

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 7

MARCH 23, 1970, TO MARCH 31, 1970

(PAGES 8495 TO 9922)

munity's potential with private and public programs at all levels of government.

Extension will be asked to bring cohesiveness into community development programs through education and to help people obtain the right kind of planning, financing and technical aid from other agencies. Each director of a state Extension Service has been asked to convene a USDA Committee for Rural Development in his state. These committees will work closely with state and local people in comprehensive planning and development and also provide technical assistance. Membership will include representatives from the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the State Extension Service and anyone else whose representatives feel will contribute.

In the decade of the 70's the strength of rural America will be vital as never before to the whole nation. The quality of the American way of life depends on it. To have a healthy, growing and habitable country, we must have a nonmetropolitan alternative and solution to the uninhabitable, ungovernable city. The opportunity and potential are there. With dedication to the goal and faith in our abilities, our America, urban as well as rural, will become the place we all want it to be. The Rural Affairs Council and the concept it exemplifies are a significant and encouraging beginning.

Still, it is the people of each community who will decide the future of that community. A well-developed rural America with sufficiently good employment opportunities and living environments will be a sum of the efforts of those people, working with their governments at all levels.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION: MORAL LEADERSHIP, NOT MORAL EXEMPTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the arguments that has been frequently presented against Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention is that this treaty is undesirable because it would allow our leaders and Nation as a whole to be brought up before an international tribunal on charges of genocide in connection with the war in Vietnam or the Black Panthers. I have dealt earlier with such arguments from a legal viewpoint, and demonstrated that these objections distort and gloss over many of the facts.

What particularly disturbs me at this time, however, is not simply that the facts are presented incorrectly. More fundamental is that this argument results from a kind of moral arrogance. It implies that somehow the United States should not be held accountable for the crime of genocide, but that this moral exemption is an exclusive American "privilege."

Moral arrogance and aloofness toward this hideous crime is a totally unwarranted reaction. It assumes that this country holds a monopoly on morality and that our moral posture is absolutely unimpeachable.

I am not saying that this is not a great country, and that its people are not good people. I am not saying that the United States cannot be a moral leader for the rest of the world. I am saying, however, that we are not inherently entitled to an exemption from morality.

The controversy surrounding the Army's investigations into the tragedies

at Songmy is a good example of the effects of claiming this exemption from morality. When the first reports of a massacre began to come in from former servicemen, the instantaneous reaction of many Americans was, "Sheer nonsense. How could our American men ever do a horrible thing like that?" In other words, this country had a claim on morality in war.

But as the facts were compiled and evaluated, the inescapable conclusion was that a tragedy of major proportions had indeed occurred. As a result of the Army's 5-month official investigation, American boys are going to be brought to court-martial on charges of murder.

The point is not, as some have charged, that we are committing genocide in Vietnam. Rather, it is that we have no exemption from morality in war. Americans, under the battle stress and severe emotional strain of war, can react in the same way as men from other countries, when faced with the same situation.

Similarly, it would be a tragedy for us to claim a moral exemption—either through fear or arrogance—from other problems facing our country today. Some people have charged that genocide is being committed in action against the Black Panther movement in the United States. I, for one, do not believe that these charges have merit. However, it is not for me to stand here and pass on the judicial aspects of this situation. That is the function of a court of law.

And that is my point: The situation involving the Black Panthers should not and must not be used as an excuse for refusing to ratify the Genocide Convention. If we oppose this treaty out of fear, then our action lends credence to the charges of genocide. If we refuse to ratify because we claim a moral exemption from genocide, then we have not paid heed to the lessons of Songmy.

Let us resolve to face up to the problems of our country, and not use them as excuses for opposition to this treaty. If there is genocide in this Nation, and it is shown to be the case, then we cannot and must not run away from the causes of the charges.

Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention would be a symbol to the rest of the world, and more importantly to ourselves, that the United States is not afraid to face up to the problems that have brought about these charges. It would be a step toward moral leadership, and a recognition of the fact that we have no special claim on morality, no moral exemption. It would be a rededication of our efforts to protect the human rights of people in our country and throughout the world.

Let us make the Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention an exemplary exercise in American moral leadership. Refusal to ratify would only be a retreat from the battle for human rights.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEBATE ON FOREIGN POLICY CONTINUES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in light of growing problems and tensions around the globe, the need for responsible and

constructive debate on our foreign policy continues.

Vietnam remains as frightening and as far from solution as ever. Laos and Cambodia threaten to widen the war throughout all of what used to be Indochina.

New directions are needed with respect to aid, trade, foreign troops levels, and a score of other foreign-policy matters.

The Democratic Policy Council has contributed to this discussion through a report prepared by Hon. Averell Harriman.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, DEMOCRATIC POLICY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, March 14.—On February 18, President Nixon submitted to the Congress "a first annual report on U.S. foreign policy"—a "State of the World" message. It is difficult to find in its 43,000 words much that adds to congressional or public understanding of the complex international issues we face. As a document that purports to be "a new approach to foreign policy," it lacks substance and candor in laying out the many serious issues the country faces, and it fails to offer a creative program of action to deal with them.

During his campaign, President Nixon declared he had a "plan for peace." Today American boys are still fighting and dying in Vietnam, and now after a year of heavy staff work the Nixon Administration has revealed its "New Strategy for Peace": "Peace requires partnership . . . ; peace requires strength . . . ; peace requires a willingness to negotiate . . . ; peace, we have learned, cannot be gained by good will alone . . . ; peace does not come simply with statesmen's smiles." These are singularly empty phrases when compared to other statements such as President Kennedy's analysis of peace at American University in June of 1963.

The report is filled with unstinting self-praise for all kinds of "firsts," "new" departures and "innovations":

The Nixon Administration proclaims an "era of negotiations," disregarding the fact that there has been no shortage of negotiations in recent years and that there have been significant agreements achieved, including the limited test ban treaty, the outlawing of atomic weapons in outer space and nuclear non-proliferation.

Two decades after the Marshall Plan made "self-help and mutual assistance" the guiding principle, the Nixon Administration discovers "self-help" to be an essential ingredient in economic development.

A decade after President Kennedy initiated the "Alliance for Progress" we are told that the Nixon Administration is the first to decide that "partnership" should be the basis of our relations with Latin America.

More importantly, this simplistic sermonizing is accompanied by bureaucratic congestion. What is missing is an understanding that far more important than the procedures of decision-making are the decisions themselves and people who make them. A few good appointments are worth a score of committees. One wise decision is worth more than a stack of studies.

For page after page the report describes the "new" machinery which the Nixon Administration has created to handle foreign affairs: layer upon layer of "planning," "systematic review," "analysis," and "study of options"; committees within committees; panels within panels; groups within groups. What emerges is this picture: an Adminis-

tration that has confused system with substance, that has substituted institutionalized mechanics for creative action.

After dismantling the Alliance for Progress, President Nixon's phrase-makers offer "action for progress." It is clear, however, that the pious preachment of "partnership" mask a "benign neglect" for the growing crisis of democracy and development in our Hemisphere.

As to Europe and NATO the report adds rhetoric in describing a "mature partnership" but no new substance to policies long established.

To Africa the Administration offers more generalities: "Our assistance throughout the continent will be flexible and imaginative,"—without describing the actions to be taken. The message states "the hard facts must be faced." Yet, the commendable step of closing our consulate in Southern Rhodesia, the Administration delayed for more than eight months after the British urged this action be taken.

Regarding Asia, the report implies that the region's peoples shall henceforth make do with their own "wide range of energy and genius." But the claims of new constraints on our involvement in Asia are hard to square with the Vice President's scatter-shot of promises to Asian leaders he met on his trip. However, we commend the initial steps taken toward improved relations with Communist China.

We agree with the President that, "Good U.S. economic policy is good U.S. foreign policy." Unfortunately, stumbling domestic economic mismanagement and our unfolding recession will have harmful repercussions abroad, especially among the developing nations.

Foreign aid was originally launched with wide bi-partisan cooperation, and we feel strongly that it should be continued on that basis. The recent recommendations of the President's Task Force for a new approach on international development give an opportunity for renewed bi-partisan cooperation for an effective program. The emphasis on increased support for the World Bank and the regional development institutions should be particularly welcomed. The proposals for multi-year funding are also sensible. However, careful examination should be given to those administrative proposals which divide responsibility for development among several high-level bodies for what is, in fact, one overall problem.

With regard to East-West relations, the message is one of hobbled gradualism on all fronts:

The S.A.L.T. negotiations—Despite the report's acknowledgement that these are the "most important arms control negotiations this country has ever entered," the Nixon Administration shows none of the urgency demanded by the rapid and deadly developments in the continuing arms race. A leisurely "building block" approach, which seeks to preserve all options while we move in measured steps toward "comprehensive assessments," ignores the mounting pressures on both sides for the deployment of weapons whose complexity gravely complicates the prospects for rational verifiable control.

In this connection the Administration's recent announcement of the decision to deploy MIRVs in June is deeply disturbing. This decision invites reciprocal escalation instead of mutual restraint in the nuclear arms race. It will make it far more difficult to reach a meaningful agreement on S.A.L.T.

A.B.M. System—The report tells us that the National Security apparatus "analyzed our options for proceeding with ballistic defenses on four separate occasions." But this fact of repeated consideration does not excuse the conclusion that we should build a costly system which neither offers security against

a Soviet attack nor is needed to deter other nuclear threats.

Chemical and Biological Warfare—We support the President's initiatives in these fields, including the elimination of biological-toxin weapons and his submission to the Senate for action on the ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical and biological weapons.

Improved relations between East and West in Europe—The matter is shunted aside with some cautionary phrases about the complexities and dangers of negotiations.

East-West Trade—The Administration does not seem to regard expanded trade in non-strategic goods as a commercially profitable step toward better relations. Rather the report suggests that the Soviets must pay with political concessions for the right to buy from us such products already obtainable in large quantities from Western Europe and Japan. This is not merely fruitless but counter-productive.

Laos—It is a measure of the message's comprehensiveness and candor that Laos was not mentioned and that less than three weeks later the Administration has had to make detailed statements on this critical problem.

The Vietnam War—What might have been the vehicle for constructive initiative for negotiated settlement reveals nothing new. The report refers to the Administration's desire for a "just peace"—without attempting to define that term in any meaningful fashion. It tells us again that the Nixon Administration is placing its reliance on Vietnamization of the war as a "plan for peace" whereas this program at best can only perpetuate the fighting with continued U.S. involvement. It fails to provide either a program or a final date for the withdrawal of all American troops in Vietnam.

It continues to give a veto over U.S. efforts for a negotiated settlement to the repressive minority government of President Thieu. That Government shares neither our objective of a negotiated compromise settlement nor the deepest desires of its own people for peace. In fact, the recent arrest and conviction of Deputy Tran Ngoc Chau—in flagrant disregard of constitutional safeguards and judicial procedures—is another shocking instance of the pressure to silence all South Vietnamese who want peace through a negotiated settlement.

These views on Vietnam are not partisan ones. They are shared in major respects by many responsible people of both parties.

The "State of the World" paper is more notable for what it fails to say than what it says. Apparently, the Administration is content to substitute rhetoric and bureaucracy for effective and enlightened initiative in foreign affairs.

THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) spoke on March 14 at Western Michigan University on a subject of particular concern to me: the total environment.

He warned that we must do more than clean our air and water. We must develop a reverence for our fellow man as well as for nature or we shall have a "dangerously polluted environment," he told the environmental teach-in at that campus.

His words demanding that environment—in its fullest meaning—be the national priority deserve our attention. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the remarks

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART

We meet today to pay homage to the latest in-thing, and to express the hope, at least on my part, that concern for man's inhumanity to nature will not only outlast the life span of its predecessors, but also grow to include other types of pollution which degrade our environment.

Remember the 1960's, when the in-things were civil rights, the war on poverty, and, for one fleeting moment, hunger in a land of plenty?

Those were in-things concerned with pollution too—the pollution of the spirit which poverty breeds, the pollution of the mind which results from malnutrition, the pollution of self-respect which is the end product of discrimination.

We don't hear so much about those wars any more. You might, if you were a stranger to our ways, think that the relative silence signifies victory.

But the truth, of course, is that we have pulled a switch on the saying which holds, "There is no substitute for victory."

There have been no victories, only substitutes of one war for another, a switching of in-things to keep the natives occupied, if not happy.

That is not to say the much described crisis facing nature is not real, but rather to warn that there can be no lasting victory for a better environment unless we rid society of all types of pollution.

To clean the air but not to feed children, to build waste treatment plants but not to eradicate poverty, to develop a new reverence for nature but not for our fellow man will still leave us with a dangerously polluted environment.

An Indian youth said it better. He was asked what part of Indian culture he would most like to see preserved in modern life.

He answered:

"The part of Indian culture I would like to see restored is the respect for natural resources . . . an appreciation of the sky, winds and water.

"It's an appreciation of your surroundings and the people in it.

"The most important thing is your belief in those surroundings and not using them indiscriminately, especially people. It's a good thing to think and not just follow the crowd."

Use neither people nor nature indiscriminately. That says it all. If we have too long been content to measure progress for blacks in terms of the number of lunch counters opened to them, the number of school rooms integrated, we have too long measured national progress solely in terms of gross national product numbers, ignoring the damage those numbers have done to nature.

If we have been slow to see that progress for blacks can only be measured as it can be for any man—in terms of respect and self-esteem—we have been even slower in recognizing that we are also a brother to and a part of nature.

We are learning that just as respect for a man depends on approaching him as an individual, so too must we give individual attention to problems affecting nature.

Traditionally Congressional response to environmental problems has been to set minimum standards to define pollution and then to provide only limited means to enforce those standards.

Even if additional means of enforcement were supplied, over-reliance on this approach raises several difficulties.

There are matters of environmental importance—such as minimums for odors, deleterious effects on wildlife, esthetics—that cannot be quantified into standards.