

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 9

MAY 5, 1969, TO MAY 14, 1969

(PAGES 11209 TO 12644)

microbiological methods of warfare will continue and intensify indefinitely.

The United Kingdom Delegation therefore propose the early conclusion of a new Convention for the Prohibition of Microbiological Methods of Warfare, which would supplement but not supersede the 1925 Geneva Protocol. This Convention would proscribe the use for hostile purposes of microbiological agents causing death or disease by infection in man, other animals, or crops. Under it states would:

(i) declare their belief that the use of microbiological methods of warfare of any kind and in any circumstances should be treated as contrary to international law and a crime against humanity;

(ii) undertake never to engage in such methods of warfare themselves in any circumstances.

5. The Convention should also include a ban on the production of microbiological agents which was so worded as to take account of the fact that most of the microbiological agents that could be used in hostilities are also needed for peaceful purposes. Thus the ban might be on the production of microbiological agents on a scale which had no independent peaceful justification. Alternatively, the Convention might ban the production of microbiological agents for hostile purposes, or it might ban their production in quantities that would be incompatible with the obligation never to engage in microbiological methods of warfare in any circumstances.

6. Whatever the formulation might be, the ban would also need to cover ancillary equipment specifically designed to facilitate the use of microbiological agents in hostilities. In addition, the Convention would of course need to include an undertaking to destroy, within a short period after the Convention comes into force, any stocks of such microbiological agents or ancillary equipment which are already in the possession of the parties.

7. The Convention would also need to deal with research work. It should impose a ban on research work aimed at production of the kind prohibited above, as regards both microbiological agents and ancillary equipment. It should also provide for the appropriate civil medical or health authorities to have access to all research work which might give rise to allegations that the obligations imposed by the Convention were not being fulfilled. Such research work should be open to international investigation if so required and should also be open to public scrutiny to the maximum extent compatible with national security and the protection of industrial and commercial processes.

8. In the knowledge that strict processes of verification are not possible, it is suggested that consideration might be given *inter alia* to the possibility that a competent body of experts, established under the auspices of the United Nations, might investigate allegations made by a party to the Convention which appeared to establish a *prima facie* case that another party had acted in breach of the obligations established in the Convention. The Convention would contain a provision by which parties would undertake to co-operate fully in any investigation and any failure to comply with this or any of the other obligations imposed by the Convention would be reported to the Security Council.

9. As regards entry into force of the Convention, the appropriate international body might be invited to draw up a list of states (say 10-12) that it considers most advanced in microbiological research work. The Convention might come into force when ratified by all those states and a suitably large number of other states.

10. Consideration should be given to the possibility of including in the Convention an article under which the parties would undertake to support appropriate action in accord-

ance with the United Nations Charter to counter the use, or threatened use, of microbiological methods of warfare. If such an article were included it might be endorsed by the Security Council in rather the same way as the Council welcomed and endorsed the declarations made by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom in connection with the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

THE 178TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, May 3 marked the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, one of the guiding lights of European democracy. That constitution encompasses many of the principles of a free society that we in the West hold true today: the sovereign power and will of the people, the rule of law, and the protection of the individual from the smothering influence of an all-powerful state.

How tragic it is that this nation should now be the subject of those evils against which it asserted itself at such an early date.

Yet despite the history of oppression and inhumanity that has troubled the country, Poland has been able to make a real contribution to the cultural development of Europe. We are indebted to Poland for Copernicus, Marie Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, and many others, such as the courageous Kościuszko, the heroic Masaryk, and the Jewish heroes of the Warsaw ghetto.

The people of Poland have acquitted themselves on many historic occasions with the honor and courage that is so characteristic of a freedom-loving people in the many historical misfortunes they have had to bear.

America owes a great deal to Poland for the sturdy citizens it has sent to our shores. As a measure of appreciation I join in saluting the glories of Poland's past, and in looking forward to a hopeful future of greater understanding and cooperation between our two nations.

A NEW MEXICAN-AMERICAN MILITANCY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Homer Bigart is the New York Times reporter who just last month wrote an award-deserving series of articles on hunger in America. Some of the articles were directly related to the hunger and malnutrition suffered by migrant farmworkers, a substantial number of whom are Mexican-Americans.

It seems quite natural, therefore, that Mr. Bigart followed up his series on hunger with a long article on Mexican-Americans, "a distinctive minority, separated from the dominant culture by a great gulf of poverty and differences in language and culture." In his article, Mr. Bigart describes his travels throughout the Southwest and West and reaches a conclusion that—

Too few of us have yet come to grips with the (Mexican-Americans) all have a common complaint: they say all the Anglos treat Chicanos as a conquered people by suppressing their Spanish language in the schools and discriminating against them in jobs, housing, and unions.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I am particularly aware of Mr. Bigart's finding:

The worst off Chicanos are the farmworkers.

As stated by the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, the local Texas Roman Catholic Archbishop, migrant farmworkers live "in the awful reality of serfdom."

The significance of the New York Times article is in the vivid description of the reality of a new militancy to which Mexican-Americans are being forced to turn. Will the Nation ever learn that if we do not awaken to this reality we are going to face the same turmoil in the brown community that was experienced in the black community?

Another social crisis is upon us, Mr. President. We must awaken to the reality. As a priest warned:

If there are no immediate changes in the political and economic status of the Mexican-American, then I definitely foresee that our youths will resort to violence to demand the dignity and respect they deserve as human beings and as American citizens.

I see the barrios already full of hate and self-destruction. I see an educational system doing psychological damage to the Mexican-American, creating a self-identity crisis by refusing to recognize his rich cultural heritage and by suppressing his language.

And therefore, to me, burning a building and rioting is less violent than what is happening to our youth under a school system that classes as "retarded and inferior" those with a language difficulty.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I hope to bring an understanding of this subtle yet powerful form of violence to the attention and conscience of the American people through hearings and investigation.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article written by Homer Bigart, and published in the New York Times of April 20, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1969]

A NEW MEXICAN-AMERICAN MILITANCY (By Homer Bigart)

LOS ANGELES.—Five million Mexican-Americans, the nation's second largest minority, are stirring with a new militancy. The ethnic stereotype that the Chicanos are too drowsy, too docile to carry a sustained fight against poverty and discrimination is bending under fresh assault.

The Chicano revolt against the Anglo Establishment is still in the planning stage, however. No national leader has arisen. La Causa, as the struggle for ethnic identity is called, has only a fragmented leadership of regional "spokesmen." No one really seems to want a chief, for as one young militant explained: "It's too easy to co-opt; buy off or assassinate a single leader."

The Mexican-Americans are a distinctive minority, separated from the dominant culture by a great gulf of poverty and differences in language and culture.

California, with two million, and Texas, with a million and a half, have the most Chicanos. New York probably has less than 10,000 and they are completely submerged by the massive Puerto Rican presence.

Some in New Mexico claim descent from Spanish explorers. Others say they were derived from the ancient Aztecs, and stress their Indianness. But the vast majority describe themselves as mestizos, people of mixed Spanish and Indian blood.

They all have a common complaint: they say the Anglos treat Chicanos as a conquered people by suppressing their Spanish language in the schools and discriminating against them in jobs, housing and income.

Consigned in the main to menial jobs, they earn a little more money than the Negro, but because their families are larger, the per capita income is generally lower: \$1,380 for Mexican-Americans, against \$1,437 for non-whites in the Los Angeles area.

The worst-off Chicanos are the farm workers. Testifying last December before the Civil Rights Commission in San Antonio, the local Roman Catholic Archbishop, the Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey observed that migrant farm workers lived "in the awful reality of serfdom."

Like other ethnic groups, the Chicanos are drawn to cities. The crowded urban barrios are usually adjacent to the Negro ghettos, and the rising ferment among Mexican-Americans has been stimulated in part by the Negro civil rights movement.

There are varying degrees of Chicano militancy:

In the Spanish-speaking ghetto of East Los Angeles, barrio toughs boast of grenades and other explosives cached for the day of revolt against the gringo.

In Denver, Rodolfo (Corky) Gonzales plans a massive nation-wide school walkout by Chicano students on Sept. 16, Mexico's Independence Day. Corky, a former prize fighter, claims total victory in last month's strike at a high school in the west side barrio, a strike marred by violence in which, Corky says, a dozen police cars were disabled.

QUIXOTIC COURTHOUSE RAIDER

In New Mexico, Reles Lopez Tijerina, the quixotic former evangelist who raided a courthouse two years ago to make a "citizen's arrest" of a district attorney, takes a visitor on a tour of a "pueblo libre," a proposed free city-state in the wilderness where Chicanos will control their own destiny.

Unfortunately, 90 per cent of the pueblo is national forest. This does not bother Tijerina's followers. They claim the land under Spanish royal grants made prior to American sovereignty. They have chopped down the boundary markers and other signs of gringo occupation.

They have even held a mock trial for a couple of forest rangers who fell into their hands. Tijerina himself is under a two-year Federal sentence for aiding and abetting an assault on a ranger. His conviction is under appeal.

Tijerina, who has been alternately snoozing and crunching sunflower seeds in the back seat while his lawyer, Bill Higgs, takes the wheel, suddenly comes to life. At a high pass where the road cowers under skyscraper rocks, the leader shouts: "Here's our port of entry for the Free City of Abiquiu."

Straight ahead, gleaming in the sun, is the Abiquiu Reservoir of the Chama River and on either side, sloping gently to the mountains, are wide stretches of grazing land. The black tower of Flint Rock Mesa looks down on a bowl completely empty of cattle and men.

"To me, this is holy ground," cries Tijerina with some of his old Penecostal fervor. "Here we will build a city dedicated to justice. This is our Israel! And just like the Jews we are willing to die for our Israel, yes sir."

A DIVERSE PEOPLE

Mexican-Americans are as diverse as any other people. Cesar Chavez, the gentle, introspective, sad-eyed director of the California grape strike, is totally unlike either the fiery Tijerina or the somberly wrathful Corky Gonzales.

Mr. Chavez has been called the spiritual leader of the Chicano moderates. His tiny bedroom at Delano, Calif., where he spends most of his time (he is afflicted with muscular spasms) is adorned with photos of his heroes—Ghandi, Martin Luther King, both

apostles of nonviolence—and of his political mentor, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

His belief in nonviolence seems unshakable. He told a visitor: "Those of us who have seen violence never want to see it again. I knew how it tears people apart. And in the end we lose.

"I am not saying we should lay down and die. I think I'm as radical as anyone. But I think we can force meaningful change without the short cut of violence."

The strength of the militants is impossible to gauge. Tijerina contends he has 35,000 members in his Alianza; Corky Gonzales says he can muster 2,500 for a demonstration in Denver. Barrio militants in Los Angeles say they have "gone underground" and refuse to discuss strength.

"Our people are still frightened, but they are moving," commented Mr. Chavez, who said he had no wish to become a national leader. "I'm at most a leader of our union, and that union is very small," he said.

Three years ago, the Mexican-American community had no staff-funded organization except Mr. Chavez's organizing committee. Today there are several, including the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (which resembles the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.) and the Southwest Conference of La Raza (The People), both of which are supported by the Ford Foundation.

The grape strike is now in its fourth year. The main issue is no longer money. Most of the table grape growers against which the strike is directed have raised wages. The main issue now is recognition of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, and Mr. Chavez says he expects a long tough fight before that is achieved.

STRIKE EXTENDED

This week Mr. Chavez extended the strike to the Coachella Valley of Southern California. The strikers expect even more trouble in organizing the workers there than in the San Joaquin Valley, for the Coachella vineyards are only 90 miles from the border and a plentiful supply of strike breakers can be recruited from the hordes of "green carders" who pour across the frontier each day in search of work.

These green carders, so-called from the color of identification cards, are aliens who are allowed to commute to jobs in this country. They are a constant source of cheap labor, undermining wage scales in the border region and frustrating union attempts to organize not only the farms but also the new industries that are settling in dozens of frontier towns from Brownsville, Tex., to San Diego.

Chicanos are demanding a tightening of the immigration laws. They would curb the commuting by requiring the green carders to reside in the United States. Then, confronted by higher living costs on this side of the border, the Mexicans would no longer be willing to work at depressed wages and might be more receptive to joining a union, the Chicanos believe.

The grievances of the Mexican-Americans, most of whom live in California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and Colorado, with sizable colonies in the Middle West (founded in the last century by construction gangs for the Santa Fe Railroad) sound familiar: job discrimination, miserable housing, social isolation, lack of political power (the result of gerrymandering the urban barrios) and exposure to a school system completely insensitive to Mexican-American history and cultures.

In only one respect is the Mexican-American better off than the Negro. Provided he is not too swarthy and provided he has money, the Chicano can escape from the barrio and move into Anglo middle-class districts.

He is worse off in other respects. Of all the minorities, only the American Indian

makes less money than the Chicano. A linguistic and cultural gap separates the Mexican-American from the Anglo. Proud of his ancient Spanish-Indian heritage, the Chicano is less eager for assimilation than the Negro.

MOST SPEAK LITTLE ENGLISH

Most Chicano children speak only a few words of English when they enter school. It can be a traumatic experience, especially in districts where Chicano pupils are spanked if they are overheard using Spanish in the halls on the playground.

Recalling his first encounter with the strange and threatening atmosphere of an Anglo public school, Arnulfo Guerra, now a successful lawyer in Starr County, Tex., said that when a Chicano wanted to go to the toilet he had to wave his hand and try to say: "May I be excused?" Mr. Guerra said with a laugh that for a long time he believed that "bisquez" (be excused) was the Anglo word for toilet.

Children caught speaking Spanish were sometimes humiliated, he said, by having to stand with their nose pressed against the blackboard inside of a circle of chalk. If overheard on the playground, they were made to kneel and ask forgiveness.

Besides being confronted with an alien language, the Chicano pupil finds that the attitudes, social relationships and objects depicted in his lessons are entirely outside his home experience. He is constantly admonished that if he wants to be an American, he must not only speak American but think American as well.

Their school dropout rate (34 per cent for Chicano children enrolled in grades 7-12 in Texas) is the highest for any minority group.

In San Antonio, which has the second largest Mexican-American colony (about 350,000, Los Angeles is first with about one million), a hearing conducted last December by United States Civil Rights Commissioner J. Richard Avena disclosed subtle forms of discrimination.

School officials admitted, according to Mr. Avena, that junior high school counselors tended to steer Chicanos into predominantly Mexican-American vocational high schools. This betrayed the counselors' ethnic stereotype of the Chicano as an individual inherently equipped only for vocational training and unsuited for the Anglo college preparatory schools, he said.

SCHOOLS ARE ASSAILED

The school system is a prime target of Chicano wrath. "Cultural rape" is a term frequently used by Mexican-Americans to describe what they call the system's attempt to make little Anglos out of their children.

School strikes and boycotts in the Southwest are becoming an almost daily occurrence. In Texas, Chicano pressure has obliged the school districts of San Antonio, Austin, El Paso and Edcouch-Elsa (adjacent towns in the lower Rio Grande Valley) to stop the punishment of children using Spanish in schools or playgrounds.

In Denver a few weeks ago, Corky Gonzales made the school board suspend a teacher accused of "racist" remarks.

The teacher denied having called a Chicano "stupid," denied having said: "If you eat Mexican food you'll look like a Mexican," and his denials were supported by some students who said he had been quoted out of context.

However, the school board seemed intimidated by the disorders that attended the walkout. Stones and bottles were thrown at police cars; a 26-year-old Mexican-American was struck by a charge of birdshot fired by a policeman; 16 others were injured, and more than 40 persons, including Corky, were arrested.

CONCESSIONS GRANTED

The board made a number of concessions: more emphasis on Mexican history and litera-

ture in west side barrio schools, a re-evaluation of the counseling programs (Corky charged that some counselors were urging Chicano youths to join the armed forces) and Mexican food in the cafeteria.

A grand jury returned no indictments on the Denver outbreak, although it found that "the inflammatory statements of Rodolfo (Corky) Gonzales at Lincoln Park bordered upon violations of the anarchy and seditious laws of the state." It exonerated the patrolman for shooting the demonstrator and praised the police for "remarkable self-restraint in the face of vile abuse and obscene taunts."

Corky Gonzales, 40 years old, father of eight children, was one of the top 10 featherweights from 1947 to 1955. A former Democratic district captain in the barrio, he gave up politics because, he said, "I was being used." Then he founded a militant organization, "Crusade for Justice."

On a recent warm April day, a visitor to Corky's headquarters, a former Baptist church in the decaying Capitol Hill district of Denver, was led upstairs to a barnlike room where four or five hairy, unkempt youths were watching the funeral of Dwight D. Eisenhower on television. They were offensive and rude.

"C'mon, stick him in the ground and get it over with," one of them said, and the others laughed.

ACCOMPANIED BY GUARD

Corky, when he arrived with a bodyguard, went directly to his office, a musty cluttered room that had been the minister's study. He was no longer a featherweight, but he still looked trim and tough. He had grown a bushy black mustache, and he wore a pendant symbol of his movement—a three dimensional head representing Spanish father, Indian mother and mestizo offspring, mounted on an Aztec calendar plaque.

"How can there be justice," he demanded bitterly, "if we don't have our people on the jury system and the draft boards?"

Denver Chicanos had lost faith in the political system, he said, because every Mexican-American who achieved office in the country was "absorbed into the Anglo Establishment and castrated by it."

Chicano schoolchildren were being perverted, he said, by "middle class aspirations," and the middle class was "dying and corrupt." He was against competitive society: "Success today in this country is learning how to cut throats."

Corky said he believed the best way to unify Mexican-Americans was through nationalism.

To foster Chicano nationalism Corky held a five-day conference in Denver at the end of March. About 1,000 youths from five southwestern states showed up, and they represented an ideological spectrum that included the New Left, Communists and Liberals.

COALITION IN DISPUTE

The convention nearly broke up on the issue of coalition with Negroes. Some barrio youths, resentful of Negro dominance in the civil rights movement, insisted on maintaining racial separateness.

Corky, who had quarreled with the black leadership of the Poor People's March on Washington a year ago, preached a modified ethnic nationalism, and he prevailed. Coalition with the blacks might be feasible later, he said, but meanwhile the Chicano must first achieve enough self-reliance to "do his thing alone."

As a first step toward liberating the Chicanos, Corky told the youths to go home and prepare a nationwide walkout of Mexican-American students on Sept. 16.

Down in Albuquerque, meanwhile, Corky's main rival for leadership of the Chicano youth, Tijerina, was plotting his own demonstration. It would be held on June 5, the sec-

ond anniversary of his shootout at the Rio Arriba County courthouse, an event as significant to Mexican-Americans, Tijerina believes, as the Boston Tea Party was to the gringos.

Inside this fortress Tijerina discussed the future. The June 5 anniversary would be peaceful, he said, unless the gringo interfered. Some new Chicano families would be settled in the free city-state of San Joaquin and there would be a barbecue.

"Are you in rebellion?" he was asked. "I don't know," he replied thoughtfully. "It's a matter of interpretation. The Government has raped our culture. So I think the Government is in revolt against the Constitution. It's our constitutional obligation to go on the cultural warpath to save our honor and identity. We demand that the Government cease the illegal occupation of our pueblos."

Tijerina said he had signed a treaty of mutual respect with the Hopi Indians, pledging mutual support against any aggressor.

SEPARATE STATE URGED

Another plan for territorial revision was being advanced in Texas by Dr. Hector P. Garcia, founder of the American GI Forum, an organization of moderate Mexican-Americans.

Dr. Garcia proposed that South Texas, which has a large Chicano concentration, be made a separate state. This would give the Mexican-Americans a chance to send one or two Senators and several Congressmen to Washington, he said, thereby easing the frustrations of political impotence.

The new Chicano militancy, with its cry of "Brown Power," can be heard even in Texas where Mexican-Americans have long complained of brutal suppression by the Texas Rangers and by the state and local police.

Last month more than 2,000 Chicanos paraded through the border town of Del Rio, ostensibly to protest Gov. Preston Smith's decision to shut down the local projects of VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, but also to cry out against discrimination.

Normally such demonstrations are small and sedate, the Chicanos parading behind a priest carrying the banner of the Virgin of Guadalupe.

But this time the priest and the Virgin were forced to yield the front of the line to militants of the Mexican-American youth Organization (MAYO), and they tacked a manifesto on the courthouse door warning that violence might erupt if demands for equality were not met.

Two years ago Tijerina and his band raided the courthouse in the northern New Mexico hamlet of Tierra Amarilla to "arrest" the district attorney for "violation of our civil rights."

He said that the district attorney, the sheriff, the state police and the forest rangers were all conspiring to deprive the Mexican-Americans of ancestral land, insisted that the Federal Government had wretched on a promise, contained in the protocol to the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (which ended the Mexican-American war in 1848) to honor some old Spanish and Mexican land grants.

ACQUITTED BY JURY

A jury acquitted Tijerina of kidnaping and other charges growing out of his bloodless coup.

Tijerina's headquarters are in a blue and white two-story abode building on a quiet Albuquerque street—quiet except when terrorists are trying to bomb the place. Tijerina, a hawk-faced man vibrant with nervous energy, said he suspected the Minutemen, a right-wing Anglo organization, of perpetrating three explosions, the last of which wrecked a dozen automobiles in the headquarters parking lot.

The leader of the Alliance of Free City-States has taken a few precautions. His apartment above the ground-floor meeting hall is

protected by a steel door, by 18-inch concrete walls and by a triple-layered steel and cement floor.

INDEPENDENT POLITICS

One of the founders of MAYO, Jose Angel Gutierrez, 22, said the organization's goals were the formation of political units independent of the Republican and Democratic parties ("only Mexicans can really represent Mexican interests") gaining control of schools, and the building of economic power through the weapon of boycott.

But the cause has had serious setbacks in the Rio Grande Valley. Attempts to organize farm labor have failed completely. Unemployment is high. And a powerful friend of the Chicanos, the Rev. Ed Krueger, was recently dismissed by the Texas Conference of Churches as its field representative in the lower valley.

Mr. Krueger said he had been under pressure from conference officials to "work with the Establishment instead of with the poor," and that his superiors were also displeased because he refused to withdraw a suit against the Texas Rangers, a suit alleging that the Rangers manhandled Mr. Krueger and his wife when they tried to photograph a farm strike in Starr County two years ago.

The dismissal of Mr. Krueger was investigated by a panel headed by Dr. Alfonso Rodriguez, in charge of the Hispanic-American ministry of the National Council of Churches. The panel reported "tragic conditions of alienation, polarization, conflict and tension" in the valley, adding that the tension had been aggravated by Mr. Krueger's dismissal.

Further west, El Paso and Phoenix show scant signs of Chicano militancy, despite their teeming barrios. In El Paso, where thousands of Mexican-Americans still live in squalid, rat-infested, barrack-like "presidios," some of which have only one out-house for 20 families, about the only recent demonstrations have been peaceful "prayer-ins" on the lawn of a slumlord's agent.

In Phoenix a Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. Miguel Barragan, field representative of the Southwest Conference of La Raza, said it was difficult to involve the older Chicanos because they were prejudiced against political solutions, recalling the turmoil in Mexico. And the newer migrants feared police harassment and loss of jobs.

Yet the priest warned:

"If there are no immediate changes in the Southwest, no visible improvement in the political and economic status of the Mexican-American, then I definitely foresee that our youths will resort to violence to demand the dignity and respect they deserve as human beings and as American citizens.

"I see the barrios already full of hate and self-destruction. I see an educational system doing psychological damage to the Mexican-American, creating a self-identity crisis by refusing to recognize his rich cultural heritage and by suppressing his language.

"And therefore, to me, burning a building and rioting is less violent than what is happening to our youth under a school system that classes as 'retarded and inferior' those with a language difficulty."

In California Mexican-American demands for larger enrollments of Chicanos at the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses of the University of California were receiving sympathetic attention. And Berkeley was planning a Department of Ethnic Studies in which Mexican history and culture would be taught.

But in East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights, these concessions were taken as insignificant crumbs.

Basically, people are tired of talking, said a youth in the Boyle Heights barrio. "A confrontation is inevitable. It's not unusual to see people going around with grenades and TNT. The tension is here; the weapons are

here. The new underground organizations of excon, addicts and dropouts make the Brown Berets look like Boy Scouts."

Across town, on the U.C.L.A. campus, a neutral observer gave a pessimistic but somewhat milder assessment. Prof. Leo Grebler, a German-born economist who directed a four-year study of Mexican-Americans for the Ford Foundation, a study soon to be published, recalled how Gunnar Myrdal in his classic study of the Negro in the United States had been over-optimistic about the nation's ability to cope with the racial crisis.

FORMER VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S REMARKS ON THE ABM

Mr. HART, Mr. President, former Vice President Humphrey is esteemed for his constructive and valiant efforts over a period of years in the disarmament field. He is a thoughtful and knowledgeable expert in this area.

Therefore, I believe it would be helpful to Senators and to the public generally to assemble in one place four major discussions of the ABM problem by the former Vice President. This material appeared in "ABM: Yes or No?" a publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, February 1969; in a speech made at the University of Minnesota, February 26, 1969; in remarks at the William C. Foster dinner in Washington, D.C., April 3, 1969; and in a guest editorial in the Saturday Review of April 5,

I ask unanimous consent that these documents with their thought-provoking comment on this major issue be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION: AN INTRODUCTION

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

America's determination to find ways of stabilizing the nuclear arms race will be severely tested in the coming days. President Nixon will be faced with a series of decisions that will irrevocably affect the security of this nation and the peace of the world. The U.S. Congress will review these decisions and a spirited exchange of opinions on Capitol Hill is guaranteed. We are, in short, on the verge of a great debate on nuclear arms control, a debate whose outcome could well determine the survival of this country, not to mention the life and death of millions of other persons around the globe.

Yet the American people are shamefully ill-informed on these matters. Decisions of far-reaching significance can be accomplished with only the slightest involvement of the informed and politically aware public. In a representative democracy this is unhealthy under any circumstances. When the survival of the planet may be involved, the situation becomes intolerable. That is why this paper is so important. It seeks to bring to the American people the facts on the most critical issue of nuclear arms control; should the United States build an antiballistic-missile defense system?

As President Nixon takes office he will find that the basic decisions on the strategic issues posed by ABM, far from being settled by the congressional authorization for a "thin" screen that lies on his desk, are yet to be made. He will receive, as we did in the Johnson Administration, directly conflicting testimony from his scientific advisers as to the capability of the proposed anti-missile defenses; and he will receive conflicting intelligence estimates as to the Russians' capability to penetrate our defenses, or shield

themselves against our nuclear missiles. He stands now at the point where he must modify or reverse the recommendation of his military advisers; rest with the admittedly inadequate "thin" ABM system for which the Army is already selecting sites; or make a commitment to a "heavy" system that will, by common agreement, usher in another fateful stage in the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union.

Throughout the Presidential campaign, I emphasized that the most important question facing the new President would be that of negotiating an agreement with the Soviet Union to limit the strategic arms competition. Despite the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and its dire consequences for East-West relations, both the United States and the Soviet Union continue to have a mutual interest in reaching such an agreement. The discussion over the ABM should be viewed in relation to this broader issue, but the ABM issue is however, the most immediate and potentially dangerous issue on the arms control agenda. Although the ABM issue was not discussed in detail in the Presidential campaign, I have always been skeptical in my own mind about the security value of deploying an ABM system. I share the reservations stated by Secretary McNamara when he announced the ABM deployment in 1967. At the same time, I understood the reasons why the President felt that preparations for a limited deployment might quicken the interest of the Soviet Union in meaningful negotiations on the strategic arms race, provided we place top priority on the urgent necessity of reaching an agreement on the ABM issue.

The ABM issue is not an easy one for the public to follow. It may be, as suggested by Dr. David R. Inglis, of Argonne National Laboratory, "the world's nuclear problems are too subtle for the average unconcerned citizen; the part most visible to him is the economic manna descending from the defense-industry heaven." The trouble with that complacent view is that there is no longer any such thing as an unconcerned citizen, whether he knows it or not.

There are a good many reasons why the ABM controversy, which has raged within the government for almost a decade now, has been hard to follow. Official secrecy has had something to do with it, but not much. Although sometimes delayed and distorted by security regulations, the essential facts on such large strategic questions always come to light and find their way into general circulation. The description of the development of American ABM policy quoted from a paper published by the British Institute of Strategic Studies in the preface to this paper is an example of the manner in which the information and estimates of the "intelligence community" are regularly publicized. Although a few details may be incorrect, or missing, the principal elements upon which the official policy-makers based their decisions are neatly laid out for all to see.

The record of the debate on ABM: Yes or No? which follows provides a valuable demonstration of how this kind of decision-making actually goes forward. As the reader will see, the participating scientists provide a hard core of factual analysis, usually reduced to numerical calculations suitable for a computer, and upon this base the strategists erect their structures of speculation and conjecture. It is, on the surface at least, comforting to come back to this solid collection of presumably measurable facts after a chilling exercise in what, in the nuclear era, has come to be called "thinking the unthinkable."

The very vocabulary of nuclear gamesmanship is uncomfortable for all but the most hardened practitioners. Neil Jacoby has noted that what economists ordinarily call "cost-benefit" analysis is changed to "cost-effec-

tiveness" analysis in Pentagon parlance, "probably because it puts language under serious strain to refer to the death of a hundred million Russians or the destruction of a hundred billion dollars of Soviet capital as a benefit."

But one begins to suspect that this resort to the "facts" is not, as it appears, a return to reality but a retreat from it. Changing the vocabulary does not disguise the fact that the counters in the game are human lives, and the stake the fate of nations. Jerome Wiesner, who played it for years, calls it "the numbers game" and insists that it runs out of substance at the point at which it requires human judgment—as it always does.

Trying to explain to President Kennedy why scientists, who are supposed to be the most rational of people, could differ so on a technical issue, Wiesner pointed out that it is nature that is rational, not the scientists who try to explain natural processes: "Different people make different assumptions about all these elements. That is what is involved in the argument about anti-ballistic-missile systems. One man's assumptions give one set of conclusions; another man's assumptions give a different set. Some of the assumptions are essentially undefinable. We are talking about things we do not and cannot know anything about no matter how we try. And so you can take whichever set of assumptions you choose."

Yet much of our most critical defense policy is being made on the basis of these numbers. And even so experienced a Washington hand as Dr. Jacoby, turning a skeptical economist's eye on the decision to put five billion dollars in the thin Sentinel ABM system, has looked at the cost-analysis considerations involved and accepted the result because "presumably the Pentagon has plugged figures into the equations, run the calculations, and reached an affirmative conclusion."

We are living in an environment significantly affected by what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex and its principal off-spring, the mammoth research and development budgets which sustain the defense establishment in the nuclear and missile age. R & D is a catalyst; by its nature it leads to far greater investment in production of the goods and systems it makes possible. Thus every dollar spent on R & D has produced an expenditure of at least five dollars in military procurement alone. This diversion of funds into the military-industrial complex is widely recognized. What often escapes notice is the massive diversion of manpower away from the civilian economy into the defense establishment. There inevitably arises among many of these talented individuals a disposition to justify defense expenditures, rather than to think in terms of national limitations on the production and dissemination of arms.

The principal points at issue in the ABM controversy are able set forth in the following discussion. Here, as in the inner circles in Washington, they are advanced by men of great intellectual capacity and high moral purpose. In summary they are:

Challenge: The "heavy" ABM system will be the most complex technological system ever built by man, and there is no way to test it except under actual enemy attack. The odds are for at least a partial failure, and in this contest even a low percentage of missile penetration can be fatal.

Response: The military-industrial complex can meet the challenge and produce a system with a tolerable margin for error.

Challenge: Today's offensive missiles, probably their improved penetration aids, probably their improved ABM system as now could overcome the ABM system as now visualized, and the offensive improvement that its deployment is bound to stimulate certainly will render the system obsolete before it can be made operational.