment who, if elected, would be beholden to no other constituency. This ruled out such men who were considered Presidential contenders in 1973 as: Senator Edward Kennedy, . . . Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, . . . Senator Henry Jackson. . . . Carter, by contrast, had no such powerful constituency to satisfy—or to rely on. He had no backlog of political debts to pay or to collect should he be elected President. The deal was simple: All Carter had to do was promise to appoint Brzezinski to high office and give him the shot of free rein that Nixon had given Kissinger, and the entire resources of David Rockefeller's pyramid of influence would be at his disposal both in the following three years—during which it would do all in its power to get him nominated and elected—and in the ensuing eight years, during which it would help him govern. . . ."

Sounds downright Faustian, doesn't it? It is. As Craig Karpel concludes: "The first President in America's history to promise not to lie has told a whopper. Speaking on all three television networks at once, he vilified a nameless political and economic elite and castigated unholy, self-perpetuating alliances between money and politics. One is, presumably, permitted to infer that the speaker had not himself been recruited into such an elite and was not himself a member of such an alliance. Jimmy Carter's service on and sponsorship by the Trilateral Commission means that these statements are lies so bold, so shameless, so outrageous, that they shame the Presidency."

ANNUAL PUBLIC OPINION POLL RESULTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the results of my annual public opinion poll

have been tabulated. Thousands of returns were received. As in past years the poll had space for two members of each household to answer the questions.

The questionnaire covered the full range of the issues facing our Nation. These included domestic policy, defense issues, and foreign policy.

In regard to the question of what is the biggest economic problem facing America today, 75 percent of those responding thought inflation is, while 19 percent thought unemployment is. To lower unemployment residents of the 17th Congressional District supported permanent tax cuts to stimulate job creation in private business (75 percent) while 35 percent favored leaving the economy alone and 9 percent were for creating more Government jobs.

Among the choices offered as answers to our energy problems, the choices of greater use of coal reserves, development of nuclear energy, solar energy development, and tax incentives for fuel-efficient cars received the strongest support.

In defense areas several questions were asked. Five percent thought the present American defense effort is too much and should be reduced; 54 percent thought it is too little and should be increased; 31 percent thought our present defense efforts are sufficient for our needs. On the issue of reinstating the military draft there was a closer division of opinion; 49 percent favored a return to the military draft and 40 percent opposed it with 11 percent undecided or having no opinion.

Forty-three percent believe the United Nations should have no role in U.S. foreign policy while less than half as many feel it should have a more important role, 21 percent. Twenty-five percent favor the same role as during the last administration.

The move for so-called normalization of relations with Communist China at the expense of the free Chinese on Taiwan gets little support. Only 2 percent of those responding think that the United States should recognize Communist China and cut ties with the Republic of China. A large majority—63 percent—think the United States should have diplomatic relations with both Chinas while a significant minority—27 percent—do not believe the United States should grant recognition to Communist China at all.

Eighty-six percent responding opposed relinquishing control of the Panama Canal. Eighty-five percent oppose an amnesty-type program for illegal aliens.

As I have stated before, the poll is an additional good way to get constituent views in addition to meeting, letters, phone calls, and all the other means of getting people's views.

At this point I include the results of the 1977 questionnaire. The results are both interesting and informative:

1977 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF THE 17TH DISTRICT

[Results in percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. What is the biggest economic problem facing America today?				9. The Soviet Union has implemented an intense civil defense training program for all citizens, spending some \$1,000,000,000 annually. Do you think:			
(a) Inflation	75			(a) The U.S. must implement a comparable citizen protection program	44		
(b) Unemployment	19		6	(b) Existing U.S. civil defense is adequate	28		
2. To lower unemployment President Carter has urged the creation of more government jobs with tax funds. In your opinion, what is the best way for the government to fight unemployment? (Check 1.)				(c) Measures similar to the U.S.S.R.'s would be too costly for us	13		15
(a) Create more government jobs	9			10. Do you believe unions should be allowed to represent members of the Armed Forces?	3	92	5
(b) Provide permanent tax cuts to stimulate job creation in private business	45			11. Should control of the Postal Service and the postal rate structure be returned to the Congress?	57	30	13
(c) Leave the economy alone	34		12	12. Do you favor the use of Federal tax dollars to help finance campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate?	16	77	7
3. What is your opinion on the merit of each of these proposals to help solve our energy crisis?				13. With Andrew Young as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, President Carter appears to be giving the United Nations a larger role in American foreign policy. What role do you think the U.N. should have? (Check 1.)			
(a) Higher fuel taxes	8	74	18	(a) Same role as during the last administration	25		
(b) Greater use of coal reserves	86	3	11	(b) More important role	21		
(c) Decontrol of oil and gas	47	35	18	(c) No role	43		11
(d) Development of nuclear energy	76	13	11	14. Secretary of Agriculture Bergland supports increased government target prices for agriculture. Do you think government target prices should be increased?	20	58	22
(e) Tax incentives for manufacture of fuel-efficient cars	59	25	16	15. The Hatch Act restricts partisan political activities by Federal employees. President Carter supports legislation to allow Federal employees more participation in partisan politics. Do you favor such a change?	21	67	12
(f) Taxes on large cars	31	53	16	16. Do you favor a Federal land use law which would allow greater Federal control over State, local, and private land use?	5	87	8
(g) Solar energy development	85	3	12	17. Should the CIA be prohibited from conducting undercover activities in foreign countries?	9	82	9
(h) Set aside strict environmental restrictions on coal	54	30	16	18. What policy should the United States follow regarding China?			
4. There are several proposals in Congress about reforming the welfare system. Which one of the following most closely parallels your views?				(a) Recognize Communist China and cut ties with the Republic of China	2		
(a) We should retain the present system whereby State and local governments administer the program with the Federal Government paying a large share of the cost and setting guidelines	10			(b) Grant diplomatic recognition to both Chinas	63		
(b) We should reduce the Federal role, gradually returning the responsibilities to the State and local governments	69			(c) Refuse recognition of Communist China	27		8
(c) We should centralize the welfare system at the national level to provide a guaranteed annual income for every family financed and administered by Federal revenues	9		12	19. President Carter's proposals for upgrading servicemen's discharges could mean deserters would be eligible to receive the same benefits as those who received honorable discharges?	2	94	4
5. In dealing with world famine and hunger, which of these policies more closely represents your opinion?				20. An estimated 7 to 10,000,000 illegal aliens are presently in the United States. The Carter administration is considering an amnesty-type program to legalize their status. Do you agree?	8	85	7
(a) Increase American food gifts to needy nations and people	7			21. The Carter administration is conducting negotiations with Panama which will probably result in relinquishing American control over the Canal. Do you think we should agree to such a treaty?	9	86	5
(b) Establish an international money fund to which all nations can contribute for purchase of food for needy nations and people	51			22. Now that Jimmy Carter has been elected President, which one of the following statements do you feel best describes the future?			
(c) When Arabs give away oil, we should give away food	32		10	(a) Things will be better than before	19		
6. Do you agree with President Carter's granting of a blanket pardon to all draft evaders?	13	81	6	(b) Things will probably get worse	38		
7. Do you believe that the present American defense effort is:				(c) It really doesn't make much difference	30		13
(a) Too much, should be reduced	5						
(b) Too little, should be increased	54						
(c) Sufficient for our needs	31		10				
8. There has been criticism of the Volunteer Army. Do you support a return to the military draft?	49	40	11				

IN PHILADELPHIA, PEOPLE WANT TO WORK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, just recently in Philadelphia, nearly 100 people waited all night in the rain so that they could have first chance at some 25 job openings advertised by a local company. They demonstrated that when you look beyond the endless, faceless unemployment statistics, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that Americans want to work.

As the following stories from the October 28 editions of the Philadelphia Daily News and the Philadelphia Bulletin indicate, a person who cannot find work goes through a traumatic experience. The costs to us as a society—and I mean social and emotional costs as well as economic costs—are dear.

They are costs we simply cannot afford, and that is why I continue to maintain that our first priority in Congress must be to find a way to put Americans to work.

ONE HUNDRED WAIT IN RAIN SEEKING 25 JOBS
(By Karen Scanlon)

Sometime yesterday word filtered out of the Keebler Co. plant, G St. and Hunting Park Ave., that applications would be taken today to fill 25 jobs.

At 10:30 last night the first of more than 100 persons began showing up at the gate leading to Keebler's personnel office. More were expected, but they'll probably have missed out if the firm does its hiring on a first-come first-employed basis.

At first the applicants leaned against the cyclone fence with its black-on-yellow sign that said, "Employee applications are being accepted at this time," which was apparently the only advertisement of the jobs.

Accepted, yes, Hired, maybe. But even the slimmest chance of employment was something not to be overlooked by the job-eager persons who came equipped for an all-night stay.

Bertha Orawsky, 49, of 9218 N. Delaware Ave., was the first in line. She's been out of work since Dec. 24, 1975. Used to do everything from cut rubber to driving a truck, but the Uniroyal plant where she worked closed its doors and moved south.

Ms. Orawsky said she's now on welfare but wants to get off. She'd heard about the job openings from her son. She was sitting in a yellow deck chair with a shawl over her shoulders. (She and others heard the pay was about \$4 an hour.)

"I need to go back to work," Bertha said. "I think everybody needs to work."

Bruce Magum, 22, of North Philadelphia, was No. 26 in line, which put him just past the cutoff point if only 25 persons were hired. Until Oct. 16 he was driving a Good Humor truck, but you don't sell much ice cream in the winter and he's back pounding the bricks.

"I got a note on my car and a young daughter to support," Magum said.

He said he arrived at the plant at 1:30 a.m. after hearing about the job from his

grandfather who works there as a maintenance man.

"I'm on unemployment," Magum said. "I don't want to stay home. I want to work."

Earlier a security guard gave the persons already in line a break, and admitted them inside the gates but not in the plant. The others were told they'd have to take their chances. Some left, but the majority stayed, hoping against hope they'd be able to come away with some assurance of a job.

From inside the plant workers on the overnight shift looked out on the applicants who by now were drenched in the drizzle that fell throughout the humid night.

In a gesture completely understood by one hourly worker for another, they emptied machines inside the plant for sandwiches and coffee for those waiting for the personnel office to open.

Nos. 12 and 13 in the line were sisters, Clara Lozano, 50, of 4618 C St., and Louise Esposito, 52, of 6848 Woolston Ave. Both are old hands at looking for work, but feel they're discriminated against because of their age. Both were soaked to the skin but determined to get inside and get their names on paper.

"There's no jobs around," Louise said. "We all need work. They can't go by color or age anymore. I been outta work four years in March."

Louise said she used to work for Philco Ford but "my plant moved to Brazil. I was there from 1942 to 1974."

Clara interrupted. "See, they figure you're a little past 50, they don't hire you. They don't say it they just don't hire you."

Louise said she'd waited a month on her last job application. It was for work in a factory. "I think they hired by age," Louise said.

"They showed me all around the plant when they interviewed me and I could tell, there were all young girls working there.

"I can't get work because of my age. They think you're not fast, but when you work on a conveyor belt, you're fast. I did everything (at Philco)."

Clara said she had a job as a sorter in the Roxborough store of the Salvation Army and cleared \$73 a week after taxes. "I need more money," she said. "I got a \$152 a month mortgage, gas and electric bills. Louise called me about this job and I came right over. If they hire me I'll be in my glory. This is like waiting for a concert ticket."

No. 10 in the line, Vincent Campbell, 20, of Pennel, Langhorn, Bucks County, answered her: "Yeah except they only got 25 tickets for sale."

Campbell has been out of work for the past three months. He had worked at the Keystone Lighting Co. in Bristol, but had been laid off.

"I graduated from the Bucks County Technical school," Campbell said, "and tried to get into the Oil Burners Trade Union. They told me they had no vacancies and I had no experience. How you gonna get experience if you can't get in the union that covers the jobs?"

Campbell said his sister Barbara, 18, told him about the jobs, and she was sleeping in the car. He was holding the No. 11 spot in the line for her.

All of them seemed to know they were bucking the odds when it came to being one of the lucky 25 hired, but all were determined to give it their best shot.

FIFTY WAIT ALL NIGHT FOR JOBS

(By Michael E. Ruane)

The sweet lure of work in a cookie factory drew more than 50 job-hungry people to a rainy night-long vigil at the gates of the Keebler Co. bakery.

"I'm freezing and I'm soaked, but jobs are hard to get," said Bertha Orawsky, 49, who was sitting at the head of a line of job seekers.

"A lot of people told me to get here early," said Mrs. Orawsky, so she arrived at 10:30 last night to await the opening of the personnel office at 8 this morning.

An esprit de corps quickly sprung up as the crowd, huddled just inside the company gates at G st. and Hunting Park ave., began to swell. The word that applications would be taken for 25 job openings had been spread by Keebler workers after a notice was posted at the company.

Mrs. Orawsky, of the 9000 block of Delaware ave., heard of the openings from her son, who works at the plant. She had been without work for 18 months and arrived at Keebler with a folding chair, a thermos of coffee and a determination to sit through the night.

Bonnie Kyle, 19, arrived an hour after Mrs. Orawsky and won sixth place in line. The mother of a 3-year-old boy, Ms. Kyle said she had been interviewed for more than 20 jobs without success. She sat on a soiled blanket, soaked to the skin, cold and determined.

"It's not right to depend on my parents, they can't afford me and my baby," she said.

Ms. Kyle said she once saw a newspaper ad for a "go-go dancer and model," but was shocked at what she found when she applied.

"It sounded fantastic, but I should have known." She said, "\$500 is not enough to make me take my clothes off for anybody". She sat reading want ads from the newspaper to while away the time.

Clara Lozano, 50, had an easy explanation for her determination to sit in the rain for nine hours in pursuit of a job.

"Look at that bill," she said, pulling her \$23 gas bill from her purse. "It was only \$9 during the summer."

Mrs. Lozano and her 14-year-old son have been cutting corners to save money since she was laid off about a year ago.

"We only watch TV for two hours, sometimes less, so the electric bill isn't so high," she explained.

She looked down the long line, shook her head and sighed.

"I just hope we get hired."

IN TRIBUTE TO AL KOCHMAN

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the head of the San Mateo County Democratic Party for the last 7 years, Mr. Al Kochman, recently passed away and I would like to take this time to say a few words about him.

Known well for his outspoken party leadership and concern for human rights, Mr. Kochman headed the San Mateo Democratic Central Committee from 1970 to 1976 as its chairman and had worked diligently for party unity through the years. He was respected by those who knew him for his integrity and unselfish contributions to making our political process one that works in the public interest.

A native of Germany, Al Kochman had lived in the San Mateo area for the past 19 years. He will be missed by many.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM D. FORD OF MICHIGAN SAYS VA EDUCATION PROGRAM IS A MESS. IS IT?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 8701, the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977, was being considered on the floor of the House November 3, Congressman WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan made some remarks that I consider the first shot of a campaign to discredit GI education for veterans. I ask veterans and officials of veterans' organizations to consider his words:

... (this bill) is going to be perceived by the veterans who are the age of my son as an "anti-Vietnam-era veterans" bill, and I think they are right.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan also remarked that the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, of which he is chairman, is being continually asked to "clean up the mess"—meaning the education program—of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Vietnam-era veterans spoke eloquently for themselves when they told the Veterans' Affairs Committee they needed a 6.6 percent increase in their educational assistance allowances to meet the rise in the cost of living. That is what the bill contained. I do not know how Mr. Ford and his son arrived at their "anti-Viet-

nam-era veteran" conclusion. Mr. Al Po-teet, Assistant Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Legislative Service volunteered this testimony while appearing before our committee in favor of H.R. 8701:

I can guarantee you, Mr. Chairman, that as a Vietnam veteran who has and who is still utilizing the GI Bill, that this VA educational program is reasonable and affords veterans a golden opportunity to attain their educational objectives whatever they may be.

The American Legion with 700,000 Vietnam-era veterans in their membership supported the bill. The Veterans of Foreign Wars with 500,000 Vietnam-era veterans supported the bill as did the Disabled American Veterans with 170,000 Vietnam-era veterans. The administration of President Carter supported the bill.

I would remind the distinguished gentleman that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has exclusive legislative jurisdiction over veterans' readjustment benefits, including educational benefits. Mr. Ford's Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education has no authority to clean up "messes" in the veterans' education program even if he were able to smell them out. However, Mr. Ford can be assured of our full attention if he has positive ideas that would benefit the VA education program. We wait to hear from him.

His nose for inept education programs is suspect, however, if he is unable to scent the one in his own quarters. The scandal-ridden, hodge-podge, jerry-built structure called "aid to higher education" that has been put together by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the beneficent assistance of Mr. Ford's subcommittee, certainly smells to high heaven.

The many recent newspaper stories about the enormous rate of unpaid student loans have been too widely circulated to require further comment from me. An article in the New York Times noted that although outlays of Federal funds in the billions are made each year to colleges and universities, "there is no unifying policy on higher education in the United States nor is there any central coordination." Eighteen medical schools, for example, have become so incensed at the Government's enchoachment on their academic freedom that they say they will no longer accept all these funds.

Under the blessing of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, the Federal Government now touches almost every aspect of academic life from hirings and firings to student aid, changes in curriculum, architecture, research, and extracurricular activities. And Mr. Ford calls the GI bill education program a mess. Coming from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, that is a laugh.

It must be a laugh, Mr. Speaker, because surely the gentleman is not serious. Perhaps with too light a heart he has listened to associations that represent institutions of higher learning. They seek control of the VA education program just as others covet the VA hospital system and the VA home loan program for the

same reasons. The fact that, on balance, this cleanly administered program does its job of helping veterans get their education day-in and day-out without tumult and turmoil is a thorn in the side of those who preside over the dismal swamp and thicket they call "aid to higher education." Their purpose in talking of the veterans' program "mess," in my opinion, is to divert public attention from their own incredible ineptitude.

I trust all those who have the best interest of veterans at heart will look behind these seemingly casual remarks by Mr. Ford that slander the GI bill education program. If it were true that this is an "anti-Vietnam-era veterans' bill" as he says, it is most unusual that the organizations representing these veterans would support it. Mr. Ford alone in his condemnation of the bill.

LATE HUBERT F. LEE

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for Georgia and for the Nation when Hubert F. Lee passed away. He was the editor and publisher of Dixie Business magazine, a publication which published the upbeat, encouraging news of our region.

Hubert Lee dwelled not on the catastrophes or disasters, but on that part of the human spirit which continues to build and improve. I wish to include in the RECORD today the editorial from the Atlanta Constitution in honor of Mr. Lee. We extend our condolences to the family of Hubert Lee.

The article follows:

EDITOR HUBERT LEE

The death of Hubert Floyd Lee, for 48 years the publisher of Dixie Business Magazine, is a sad occasion for his many friends in this state and region.

Lee, who was a reporter for The Constitution before beginning his magazine, became well-known through his magazine's selection and recognition of "Man of the Year" and "Man of the South," distinguished achievers from Georgia and the Southeast.

For his many friends, Lee himself was always a man of the year and of the South during his long career as an editor and publisher. His passing will be mourned.

ARMS TRANSFERS TO NORTH YEMEN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues correspondence I have had with the Secretary of State on what appears to be an expanding U.S. military relationship with the Yemen Arab Republic North Yemen. The United States has

just consented to the transfer of four F-5B trainer aircraft from Saudi Arabia to Yemen and is considering a request by Yemen for the purchase of 12 F-5E aircraft.

While there may be good and valid reasons for eventually consenting to the sale of a limited number of F-5 aircraft to the Yemen Arab Republic I would hope that we do not embark on the sale of aircraft until our present, initial program to help the army has demonstrated that our military equipment sold to the Yemen and paid for by Saudi Arabia is being effectively and appropriately used and absorbed.

My correspondence with the State Department follows:

OCTOBER 27, 1977.

HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of October 20th in reply to my inquiry regarding the proposed transfer of four F-5B trainer aircraft from Saudi Arabia to the Yemen Arab Republic.

My primary concern on this issue is the apparent quickly escalating tempo of our military relationship with Yemen at a time of considerable political uncertainty throughout the Southern Red Sea, Horn of Africa region and in Yemen itself. We have only recently embarked on the first phase of a military modernization program in Yemen involving a delicate trilateral relationship between Saudi Arabia, Yemen and the United States. Most of the equipment involved in the first phase is undelivered. Yet, we are now starting a second phase involving aircraft.

The start of this new phase prior to the development or even testing of the first program seems to be rushing matters. There may be compelling political reasons for this earlier-than-expected move into an F-5 program with Yemen, but I would rather see economic and diplomatic levers used to show the needed immediate political support rather than once again relying on arms sales for an apparent quick fix.

I appreciate your asking for my views on this matter. For the moment, I wish to reserve final judgment on the possible future sale of 12 F-5 aircraft to Yemen even though I see some good arguments in favor of a modest effort to help the Yemeni air force.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Europe and the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1977.

The Honorable LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the
Middle East, Committee on International
Relations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of September 26 concerning the proposed transfer of four F-5B trainer aircraft from Saudi Arabia to the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR).

As you know, our Saudi-funded military supply relationship with the YAR has, until now, concentrated on the reorganization and re-equipment of the army. The Saudis originally planned to re-equip the air force sometime after the army program was well under way because, in their view, the air force was the service most heavily influenced by the Soviets. However, from the beginning it was anticipated that Western equipment and aircraft would eventually be purchased by the YAR Air Force. The current request by Saudi Arabia to transfer the F-5B aircraft is thus

consistent with the planning for the overall modernization program.

Recently the Soviet Union, in an apparent bid to regain its faltering position in the YAR, offered to supply MIG-21 aircraft. While the YAR leadership resisted the offer, the absence of up-to-date aircraft in the current YAR inventory (the YAR Air Force currently has some MIG-15s and MIG-17s) and the potential morale problems implicit in continued neglect of the air force, prompted the YAR to press the Saudis for alternative aircraft. To continue to withhold replacement aircraft could make it difficult for the current government in Sana to sustain its pro-Western orientation and force it back into its former reliance on the Soviets. Given these factors, the Saudis have shortened the timetable somewhat.

While the transfer will mark an expansion of our military supply relationship with the YAR, we believe the program serves our interests by promoting cooperation among countries opposed to an expansion of Soviet presence and Soviet influence in the region. The recent assassination of YAR President al-Hamdi has not led to a change in the pro-Western orientation of the government. Lt. Col. al-Ghashmi, the new Chairman of the Command Council and himself reportedly strongly pro-Western, has publicly stated he intends to carry on with the policies of his predecessor.

Although no commitment has yet been made, we recognize that implicit in our consent to the transfer of the F-5B is eventual favorable consideration of the sale of the F-5E. The Saudis have told us they plan to finance the purchase of 12 F-5E aircraft for the YAR. The aircraft proposed for Yemen would not have the extra capabilities the Saudi F-5E possesses (e.g., Maverick or LGB capability). Maintenance, support and funding for training would, as presently planned, be provided by Saudi Arabia.

Sale of these aircraft would be consistent with the Administration's arms transfer policy since no new or advanced systems would be introduced into the region.

The Department would appreciate your reaction to our longer term thinking. If you have any further questions, I would be happy to arrange a discussion with a knowledgeable Department official.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. BENNETT, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1977.

The Honorable CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 20, 1977 pursuant to the provisions of Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act you informed Congress of your intention to consent to the transfer of 4 F-5B aircraft from Saudi Arabia to the Yemen Arab Republic.

I would like to know your justification for this transfer and whether the provision of trainers means, in any way, that favorable consideration will be given to the sale of aircraft later on, and if not, why these trainers are being provided? While we have important and improving relations with Yemen and we have started a trilateral military supply relationship with Yemen to be financed by Saudi Arabia, the provision of fixed-wing aircraft and the F-5 plane, if only trainers, appears to raise significantly the threshold of our military relationship with the Yemen Arab Republic.

I appreciate your consideration of this inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Europe and the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1977.
The Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, I wish to notify you that the Department of State intends to consent to a request by the Government of Saudi Arabia for permission to transfer four F-5B aircraft to the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR).

These are two seat trainer versions of the F-5A aircraft which were produced in the United States in 1971-72 and sold to Saudi Arabia for approximately \$1.4 million each under Foreign Military Sales procedures.

We have reviewed this request in light of our policy concerning the provision of U.S. defense articles, related training and other defense services to the YAR and have concluded that the United States would itself transfer these aircraft to that country. The proposed transfer is consistent with U.S. law and policy. We will obtain re-transfer assurances before granting final approval to the transfer which will occur immediately thereafter.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS J. BENNETT, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE ISSUE OF THE CROWN OF ST. STEPHEN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on November 4 the New York Times ran a front-page story concerning the intention of this administration to return the Crown of St. Stephen to the present Communist regime in Hungary. This is not the first time that this issue has been raised and Members of Congress and private interested peoples have protested its return. Legislation was introduced in earlier Congresses as in the case of the present Congress in which legislation has again been submitted and cosponsored by a number of Members.

It would seem that the present attempt by the State Department to send back the crown sought to exclude Congress as the news of the intended move became known as Congress was about to recess for several weeks. During the year inquiries to the State Department were met with statements that there was no intention of returning the crown at this time. No sooner had Congress begun preparations to recess than the administration's intentions became known.

Plainly, full-scale hearings are in order in both the House and the Senate on this matter. Past experience has shown that this issue is controversial and that Congress should be involved.

This is not an issue which involves Hungarians alone. At the hearing before a House International Relations Subcommittee this past Wednesday testimony was presented by Mr. Stephen Koczak which gave some idea of the wide-scope interest in the crown. Mr.

Koczak, a former American Foreign Service officer who was expelled from Hungary just before the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, is well versed in the history of the crown. His testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN A. KOZAK

At the outset, in appearing before this Subcommittee, I wish to endorse fully the views which other members of this Panel have expressed in opposition to the return of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen to Hungary at this time.

I should like, however, to concentrate my testimony today on other considerations which affect all Americans and the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. These comments would apply even if all Hungarian-Americans were silent today and even if there were no Hungarians left in Hungary itself.

When the evidence behind these considerations is weighed, it will be manifest that the return of the Holy Crown to Hungary now, under the conditions announced by the White House, will result in great harm to U.S. global interests, no matter what the alleged or presumed or imputed "improved U.S.-Hungarian relations."

Because of the brevity of time, I can only summarize the multiple reasons for this general global harm. As an introduction to the summary, however, I should like to ask permission to insert into the record fourteen communications which I have received—none from Hungarians—asking me to call to your attention the disastrous impact on U.S. foreign policy of this proposed action, not only in Eastern Europe but as far as the borders of India and China. They include secular and religious leaders. Among these communications from religious and secular groups are the following nationalities and religions:

NATIONALITIES

1. Bulgarian.
2. Byelorussian.
3. Cossack.
4. Croatian.
5. Georgian.
6. Polish.
7. Russian.
8. Slovak.
9. Slovenian.
10. Indian.

RELIGIONS

1. Roman Catholic.
2. Orthodox (autocephalic churches).
3. Hindu.
4. Jewish.
5. Moslem.
6. Sikh.
7. Buddhist.

Mrigendra Singh, Raja of Patiala, in his communication to me, summarized the distress of these many faiths and nations when he wrote as follows:

"The fate of the Crown is not only of grave concern to my Christian religious colleagues, especially Catholics and Orthodox of high rank, but the idea of putting a Christian spiritual relic such as the Crown of St. Stephen into non-spiritual hands has Universal ecumenical implications and ramifications to Sikhism, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism and Hinduism as well as to Christianity. For example, I feel confident that even His Holiness the Dalai Lama and the Chogyal of Sikkim would probably be saddened at the spiritual implications of such a transfer."

I should also like to insert into the record a copy of a letter, dated May 6, 1977, from Jon Speller and published in the New York Times on May 20, 1977. In that letter, Mr. Speller wrote as follows:

"It should be noted that, historically speaking, the Holy Crown of St. Stephen synthesizes elements from both Rome and Con-

stantinople. As a religious relic of ecumenical significance to both the Latin and Greek branches of Christianity, it would seem fitting that the decision of when to return the crown to Hungary should take into consideration the views of the world's entire Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Episcopates, gathered in proper ecclesiastical convocation. Toward that end it would seem to be desirable to first elicit the formal spiritual views on the question of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen of both Pope Paul VI and Ecumenical Patriarch Demetrios of Constantinople."

Finally, I should like permission to submit separately for the record a more complete statement in which I hope to shed light on the profound significance of this Holy Crown to these many different nations and many religions spread throughout the world. To them, the Holy Crown is not only a historic international symbol of national independence and of constitutional guarantees of human rights but, quintessentially, it is a relic attesting to a direct relationship between mankind and divinity.

For these reasons, for those you have heard from other witnesses on this Panel, and for the considerations cited in the messages appended to my statement, I urgently beseech you to enact H.R. 7983 in the interest of the American people and of all the nations which look to the United States for high moral values and ethical leadership.

ATTACHMENT TO STATEMENT OF STEPHEN A. KOZAK ON H.R. 7983

There follows a list of communications from nationalities and religious groups to be placed into the record of Hearings on H.R. 7983, "Hungarian Crown of Saint Stephen Protection Act.":

1. Rt. Reverend Bishop Simeon, Bulgarian Patriarchate, American Bulgarian Eastern Orthodox Diocese of Akron, Ohio, USA, Canada and Australia.
2. Mrigendra Singh, Raja of Patiala, Old Moti Bagh Palace, Annex, Patiala, India.
3. Professor Herbert Druks, Author on Jewish and Zionist Affairs, including "Failure to Rescue", documentation of failure of Western democracies to rescue European Jews from annihilation by Nazi regime.
4. Dr. Roger Horoshko, Publisher, Byelorussian Times.
5. Konstanty Hanff, Executive Director, Free Poland Wolna Polska.
6. Jerzy Mroczkowski, Editor, Polish Times Political Weekly, Winnipeg, Canada.
7. Dr. Oton Ambroz, Yugoslav Exile Group, Liberal International, London, England.
8. Tomas J. Veteska, Free Slovakia.
9. W. G. Glaskow, National Chairman, Cossack-American Citizens Committee.
10. Ante R. K. Jeric, Dalmatian Federation in the USA.
11. Nikolai Jetenov, Chairman of Organization of Russian Dissidents from the Soviet Union in the USA.
12. Gergoire Abudadze, Secretary, Georgia National Association in the USA.
13. Cathryn Dorney, Executive Director, American Education Association, New York, New York.
14. Jon Speller, Letter published on Editorial Page of New York Times, May 20, 1977.

Curriculum Vitae also appended.

STEPHEN A. KOZAK

Born: Trenton, New Jersey, November 13, 1917.

Education: Graduate A.B. Degree, Harvard College, 1942; Certificate, Graduate Institute of International Relations, Geneva, Switzerland (1946).

Military Service: 1942-1946; 1942, drafted into Army; commissioned in Adjutant General School, Ft. Washington, Md. 1943; in

Military Intelligence and Censorship Control—German, Russian, French, Hungarian languages. Served on staff of General Eisenhower at SHAEF and with military government in Finance Division at OMGUS (Berlin) under General Clay.

1946-1966: Commissioned as Foreign Service Officer, Department of State, November 13, 1946. Political and diplomatic posts in U.S. Missions, Legations and Embassies; in Berlin, Germany on staff of Ambassador Robert Murphy (1946-1947); American Legation, Budapest (1947-1949), with Minister Seldin Chapin, where declared persona non grata by Stalinist Hungarian government allegedly for seeking overthrow of Communist State in connection with Cardinal Joseph Mindzenty trial; Bonn, Germany with High Commissioners John J. McCloy and James B. Conant (1949-1954); at American Embassy, Tel Aviv, Israel (1954-1956), during first Sinai War and Hungarian Revolution; in Berlin, Germany with U.S. Mission (1959-1961) as head of East German Political Affairs Department during Berlin Crisis and erection of Berlin Wall; assignments in Department of State were with Bureau of Intelligence (1956-1957) and with Historical Office (1962-1966) working on European problems and political and strategic issues of nuclear warfare, missiles and outer space.

1965 to present: Director of Research, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, the largest union of Federal employees representing 725,000 in exclusive recognition bargaining units. Alternate member, five-member Federal Employees Pay Council, which advises the President's Agent, under the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970, on setting Federal pay rates for approximately 1.5 million white collar employees and 2.5 million uniformed military personnel.

HELP FOR THE STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for November 9, 1977, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HELP FOR THE STEEL INDUSTRY

What should the government do to help the steel industry? That question has forced itself onto the agenda of the Congress in the closing days of this session because steel, one of the nation's basic industries, has plunged into its worst crisis in 25 years.

Steel plants have cut back employment, steel profits have plummeted, some steel companies are sinking into the red, many steel mills are idle, and a malaise has spread throughout the industry. The basic reasons for the problems of the industry are a slack in world-wide demand for steel, an enormous surplus capacity, an influx into this country of low-priced imports, and aging and relatively inefficient plants and equipment.

Everyone agrees that there is no quick relief in sight. Japanese production costs are 15-20 percent below those of the American industry and the Japanese can sell an average mix of products in the United States at costs that are about 5 percent below those of an American producer. About one ton in five of American steel is produced in obsolete open-hearth furnaces, a process now abandoned entirely in Japan. The productivity rise in the steel industry has been lagging behind the rise in other manufacturing industries.

Steel prices are up 79 percent since 1972 as against only 24 percent for other industrial prices in the same period.

The U.S. steel industry, however, is not on the edge of oblivion. Much of the industry remains competitive, especially in the Midwest where most of the new plants have been built and where demand for industrial steel remains high.

To correct its problems, the steel industry is pushing hard for several changes. It wants a more generous and quicker tax write-off for its investment in government mandated pollution and safety equipment, and shortened depreciation on its basic steel-making equipment. These changes would allow a steel company to deduct its investment immediately as a business expense.

In return for vigorous prosecution by the government of the anti-dumping laws, the steel industry has recently dropped its push for import quotas. Import quotas might bring temporary relief to the steel industry but in the long run at a high cost to everyone. Quotas might increase the quantities of steel produced in the domestic market, but they would tend to remove competition and push prices up. Import quotas would also signal that the American commitment to open trade is half-hearted, and might encourage other nations to retaliate.

The steel industry wants and the President and Congress agree that the anti-dumping laws need to be better enforced. Dumping occurs when a country sells a product more cheaply abroad than at home. In a simple case, if a shoe factory sells a pair of shoes at home for \$20 and the same pair in the United States for \$10, that would be a clear case of dumping. Under present law the United States could impose a \$10 anti-dumping duty on the pair of shoes. The appeal of the anti-dumping approach is undeniable, but the real question is whether it will be effective. Filing dumping complaints is a time-consuming and painstaking way to combat imports. They do, however, increase the pressure on foreign steelmakers. With tough enforcement of the anti-dumping laws, a bruising battle over steel import quotas and tough negotiations with trading partners around the world can be avoided, but it is extremely doubtful that the problems of the steel industry can be resolved by anti-dumping actions alone. Even if such action is effective in stopping imports, inflation will accelerate because lower-priced steel will be shut out from our markets and a sizeable trade collision could be brought about. In short, although anti-dumping measures may be helpful in the short term, they also raise some problems and they are not going to make the steel industry problems vanish miraculously.

I believe the government should act to give the steel industry tax incentives to allow the capital formation it needs and should begin to strongly enforce the anti-dumping laws. Because steel is so basic to America's economy, I do not rule out other types of aid for the industry, including so-called orderly marketing agreements limiting steel imports, or even changes in the anti-trust laws. Since no single factor can be identified as being responsible for the industry's difficulties, no single action by government, the steel industry or steelworkers can solve them. Whatever we do, however, should be done with care.

Clearly the time has come to abandon the traditional adversary relationship that has existed between Washington and the steel industry. The steel industry is often caught in a crossfire of policies emanating from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Labor Department and the Justice Department. Planned coordination of govern-

ment policies would be a welcomed first step in any program to rescue a sagging industry.

GROWTH OF EUROCOMMUNIST PARTIES IN WESTERN EUROPE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 11, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the growth of so-called Eurocommunist parties in Western Europe, there has been a growing assumption in some quarters that the nature of communism in those nations is different. Although evidence countering such an assumption has frequently arisen, it has yet to be fully comprehended by many officials of the administration. Robert Moss, editor of the Economist's Foreign Report and author of "The Collapse of Bureaucracy" provides a much needed clarification of the nature of Eurocommunism in the summer issue of Policy Review, a publication of the The Heritage Foundation of Washington, D.C.

"Is 'Eurocommunism' different in kind from Soviet communism or merely an electoral charade played by shrewd tacticians who know that their chances of winning votes will be lessened if they are identified with the repression of Soviet dissidents or the invasion of Czechoslovakia?" To provide answers for this question, Mr. Moss examines major assertions made by those who believe that the West can coexist with Eurocommunism.

The claim that Eurocommunist parties are independent from Moscow, proves indefensible when countered by evidence that despite the repeated attacks by Moscow on the Communists of France, Italy, and Spain; and despite the anti-Soviet tone of the Western Communists' proclamations of independence, there is nonetheless a close bond between Moscow and the Communists of the West. Mr. Moss notes that the only example of polycentrism within Communist countries is China which is big enough to assert its own will—a position far from that of the Communist parties of Western Europe. Also, it is doubtful that the strong pro-Soviet factions within the Western Communist parties will allow any serious deviation from Soviet policy.

The second claim Mr. Moss effectively counters is that NATO could live with Eurocommunism assuming Eurocommunism is independent from Moscow. By citing direct quotations from Communist leaders in Europe such as Lombardo Radice of Italy, Mr. Moss shows that if war broke out between the Soviet Union and the West, the Eurocommunists would likely take the side of the Soviets. In spite of such evidence, Secretary Vance has adopted an attitude of official ambivalence toward the advent of Eurocommunism.

Mr. Moss' points are very well taken, and are especially appropriate at this

time. Therefore, I wish to insert the following excerpt from his article, "The Specter of Eurocommunism," at this time:

THE SPECTER OF EUROCOMMUNISM
(By Robert Moss)

The visit of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt to the White House on July 13 and 14 and that of Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti on July 26 and 27 will include a "hidden agenda" according to *The New York Times* of July 12, 1977.

"At the highest level of the Carter Administration," wrote *Times* reporter Bernard Gwertzman, "officials are expressing deep concern over what they see as a political and economic deterioration in many Western countries."

The "hidden agenda" to be discussed privately includes primarily "the swing toward the left" and "the trend known as Eurocommunism", which, says *The New York Times*, has "created mixed feelings" in Washington.

There can be little doubt, that from a European standpoint (and ultimately for the interests of the West as a whole) the "trend toward Eurocommunism" is indeed serious. Let us begin with Spain which recently transformed itself into a democracy.

The results of the Spanish elections on June 15th were less than a triumph for the Communist Party (which gained only 20 seats out of 350 in the Cortes) but the Communist Party leader, Santiago Carrillo, could put a braver face on it than the leaders of the traditional right which fared even worse. The Communist Party emerged as the third largest party in a situation where party allegiances are still very fluid.

Superficially, the election results seemed to have opened the way for a two-party system in Spain, with a center-right party of government clustered around the prime minister, Adolfo Suarez, and a socialist party of opposition (the PSOE) led by Felipe Gonzalez. Could it be that, despite the Communist Party's role in Spain as the focus for secret opposition to Franco and its *avant-garde* role, since 1968, in developing a "Eurocommunist" image of independence from Moscow and tolerance towards other parties, it will now be condemned to the sidelines?

Such a conclusion would be rash. First of all, it is worth recalling that the Spanish Communist Party polled only 191,000 votes in the first legislative elections of the Spanish Republic in June, 1931—not enough to capture a single seat in parliament—and only slightly more in the elections in 1933. The Communist Party's lack of a significant electoral following did not, however, make it a negligible force when the Republic fell victim to its internal conflicts.

Second, the PSOE is a Marxist, not a social democrat, party, and has attracted the votes of many of the people who might well have voted for the CP in Italy or France. The Soviets—as well as West European Socialist parties—gave considerable encouragement to the PSOE in the run up to the elections. This was no doubt related to their distrust of Carrillo's "Euro-communist" pretensions, but also to the calculation that the PSOE was the most worthwhile cause—in an electoral sense—since its foreign policy completely coincides with Soviet interests, while it has already earned the approval of Socialist governments in Europe.

Finally, the Communist Party's organized membership (it claims 150,000 members) and trade union support, steeled by the long years of underground resistance, will be a force to be reckoned with in any future political crisis: while its mastery of conspiratorial techniques is evident from the way that the party has rapidly moved to assume dominant influence over the major news magazines—

and even the recently-legalized girlie magazines.

So, while it may be concluded that the net result of Spain's elections was to expose the limited popular support for the Communist Party, it does not follow that the Communist Party has suffered some irreversible setback. It can count on mobilizing union discontent in a deepening economic recession in Spain, and of continuing to try to build a broad "popular front" combining the Communist, Socialist and left-wing Christian Democrat forces. Meanwhile, the specter of Euro-communism is more immediate to the north and east: in Italy, where the Communist Party gained 34.4 percent of the votes in the elections of June 1976 and controls all the major urban centers; and in France, where recent opinion polls suggest that the Communist Party-Socialist alliance (the Union of the Left) has a chance of winning next year's legislative elections.

One of the most striking features of the advance of Communism in Southern Europe is the widespread assumption that the nature of Communism has somehow changed. The postwar leader of the French Communist Party, Maurice Thorez, coined the celebrated phrase that his party was "*pas comme les autres*." Yet when the pollsters recently asked (in a poll that appeared in *Paris-Match*) whether people thought that the Communist Party had become "a party like the others," an astonishing 43 per cent of those interviewed said yes. Only 35 per cent continued to believe that the French Communist Party was different from other parties. The rest were undecided.

Even more striking, perhaps, was the response to another question, "Would the Communist Party be favorable to press freedom?" Of those interviewed, 35 per cent thought the Communist Party would respect press freedom; only 32 per cent thought that it would not.

Has the nature of Communism changed in Western Europe? Is "Eurocommunism" different in kind from Soviet Communism or merely an electoral charade played by shrewd tacticians who know that their chances of winning votes will be lessened if they are identified with the repression of Soviet dissidents or the invasion of Czechoslovakia?

A NEW WORD IS COINED

It should not be forgotten that the word "Eurocommunism" only came into circulation in 1975, and has only started to be used by Communist Party leaders—after much initial hesitation—over the past year or so. (Carrillo recently published a book with "Eurocommunism" in the title.) One Soviet critic of "Eurocommunism," V.V. Zagladin, has suggested that the term was invented by Zbigniew Brzezinski. More probably, it is the invention of journalists: a convenient, but misleading, bit of shorthand used to describe some tendencies that seem to be common to several CPs in Western Europe, rather than a description that they initially applied to themselves.

The "Eurocommunist" parties have set out to demonstrate the following points:

1. That a Communist victory in a West European country would not mean domination from Moscow.
2. That Western Communist Parties are not responsible for the crimes of Stalinism and the contemporary treatment of dissidents within the Soviet bloc; and are capable of taking a critical attitude toward what their Soviet patrons do.
3. That Communism is compatible with political liberty and the survival of parliamentary institutions.

In pursuit of (1), the Eurocommunists have dropped one of the key phrases in the Marxist-Leninist lexicon: "proletarian inter-

nationalism," a euphemism for Soviet control of the world Communist movement.

In pursuit of (2), some Western Communist Parties make regular—but highly selective—criticisms of the Stalinist past and the Soviet present, usually on occasions when there are no Russians present.

In pursuit of (3), some Western Communist Parties have abandoned one of the key phrases from Marx, the "dictatorship of the proletariat," in the effort to imply that "socialist" revolution can be brought about by peaceful democratic means in conditions of political pluralism. It is not always observed that when Marx wrote of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," he was not discussing a political strategy, but setting out what he conceived as an historical inevitability—a stage of social and political evolution that would have to be undergone during the transition from capitalism to socialism. The house style-sheets for *L'Humanite* and *L'Unita* (the organs of the French and Italian Communist Parties) may be revised, but no genuine Marxist can abandon the underlying conception of history.

The three major Communist Parties that it is now customary to group together as "Eurocommunist" are those of Italy, France and Spain. Each is pursuing a strategy of tactical alliance with other parties, whose success will partly depend on convicting evidence of "de-Stalinization" within the Communist Party. It is equally important to note that each of these parties is also responding to recent historical events in other parts of the world which are interpreted as particularly relevant to the success or failure of Communism in these three countries. Thus it was in September-October, 1973, after the fall of Allende in Chile, that the Italian Communist Party leader, Enrico Berlinguer, mapped out his plan for a "historic compromise" between the Communist Party and the Christian Democrats. He had clearly drawn the lesson from Chile's coup that Communist Party success in Italy would hinge on drawing together a broader coalition of political forces than Allende was able to bring about.

While the Communist-Socialist alliance in France came about in 1972, it was after the defeat of Portugal's Communist Party in the fall of 1975 that Georges Marchais, the French Communist Party leader (and until then a staunch defender of the hardline Stalinist approach of Alvaro Cunhal) apparently drew the conclusion that he must take steps to avoid the possibility that his party could be similarly isolated and identified as an anti-democratic force. From that time, the French Communist Party joined the Eurocommunist chorus. The decisive event for Carrillo came earlier—in 1968, when Soviet tanks ended the "Prague spring."

The French, Italian and Spanish Communist Parties are the strongest in Western Europe. But beyond their ranks, "Eurocommunism" has not proved notably infectious.

The degree of agreement and co-ordination between Berlinguer, Marchais and Carrillo themselves should not be exaggerated. Their meetings have been bilateral, rather than trilateral, with the Italian Communist Party taking the lead—by inviting Carrillo to Livorno in July, 1975 and to Rome in September, 1976, and by inviting Marchais to Rome in November, 1975 and May, 1977. The only "Eurocommunist summit" that has taken place was the meeting in Madrid on March 2-3 this year, and it was notable that Berlinguer was extremely reluctant to attend and that the conference ended with a relatively anodyne statement.

MYTHS OF EUROCOMMUNISM

Those who argue that Eurocommunism is a qualitatively new form of Communism,

shorn of some of the Leninist terrors, rather than a mere tactic for acquiring power via the ballot-box in advanced industrial democracies, derive most of their ammunition from the statements that are put out for public consumption by the Communist Party leaders themselves. Those who maintain that, whether or not Communism in Southern Europe is likely to prove different in kind from Communism elsewhere in the world, it will pose major problems for the Russians, also cite the statements of Soviet bloc leaders who attack "revisionism" and "anti-Sovietism" in the Western parties. Let us single out the major assertions that are made by those who believe that the West can live with Eurocommunism, and see whether any of them stand up:

1. "Eurocommunist parties are independent from Moscow."

Marchais declared early this year that "there cannot be, it is totally impossible that the Communist movement could again be directed from any center, whether it is an international center or a regional center." (*L'Humanite*, February 14, 1977). The theme is constant in recent statements from Communist Party leaders in France, Italy and Spain.

It was during the run up to the conference of European Communist Parties in East Berlin in June 1976 that the Russians began to engage in direct criticism of the Eurocommunist parties. Spanish Communist leaders like Carrillo and Manuel Azcarate had, of course, long been targets for Soviet propaganda attacks; the Russians had actually tried to cut the ground from under Carrillo's feet by sponsoring rival Communist parties.

But Soviet attacks on Eurocommunism in general in late 1975 and early 1976 seemed to have been largely inspired by the new line of the French Communist Party. The Russians evidently found this harder to swallow than the attitude adopted by the Italian Communists long before. The reason may be that the Russians had always understood that the Italian Communist Party had its own path to tread. Unlike the French Communist Party, the Italian Communists began in the 1920's with the backing of a majority of the socialist movement in Italy, and the decay of the Italian of the Italian Socialist Party since 1945 has left the Italian Communist Party in the singular position where it can plausibly claim to represent the Left as a whole—in the absence of a serious Socialist rival. While the Russians have always been sensitive to criticism of their behavior towards dissidents at home, such attacks seemed to sting them more when they started to be made—however hypocritically and erratically—by Marchais and his supporters than when they came from Berlinguer.

In any event, in the months before the Berlin summit, a series of heavyweight attacks on "anti-Sovietism" (meaning any and all criticism of Soviet policy) and on "revisionist" tendencies in the Western Communist Parties appeared in the Soviet press. One such attack was that of A. Viktorov (*Pravda*, March 1, 1977). Viktorov took up an earlier critique of the concept of "arithmetic democracy"—in other words, the idea that political decisions should be taken on the basis of one man, one vote. According to Viktorov "experience has shown that it is impossible to achieve socialism in the framework of a bourgeois state, of bourgeois democracy. History offers numerous examples, the latest of them being Chile."

Russian displeasure has also been expressed indirectly—and frequently in more abusive language—by the leaders of satellite states in Eastern Europe and by hardline pro-Soviet Communists from the Third World and Portugal. Thus the Bulgarian leader, Todor

Zhivkov, has been a bitter critic of Eurocommunism, while a member of the Central Committee of the Czech Communist Party wrote in *Rude Pravo* last month that Eurocommunism represents an oblique attack on genuine socialism.

Similarly, hardliners like Alvaro Cunhal from Portugal or Luis Corvalan, the Chilean Communist leader who was released from detention in exchange for Vladimir Bukovsky, have been wheeled out to criticize the errors of Eurocommunist parties.

How are we to interpret these Soviet outbursts? Are such criticisms merely a smoke-screen, intended to increase the credibility of claims by Western Communist Party leaders that they are genuinely independent from Moscow?

French and Italian Communist Party leaders continue to attend closed meetings with the Soviet leaders in Moscow, although Marchais goes less frequently than before. Their tone tends to be far more moderate when they are speaking in the presence of senior Soviet officials than when they are speaking for internal consumption, while the party newspapers in both France and Italy regularly censor statements—including those of their own party secretaries—which are deemed too critical of the Soviets. Furthermore, there has been a noticeable retreat towards a more cautious position in the first half of 1977. This was evident at the Madrid meeting in March. In speeches in Budapest and Milan in January, Berlinguer praised the revolution of October, 1917, the "superiority" of the Soviet system over the West, and the "irreversibility" of socialism in the East. He also lauded the principle of "democratic centralism." On April 5th, the Italian Communist Party spokesman, Asor Rosa, declared that democratic centralism and the leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union remained the bases of international communism.

But there are three simple reasons for doubting whether a Communist Party in government in Western Europe would be able to pursue policies that conflicted with basic Soviet interests. The first, quite simply, is that the debate between Moscow and the Eurocommunist parties has been, so to speak, a discussion within the church. Criticisms of the Soviet Union from Western Communist Parties involve only the internal life of the world Communist movement, and do not affect broader Soviet interests. Thus Western Communist Parties have automatically adopted the Soviet line on international crises such as the Middle East, Angola and Southern Africa. The world view of the Western Communist Parties is a manichean view of a global conflict between "socialism" and "imperialism."

Second, the only genuine example of what Togliatti was describing back in the mid-1950s as "polycentrism" is China, which is big enough and powerful enough to sustain its own version of Communism in the face of Soviet pressures.

Third, the ultra-orthodox pro-Soviet factions inside Western Communist Parties remain very strong, and unregenerate Stalinists are frequently found to have their hands on the levers of power.

Thus, even if it were possible to believe that a leader like Marchais is sincere in what he now says, it remains very doubtful whether the structures of his own party—and the existence of clandestine networks of Soviet agents responsible to the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—would allow him to do anything that ran seriously counter to Soviet policy.*

*A newly-published essay for the London-based Foreign Affairs Research Institute by Mr. Ronald Waring is skeptical indeed (and

The fact that the Chinese are publicly skeptical about the credentials of Eurocommunist parties is revealing, since leading figures in the Italian Communist Party have called for a detente between Russia and China. However, the Chinese have not failed to notice that leading advocates of this approach—such as Alberto Jacoviello—have had their wings clipped by the Party. Their primary concern appears to be that the victory of Western Communist Parties would undermine NATO's defenses, and so strengthen the Soviet Union in its conflict with China.

2. "If Eurocommunism is independent from Moscow, NATO could live with it."

It is often argued, by those who maintain that there is some real difference of kind between Western and Soviet Communism, that the election of a Communist Party to government in Paris or Rome could create more headaches for the Russians than for the West. The argument is that this would have a contagious effect on Eastern Europe, encouraging new attempts to produce "socialism with a human face."

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance has employed this argument in what must be taken as the definitive attitude of the Carter administration (at least to date) on Eurocommunism. Speaking recently in the rambling prose style—interspersed with the calculated naivete which seems to be the mark of the new American government—Mr. Vance thought out loud using the following phrases from the *U.S. State Department Stock Phrase Book* (Washington, D.C. 1977).

"We have said that in dealing with our Western allies on vital issues we would prefer to be dealing with countries who have the same fundamental values, the same democratic concerns that we have, and if the Communists were to take a dominant role in those governments, that could present serious problems insofar as we are concerned. We have gone on to say that we think the question, the political question of whether or not Communists should or should not play a part in the government of a particular country is a political issue to be decided by the people of that country and one in which we should not interfere. However, at the same time I say again that does not mean we are indifferent to the fact that they may."

He added that it "is a possibility" that Communists in NATO governments would lead to new problems for the Soviets, possibly outweighing any difficulties endured by the West. He concluded in *Il Tempo*, incisively with the sentence: "I think it depends on how Eurocommunism develops."

with reasons) of a "change-of-heart" on the part of Europe's Communists. Mr. Waring in his article, entitled "Eurocommunism and Italy," notes that: "It is inconceivable that Moscow could permit a new form of Communist heresy which would be so immensely attractive to the peoples of the Eastern European countries such as Rumania, Hungary and Poland, not to mention to the Russian people themselves. Both Russian imperialism and international Communism themselves would be in mortal danger. Moscow has already attacked Carrillo for splitting Communism by supporting the concept of Eurocommunism, but this condemnation is a tactic to give greater credence to the acceptable "independence" of Eurocommunism and it is worth noting that La Passionara—a creature of the Soviets if ever there was one—voted for Carrillo. The Soviet Union would have the military force to crush such a dangerous situation should it arise, and could easily be called in by a hard core within the Party, after the overthrow of Berlinguer and his adherents, to restore order in the interests of "proletarian internationalism" and the upholding of the Brezhnev Doctrine."

This possibility should not be hastily ruled out. However, it is equally true that the more attractive and independent Communism in one Western country is made to appear, the more likely it is to take root somewhere else. The domino effect of a Communist electoral victory in Paris would be felt in Rome more quickly than in Prague or Warsaw.

The key question for NATO remains: which side would the Eurocommunists take if war broke out between the Soviet Union and the West? The question was put to Lucio Lombardo Radice in a revealing interview in *Encounter*, published in its May, 1977 issue. In the original tape-recorded version of the interview, Radice said "we would choose the Soviet side, of course, and we would do so on grounds of principle. . . ." In the edited version of the interview, the passage was altered at Radice's request to read as follows: "It depends. If there is an imperialist aggression with the avowed objective of rolling back socialism, we would feel entirely absolved of any obligation of loyalty to the defensive character of NATO and take the side of the Soviet Union." Whichever version is deemed more authentic, it is plain that in a war between "socialists" and "imperialists," the Italian Communist Party would find it hard to stand with the "imperialists."

3. "Eurocommunists will respect the rules of the Democratic game."

Assurances from Western Communist Parties that their brand of Communism has become compatible with political liberty would be more plausible if they did not totally subscribe to the doctrine of democratic centralism—which means that all key decisions are taken at the top, and that as soon as the background discussion has taken place, no differences of opinion will be tolerated. In short, while Western Communist Parties attack the historical errors of Stalinism in Russia, they continue to practice Stalinism within their own parties.

The supposedly "liberal" Italian Communist Party, for instance, gave an assurance at its conference in Bologna in February, 1969, that it would tolerate internal differences of opinion. Later that year, after a Stalinist-style show trial, it exiled the supporters of *Il Manifesto*, a magazine of New Left tendencies, for exceeding the "tolerable" limits of dissent. If Eurocommunist parties cannot tolerate differences of opinion within their own ranks, how is it possible to believe that they will allow political freedom for rival parties if they manage to take power?

The typical reply from Eurocommunist leaders to the question—would they be prepared to bow out peacefully if they lost their popular support?—is that such a situation is impossible to imagine. Thus Lombardo Radice said: "once the working class has acquired hegemony . . . it would be difficult to envisage anyone wanting a regression from a better state of society to a worse state." In the same interview, he allowed that "it is in the logic of our policy" that the Italian Communist Party should give up power if it

suffered a defeat under the democratic system.

However, his comments on the Soviet intervention in Budapest in 1956 do not encourage confidence that this would happen, and raise the specter of the ultimate instrument that a Communist government in Western Europe could employ to maintain itself in power: the Red Army. Radice admitted that he was in favor of Soviet action in Hungary because "Socialism in Hungary was a weak plant, only some seven years old, and there was danger of a regression to capitalism . . . socialism was as yet without roots, therefore the roots had to be protected." Is it impossible to conceive of a Communist Government in Rome several years hence appealing to the Russians to defend it against the dangers of "a regression to capitalism"?

So how should we interpret statements like Marchias' declaration last year that the "there is no democracy and liberty if there is no pluralism of political parties, if there is no freedom of speech"? (He added that "we have a disagreement with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union about this problem.")

A helpful guide is Lenin, who wrote, in a notorious letter to Chicherin, that "to tell the truth is a bourgeois prejudice. On the other hand a lie is often justified by our ends." There is further evidence for thinking that pluralism would not last long under a Communist government in Paris or Rome. Look at the way the French and Italian Communist Parties deal with the press.

The Italian Communists have been trying to silence a television station that is outspoken in its criticism of them, Tele-Monte-Carlo, under Clause 40 of the recent law on Italian broadcasting, which seeks to restrict material transmitted to Italy from abroad. Tele-Monte-Carlo broadcasts an Italian service with a special news program produced by Indro Montanelli, the distinguished conservative journalist and cofounder of *Il Giornale Nuovo*, the Milan newspaper which has systematically exposed the inside workings of the Italian Communist Party. (Montanelli was shot in the legs by terrorists of the "Red Brigades" on June 2nd.) In their communique, they denounced him as "a servant of the bourgeois State and the multi-national companies."

Tele-Monte-Carlo has been a tremendous popular success in Northern Italy, as an alternative to the increasing left-wing bias of the State television network inside the country. So it is no real surprise that the Communist Party, which noticed no illegality about broadcasts from Yugoslavia and Switzerland to Italy, should now be seeking a pretext to gag a formidable critic.

In the case of the French Communist Party, it is even clear that its attitude to press freedom will be based on its ancient philosophy that the truth is what it is expedient to say. When Costa-Gavras' film about the Prague show trials, *L'Aveu*, was first screened, it was attacked by *L'Humanite* as the "exploitation of a bad cause." The film touched a sensitive nerve, not least because

it was not forgotten that the French Communist Party forwarded material on members of the International Brigade who had fought in the Spanish Civil War to Prague, to help in preparing the case against Slansky and others.

When *L'Aveu* was screened on French television last December, Jean Panapa, one of the most pro-Soviet figures in the party leadership, joined a panel to discuss it. He tried to absolve the French Communist Party from the charge that it had tried to cover up the crime of Stalinism by pleading ignorance. "If we had only known," he said, "we would have shouted our indignation."

Within a few days, however, Kanapa's argument of ignorance was demolished by the appearance of a two-part article in *Le Monde* by a Communist Party historian, Jean Ellenstein. He revealed that the French delegation at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, when Khrushchev gave his celebrated "secret speech" denouncing Stalin, had been shown the text of the speech the morning after—but decided not to make public what it contained: Communist Party spokesmen, including Kanapa, had always denied that this had happened.

A *gauchiste* weekly, *Politique Hebdo*, followed up by publishing the personal reminiscences of an ex-member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, Jean Pronteau, who had traveled to Warsaw shortly after the 20th Congress. He was also shown a copy of the Khrushchev speech. On his return he went to see Maurice Thorez, the leader of the French Party. Pronteau promptly opened his briefcase and began to read from the text he had brought back from Warsaw. Thorez's response was a classic, "Alright then. You've got it. You could have said so right from the beginning. But remember one thing, this secret speech does not exist."

If the French Communist Party goes to such lengths to conceal the past, would it really be prepared to allow frank discussion of the present if it gained a position of power?

But there is a still broader reason for believing that "Eurocommunism"—like any brand of Marxism-Leninism—is incompatible with the survival of political liberties. The radical changes in economic and social structures that the Communists propose to bring about are not only designed to be irreversible, but are incompatible with political pluralism.

A final cautionary note is that, for every reassurance that a Western Communist Party leader makes about guarantees for political pluralism under a future popular front, it is possible to dredge up a dozen or more from the recent past that say precisely the opposite. One example will have to suffice. It is from George Marchais, in *L'Humanite* on December 23, 1970: "We do not believe that the struggle for socialism should be inspired by the system of alternative government (*politique d'alternance*) that, as in England, allows the Conservatives and the Socialists to take turns in power to inflict the worst possible injuries on the workers."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, November 15, 1977

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Set your troubled hearts at rest. Trust in God always.—John 14: 1 (N.E.B.).

O God, our Father, in the quiet of this moment we turn to Thee praying for ourselves, for our loved ones, for our country, and for all Thy children. Comfort

those who mourn, heal the sick, help the needy, encourage the discouraged. Give light to those who sit in darkness, love to those whose hearts are bitter, and life to those who have missed the way. To us give wisdom, courage, and strength and above all a consciousness of Thy presence that as we live this day we may have the feeling that Thou art with us.

In the spirit of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.