

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 15

JUNE 15, 1970, TO JUNE 23, 1970

(PAGES 19651 TO 21100)

democracy is not something that is easily fabricated in an underdeveloped country, especially one that is torn by war. But at least, with the vital advantage of true national independence, these peoples have a fighting chance to build an egalitarian society. This is not so for those supposedly "independent" states in the communist world. Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev Doctrine spelled that out very clearly. Much has been made over the "Independence" of North Vietnam from Communist China. But do you imagine that Peking would be willing to see a transformation of North Vietnamese society any more than Moscow was able to countenance such actionisms in Prague?

If we step aside, then every chunk torn out of the Free World will also be turned out of the soul of America. As the greatest of the free nations, we, like Pontius Pilate, will be unable to really and truly wash the blood off our hands.

NEW YORK CASE ILLUSTRATES ABUSIVE USE OF UNION FINES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for more than a year now the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has had pending before it a bill introduced by me and Senator FANNIN to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for any labor organization to impose any fine or other economic sanction against any person for exercising his right not to engage in concerted activities or for invoking any process of the National Labor Relations Board.

A case from the State of New York has recently come to my attention which I feel points up vividly why S. 1946 should be approved by committee and sped to the floor of the Senate for our consideration.

That case involves fines of \$3,000 levied by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, customarily referred to as the IAM, against three of its members who were employed by the airlines in New York. I would like to review briefly the facts of that case as I understand them.

The three defendants in the case were members in good standing of IAM's Lodge 1894 which has a union shop agreement with the airlines at LaGuardia and Kennedy airports in New York. In fact, two of them were elected to positions in the union. They understood the import of their membership and participation in the union and of its role as bargaining agent for the airline employees.

However, the three defendants apparently ran afoul of the union leadership back in 1962 when they participated in the formation of a rival group, the Aircraft Mechanics Fraternal Association—AMFA. That organization made application for craft separation from the IAM, but the National Mediation Board turned it down.

About 5 years later, the defendants participated in a move by AMFA to replace IAM as bargaining agent for the mechanics working for National Airlines in New York.

It seems to me that under the statutory process of the labor laws, such activities would clearly fall under the right of employees to move for decertification of a union that has become unresponsive to its members. As I understand facts of

this case, the three airline mechanics thought the AMFA would be more responsive to their needs than the IAM, and consequently they took action to win recognition for the new group.

The IAM, however, equated this action to "treason" and brought charges against the three men for participating in dual unionism. The allegations were that the three men tried to destroy the IAM local while they held office in it. The men were tried by the union in accordance with procedures set out in its constitution. They were adjudged guilty and the fines were imposed. The defendants refused to pay the \$3,000, and although the union made no attempt to interfere with their employment or cause their discharge, it did bring suit in the New York State courts to collect the fines.

Unfortunately, the law as it now stands would allow this court action, and the mechanics may yet be forced to pay the fines. Under the NLRB's infamous Allis-Chalmers ruling, which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, unions may sue in the State courts to collect such fines. The Board and the Court reasoned in Allis-Chalmers that the Taft-Hartley Act did not apply to a union's internal affairs, and that union fines were internal matters which did not violate the "coerce or restrain" prohibition of Taft-Hartley, S. 1946, which would prohibit union fines, is designed to correct this indefensible reasoning and restore the true intent of Taft-Hartley to protect the rights of employees. The Allis-Chalmers decision reduced the status of any individual union member from that of a substantially free man to that of a union puppet.

We must remember that labor organizations operating under union shop agreements are not voluntary associations. Prof. Clyde W. Summers, a member of the Yale University Law School faculty and a noted authority on labor law, dealt succinctly with this problem in "Union Democracy and Union Discipline," NYU 5th Annual Conference on Labor 443, 459-460 (1952):

A union, however, is not a voluntary association. A worker does not have a free choice whether he shall come within its power, nor can he readily escape its reach. The union as bargaining agent represents all employees in the unit, whether they are members or not. It helps determine for each and every one his hours, his wages, his seniority, his vacation and his retirement. A worker does not voluntarily submit himself to its control, but is bound by its decision regardless of his choice. His only escape is to quit his job and seek work elsewhere—and be governed by another union! Unions are not only involuntary associations but obtain a substantial measure of their compulsory jurisdiction over individuals from the law itself. Labor relations acts, both federal and state, compel the employer to give the union exclusive bargaining rights, and the individual is legally barred from asserting his independence.

Union-shop agreements are not required by the law; they are permitted by the law. Many unions have been able to rely on voluntarism and not the coercion of compulsion. Others, however, have resorted to union fines and other forms of coercion and restraint to completely

negate the rights of their members, rights which have been guaranteed by the Congress in the labor statutes but which have been stomped into nothingness by the unions themselves.

The bill S. 1946 would go a long way toward restoring the rights of employees to insist that their unions be responsive to their needs, and it would insure that they be allowed to exercise the rights already written into the labor statutes.

I urge the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to take this bill up and report it favorably in order to give the entire Senate an opportunity to vote for individual freedom.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I want to join those who have spoken out in praise of President Nixon's nationwide talk today on the economy.

I found it a realistic speech that faces up to the problems of that economy and offers concrete proposals for meeting those problems.

I was gratified to note that the speech was not political in nature or in tone, but instead recognized that these problems affect all of us and all of us here in the Congress have a duty to help solve them.

I can assure the President he has my support in combating both inflation and the threat of unemployment. And I am confident that with his leadership and his recognition of what must be done, we can keep our economy strong, we can end the inflation without a drastic recession or depression, we can renew our productivity and we can build a healthy and prosperous peacetime economy.

MINNESOTANS OPPOSE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the tragic escalation of the war in Southeast Asia has been shown by strong disapproval by my constituents. I am interested to see that the White House continues to issue vague statements about public support for this dangerous escapade. There is no doubt about the views of Minnesotans. My mail has been very heavy on the Cambodian invasion and has been running 10 or 12 to one against the President's action.

An excellent letter from a thoughtful Minnesotan was recently printed in the Minnesota Tribune. Mr. Russell points out so well:

We have serious problems at home that demand our full attention and . . . the time to get out of Vietnam is now—in 1970.

I understand that readers of the Tribune who contacted Mr. Russell were unanimous in their support of his position.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this perceptive letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD.

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

EX-NAVY MAN IS FED UP

To the Editor: As a short-haired, middle-aged, conservative, ex-Navy, establishment-

type Republican, I am getting increasingly fed up with all the generals, politicians and press, radio and TV characters who keep talking about "the enemy" in Vietman, Laos, Cambodia or Thailand.

Whose "enemy"? Certainly not mine. No war has been declared, I don't hate anybody, anywhere in Southeast Asia, and I don't know a single Minnesotan who does. I couldn't care less what kind of government they have, if any.

If a bunch of Asians came over here and tried to tell us how our part of the world should be run, I'd be happy to help throw them back across the Pacific, and I just can't conceive of any self-respecting, patriotic Vietnamese not feeling the same way about half a million Americans trying to play God 10,000 miles from home.

Like us, the Vietnamese, North and South, are perfectly capable of lousing up their own affairs with no "help" from outsiders. After all, they've been successfully fighting off the Chinese for centuries, they finally got rid of both the Japanese and French, and then we crazy Americans had to come over and drop more bombs on their little country than were used by both sides in Europe in all of World War II. With "friends" like that, who needs enemies?

You don't need to visit Expo '70 to figure out that the Japanese, who have led the world in shipbuilding for the last 14 years and know the Chinese can't walk on the water, are again the dominant power in the Western Pacific. Also, you don't need to wear long hair and a beard or be under 30 to realize that we have serious problems at home that demand our full attention and that the time to get out of Vietnam is now—in 1970. As the world's most powerful nation, the initiative is completely ours, nobody can stop us, and no "negotiations" are necessary or desirable, least of all with a fourth-rate power in Paris.

TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Life magazine for June 12, 1970, contains an article and an interview by Oriana Fallaci with Dr. George Habash, the head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. This group is responsible for many acts of terror which have shocked the world, and the nation of Israel in particular. It is a rare opportunity to look behind such violent and seemingly irrational acts to the individual committing them, and this interview is one of those occasions. I commend the article to Senators so that we may better understand the tragedy of the Middle East and, it is hoped, change the tendency toward escalating conflict and polarization in that troubled land.

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

A LEADER OF THE FEDAYEEN: "WE WANT A WAR LIKE THE VIETNAM WAR"

(By Oriana Fallaci)

The man I was facing was responsible for most of the acts of terror the Arabs have committed in Europe. The head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine: Dr. George Habash, a Christian doctor who until a few years ago was a Schweitzerlike figure running a private clinic with a group of nuns in Amman. This hospital was filled mostly with children and poor old people. Dr. Habash never insisted on being paid and he bought the drugs for his patients out of his own pocket, then slipped them a roll of notes when they were ready to leave. Born rather rich, he used up much of his wealth in this way. He spent nothing on himself:

a sterilized white coat over old clothes was all he ever wore, and he slept under a crucifix on a cot in his hospital.

One day the clinic was closed and Dr. Habash disappeared. He had gone with the *fedayeen* to follow the only calling in which he now believed—the pitiless fight for vengeance. It was 1967 and since that day he has given up everything, including his two children and his beautiful young wife whom he had married five years before. He now lives in the *fedayeen* bases that he leaves only at night escorted by a bodyguard.

In any sense, it's a tough life. The *fedayeen* who belong to the Front have no regular salary like those who belong to Al Fatah; at most they get a subsidy of \$5 a month and transport every 30 days to visit their families. Their few military bases are ill-equipped and insufficiently supplied; the daily fare is boiled beans, meat once a week if all is well. Any free time left over from military training is filled with study of Marxist and Leninist classics. There is no question that the Palestinian resistance is a socialistic movement aided by China and the U.S.S.R. But the Front is so poor that it doesn't even have a headquarters or a telephone, so a *fedayeen* who joins the Front does not do it for material gains. That would explain why there are only 1,600 or so members.

Yet those 1,600, for ill or for good, are attracting the world's attention with acts of terrorism. "Why?" is what I went to ask Dr. Habash. We met at night in the suburbs of Amman, in a building attached to a refugee camp. The room contained one desk and a few chairs; outside the closed doors, armed *fedayeen* stood guard. Inside there were only four of us: Habash, myself, a photographer and the man who had driven us there. I was sitting behind the desk and Habash sat on a chair in front of me, with his hands resting on his baggy knees, his tired, unshaved face slightly lifted in expectation of my questions. Solidly built, with shoulders like a wrestler, he kept watching me through steady and pained eyes, making it hard for me to attack him. I ask his age, and he said 44. Then he rumbled his gray hair with his fingers, as if to apologize for looking so old, and smiled humbly. But when I asked "Why?" the smile disappeared.

Dr. Habash, the Front specializes in acts of terrorism, many of them carried out in Europe. What right do you have to impose this war on Europeans?

I will explain. Let us start with a premise: in a war one has to establish scientifically who one's enemies are. In this war Israel is not our only enemy. Our enemy is Israel, plus the Zionist movement that controls many of the countries which support Israel, plus imperialism. I mean specifically British imperialism from 1918, and American imperialism from 1948 on. If we had to face Israel alone, the problem would have been almost a simple one: but we have to stand against whoever supports Israel economically, militarily, politically, ideologically. This means the capitalist countries that have conceived Israel and are now using it as a bulwark to protect their interests in Arabia. They include the U.S., and almost every country in Europe.

Let us for a moment leave out Europe, and concentrate on Israel. From an economical and political point of view Israel is an island isolated from its friends and surrounded by enemy lands: Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Egypt. Its communications with friendly nations can take place only through the air and the sea; therefore it becomes imperative for us to block those avenues. In the future we will take care of maritime communications, aboard ships at the docks or at sea. We have been taking care for some time now of the air routes by striking at the planes of El Al, the Israeli airline. El Al planes are a perfectly legitimate military target: they

belong to the enemy, they connect the island of Israel with other shores, and they transport troops and ammunition. They are flown by reserve officers of the Israeli Air Force. In a war it is fair to strike the enemy wherever he happens to be, and this rule leads us also to the European airfields where El Al planes land or take off.

Dr. Habash, you are forgetting that those planes also carry citizens of neutral countries, and that the airfields belong to neutral countries, not Israel. To respect neutral countries is another rule of war.

Aside from the fact that these airfields are always located in pro-Zionist countries, I repeat that we have the right to fight our enemy wherever he might be. And as for the non-Israeli passengers, they are on their way to Israel. Since we have no control over the land that was stolen from us and called Israel, it is right that whoever goes to Israel should ask for our permission. Countries like Germany, Italy, France, and Switzerland, with many Jews among their population, allow their territory to be used as a base for the Jews to fight the Arabs. If Italy, for instance, is a base against the Arabs, the Arabs have a right to use Italy as a base against the Jews.

No, Dr. Habash, Italy is not used as a Jewish base, nor is Germany, France or Switzerland. And you don't stop with El Al's planes. How far are you planning to go? Do you want to make war on three-fourths of the planet?

No, we don't want to do that. But we have to look at this scientifically and recognize that our revolution is a phase of the worldwide revolution. We ought to be honest and admit that what we want is a war like the war in Vietnam. We want a Vietnam war not just in Palestine, but throughout the Arab world. Palestinians are part of the Arab nation, and what we need is for the whole Arab nation to enter the war; which will occur anyway, within three or four years. By then, if not before, the revolutionary forces in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon will rise to our side in a total war. Our struggle has barely begun, the worst is yet to come. And it is right for Europe and America to be warned now that there will be no peace for them until there is justice for Palestine. There are uncomfortable days ahead for you all, and they will not be too steep a price to pay for the help you extend to Israel. Now that this is clear, let us return to the subject of planes not belonging to El Al. I assume that you refer to the TWA flight we rerouted to Damascus. Well, the United States are a harbor of our enemies, and so they are our enemy too. The plane was hijacked in protest against the American sale of Phantom jets to Israel.

America sells Phantoms to Israel, and Russia sells Migs to Egypt. Don't you think it all even out in the end? If the Israelis were to hijack planes every time Russian gives weapons to Egypt, we would all be traveling on bicycles. Don't the prospect of triggering a third World War bother you?

To be frank, it doesn't. The world has been using us and has forgotten us. It is time they realized we exist, it is time they stopped exploiting us. Whatever the price, we'll continue our struggle to return home.

The opinion of the world does not concern you?

Obviously we are concerned with world opinion. When it is on your side it means you are in the right, when it's against you it means there is something wrong in what you are doing. But the problem has to be stated differently, because we are interested in public opinion more on the plane of knowledge than on that of emotion. Let me explain: the attacks of the Popular Front are based on quality, not quantity. We believe that to kill a Jew far from the battleground has more of an effect than killing 100 of them in battle; it attracts more attention. And when we set