

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 19

JULY 21, 1970, TO JULY 29, 1970

(PAGES 25135 TO 26488)

arranged code or frequency on which to transmit.

With an increasing Allied offensive, more and more Americans were parachuting into our midst, along with a smattering of Russian, Italian, French, Canadian and British personnel. A pow-wow of ranking American officers decided an evacuation should be attempted. We decided our only chance was to risk a transmission in the clear and in the blind to 15th Air Force Headquarters at Bari, Italy.

"S.O.S. . . . S.O.S. . . . 150 American crew members in need of rescue . . . many sick and wounded . . . advise . . . S.O.S. . . ."

If ever received, the message sent repeatedly for two days was ignored.

With Mikhailovich persona non grata with Allied headquarters, we had to devise a code that would be believed. We came up with one, extremely complicated—and a bit absurd. But it worked.

It involved such things as the third letter in the hometown of the bartender at the Lecce Officers Club for use of the letter A; for B, the fourth letter in the name on the photograph on the Intelligence officer's desk at Brindisi. God knows how it was ever figured out.

All I know is that three days later, a reply came through: "Standby for aircraft 31 July 2200 hours . . ." just two days away.

The next day, cries of "Draja" rose up from our ranks. Heads turned toward a man approaching, surrounded by scores of laughing children. He went with us to a grazing meadow which could serve, if crudely, as a rescue airstrip. There, 1,000 of his troops put on a review in our honor.

Afterwards, we assembled under a huge tree and Mikhailovich, through an interpreter, spoke to us. He sat on a rock and discussed the state of the war with more than 100 bearded, shabbily dressed soldiers of a foreign country.

He stared into space as he related the Yugoslav's love of freedom to that of the American's. Then he expressed his disappointment that the Allied nations had abandoned him to favor Tito, a bitter irony of war which he saw as a deceitful power play by Stalin.

He was aware, he told us, of false reports Tito had broadcast about him. With moist eyes, he appealed to us "take back the truth to your homeland."

Quickly, then, he turned to the task at hand, getting us safely out of Yugoslavia. Within a day he would have more than 8,000 men surrounding the airstrip. If the enemy should discover the plan, his men could hold them off until all our planes were off the ground.

In parting, I insisted he accept my class ring, which he had previously admired. He took it and pressed upon me the ceremonial dagger he had so long carried at his side.

On Aug. 9, after much planning and many heartbreaking nights of waiting while rescuers tested and probed for a safe way to fly us out, evacuations began. It was a colossal success under the most trying circumstances.

In all, 243 Americans, plus an assortment of other Allied nationalities, were flown to Bari, Italy, in waves of C-47s with hordes of Mustang and Lightning fighter plane escorts.

The war in Europe ended in May, 1945.

On March 25, 1946, Tito announced Mikhailovich had been captured and would be tried as a "war collaborator."

Collaborate with the Nazis? Fantastic! I still have in my possession on a poster I ripped from a tree while traveling through Yugoslavia. It was one of many found all around the countryside and in the villages of Yugoslavia. It says, in part:

Reward—100,000 reichmarks in gold will be awarded to the person bringing in, dead or alive, the leader of the bandits, Draja Mik-

hallovich . . . By the Supreme Commander of the German troops.

I read anew of Tito's plans to try Mikhailovich as a war criminal and felt that someone had to take steps to clear his name, in behalf of the many Americans whose lives he helped to save and, indeed, in behalf of America itself whose engagement in war, I felt, was definitely shortened by the Chetniks' contributions to the frustration of the German war machine.

I went to every major newspaper plant in New York City, receiving dismissals sometimes curt, sometimes polite.

The Journal-American did not dismiss me. It told my story on page 1.

Immediately, letters of support poured in. Other airmen who had been saved by the forces of Mikhailovich volunteered their services. The Archbishop of the Serbian Orthodox Church in New York City wrote me: "It matters not whether Draja lives or dies . . . the important thing is to clear his name."

On April 3, I told my story over the National Broadcasting Company radio network. Soon afterwards, a few of my former buddies and I formed the Committee To Aid General Mikhailovich. In one week we received more than 300 deposits from airmen who had been with us in Yugoslavia.

On April 28, 1946, 20 of us, plus two Canadians, chartered a plane to Washington to plead not for blind amnesty for Mikhailovich but for a fair trial.

We specifically were not claiming to pass judgment on his guilt or innocence, a matter technically beyond our province; we merely wanted to offer the overwhelming evidence we had in his behalf to be presented at his trial.

The reception committee at the airport was impressive—a turnout of more than 2,000 people and a distinguished welcoming committee that included Senators Taft, LaFollette, Wiley, Revercomb and McClellan, along with Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth and Maj. Gen. E. L. Oliver, father of one of the rescued airmen.

The following day we swarmed over Capitol Hill and pleaded our cause to Senators and representatives. An eloquent plea on the floor of the House of Representatives was made by Mrs. Bolton, Congresswoman from Ohio, and is recorded in the May 1, 1946, edition of the Congressional Record.

Although our request to see President Harry Truman was not granted, our efforts were not without results. Shortly thereafter, the State Department sent an official note to the Government of Yugoslavia.

" . . . A number of these individuals (U.S. airmen) and others in the United States who were closely associated with General Mikhailovich possess firsthand evidence which cannot but have a bearing upon the charges of enemy collaboration which the Yugoslav authorities have indicated they will bring against General Mikhailovich.

"The United States Government, in these circumstances, is confident that in the interests of justice the Yugoslav Government will wish to make suitable arrangements whereby the evidence of any such persons who may so desire may be presented in the connection with the trial. . . ."

Public indignation was rising. A group of prominent Americans took up the cause, forming the Committee For A Fair Trial for Draja Mikhailovich. Among its members were Sumner Welles, Justice Ferdinand Pecora, William Phillip Simms, Dorothy Thompson, Clare Booth Luce, Norman Thomas, Justice Francis Rivers, Miriam Hopkins.

The list of signatories endorsing the cause included approximately two dozen governors and Congressmen. The executive chairman was Ray Brock, then New York Times foreign correspondent.

The State Department sent a second note to Yugoslavia. A reply came back this time. Stonoj Simitch, Yugoslavian foreign minister, advised that the second note and any subsequent notes "would be ignored." (At the time, Yugoslavia was receiving 90 per cent of her economic subsistence from the United States.)

The committee reacted quickly, forming a Commission Of Inquiry In The Case Of Draja Mikhailovich. To hold the inquiry, four of the most prominent jurists in America were appointed—Arthur Garfield Hayes, chairman; Adolph A. Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State; Charles Poletti, former lieutenant-governor of New York, and Theodore Klendl.

The Commission convened on May 17, 1946, at the County Lawyers Association Bldg., 14 Vesey St., New York. For a full week the Commission heard the evidence. Its full findings, together with almost 600 pages of testimony, were forwarded to the Government of Yugoslavia for presentation at the trial. The Commission's conclusion:

"We are convinced that the testimony given before us is material on the question of the guilt or innocence of General Mikhailovich as a war criminal and that under standards of justice which have been throughout the years, the exclusion of such testimony from the trial of the charges . . . would be so highly prejudicial as to prevent the possibility of his obtaining a fair trial."

An editorial in the New York Times, May 31, noted that the cause of a fair trial "probably is a lost cause . . . (the Tito government) intends to find (Mikhailovich) guilty of collaboration with the Germans and hang him or shoot him.

"This much has been done, however . . . a record has been made for history. That will be small solace for Mikhailovich as he goes to his death. But it will serve to mitigate, if it does not entirely clear, his memory."

On July 10, 1946, Mikhailovich went under trial as a war collaborator and traitor in a courtroom in Belgrade.

Just before sentence was pronounced, Mikhailovich, looking unutterably weary (and drugged, say some of his defenders), stood before the bench and stated his last public words:

"I wanted nothing for myself . . . I never wanted the old Yugoslavia, but I had a difficult legacy . . . I had against me a competitive organization, the Communist Party, which seeks its aims without compromise . . . I believed I was on the right road . . . But fate was merciless to me when it threw me into this maelstrom. I wanted much, I started much, but the gale of the world carried away me and my work."

On July 17, 1946, a Communist firing squad carried out the sentence of the court.

Is that, then, the end of Draja?

Maybe. Maybe not.

True, the wartime quid pro quo between Tito and Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill is still functioning.

But so is the Committee To Aid General Mikhailovich.

FARMWORKER POWERLESSNESS AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COVERAGE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, for those who have not yet weighed the import of the long series of hearings and investigations by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee on Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Powerlessness, perhaps an editorial in a recent Washington Post, July 8, 1970, may be helpful.

The editorial urges immediate House and Senate action on the conference report on H.R. 14705, the Unemployment

Security Amendments of 1970. The major thesis of the editorial is that action on the report is essential to meet the serious problem of unemployment because the bill authorizes additional benefits for the unemployed, and extends benefits to workers not heretofore covered. That report, as I have pointed out previously on the floor of the Senate, eliminates coverage of farmworkers from the bill although such coverage had been included by the Senate Finance Committee and confirmed on the floor by a 42 to 36 vote.

Since the filing of the report, I joined with the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) in informing the Senate that perhaps the conference report should be rejected in the hopes that the conference committee would reconsider its action in eliminating coverage for farmworkers.

The Post editorial suggests that insistence on farmworker coverage would endanger the entire measure, and that "the bill should not be allowed to fail for want of these amendments." No reason is given for why farmworkers are expendable. *Se la Vie!*

Mr. President, I shall not at this time belabor the plight and the poverty of this Nation's farmworkers, particularly those who travel throughout this country in search of work and who work to pick our abundance of food. Our hearings on powerlessness during this Congress have adequately described this situation; the television documentary scheduled for July 16, 1970, at 7:30 p.m. will no doubt shed more light on this problem; and, our subcommittee hearings on July 20 and 21 should further serve to enlighten those who do not understand the tragedies of the farmworker's life.

But I do want the RECORD clearly to show yet another example of how the farmworker is expendable in the minds of some, at least, and that meeting the problems of farmworkers is still not a priority item. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, the editorial from the Washington Post of July 8, 1970.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT: STILL A SERIOUS PROBLEM

If the decline in the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate from 5 per cent in May to 4.7 per cent in June should mark the beginning of a new trend, it would astonish the chart-watchers. Many economists have assumed that unemployment will reach 5½ per cent on the upward curve that has been in evidence in recent months before a turn for the better can be expected. Others who take a darker view of the general economic climate place the figure at 6 per cent or more. However powerful the hope that these forecasts will prove inaccurate, there is very little to cheer about in the Labor Department's June report.

One reason for the statistical decline was a reduction in the number of unemployed women and teen-agers. But since the labor force showed a shrinkage from 85 million in May to 84.1 million in June, the analysts assume that many women and youths have taken themselves out of the category of job-seekers because the outlook was so bleak. When unusual factors of this kind impinge

upon the samples taken by the Labor Department, the adjusted seasonal rate for any given month may convey a quite inaccurate impression.

Certainly there is nothing in the report which relieves the urgency of enacting legislation to extend job-training programs and improve unemployment compensation. The continued stalling of Congress on the unemployment compensation bill is especially curious because the House-Senate conference reached agreement two months ago. The bill is important because it would authorize additional benefits for the unemployed when joblessness has remained at a national level of 4.5 per cent for three consecutive months. It would also extend benefits to 4.8 million additional employees and to a possible 436,000 more state and local employees, if state and local governments should give their approval.

It is said that there is some dissatisfaction in the Senate because the conference committee eliminated two amendments, although one was a rider having no direct bearing on unemployment compensation. The other is an amendment bringing workers on large farms under the system. The bill should not be allowed to fail for want of these amendments. Incidentally, the high unemployment in this period of economic recession also enhances the need for enactment of the bill for protection of workers' rights under private pension and welfare plans, which has made very little progress in either house.

BRISTOL BAY OIL SLICK

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, last spring it was widely reported that an oil slick in Bristol Bay off the coast of Alaska was responsible for the deaths of 86,000 murre, seabirds. Implied in these reports was that oil companies had caused the oil slicks.

Subsequently, a joint investigation was conducted by the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to determine the cause of death of these birds.

The report of this investigation stated in part:

The evidence suggests that it (the deaths) was a catastrophe of nature—

And that the birds—

probably died from a combination of starvation and exhaustion which was aggravated by a severe storm that prevented them from feeding during a critical few days. . . . None of the murre examined along the beaches were oil-stained. . . . Gas chromatograph and infra-red scan testing revealed no evidence of petroleum products in any of the samples.

Mr. President, often an accusing finger is pointed at companies in the oil industry as the ones causing damage to wildlife through oil spills and leaks. Regrettably, a few accidental leaks have occurred and these leaks have caused ecological disruptions. The oil companies responsible for these leaks do not desire to avoid blame for such accidents when blame is due them.

But, at the same time, they should not receive the blame for calamities to our precious wildlife when the blame is undeserved.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the "Summary Report on Bristol Bay Murre Mortality," dated April 1970, be printed in the RECORD so that those companies which were blamed will be completely exonerated from any responsibility for the deaths of these birds.

There being no objection, the report

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

SUMMARY REPORT ON BRISTOL BAY MURRE MORTALITY, APRIL 1970

At least 86,000 common murre died in Bristol Bay, Alaska during a brief period in late April of this year. Although the cause of death may never be completely resolved to everyone's satisfaction, the evidence suggests that it was a catastrophe of nature. The murre, apparently still weakened after wintering in the Bering Sea, probably died from a combination of starvation and exhaustion which was aggravated by a severe storm that prevented them from feeding during a critical few days.

Post-mortem examinations of murre by pathologists from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife research centers in North Dakota and Maryland, the Arctic Health Research Center in Fairbanks, the National Disease Laboratory in Iowa, and the California Department of Fish and Game in Sacramento found no evidence that pathogenic bacteria or viruses contributed to the mass mortality. Foods were not found in the digestive tracts of these birds. Tests for presence of toxins in the small quantities of fluid found in the intestines were inconclusive.

All specimens were emaciated and had no appreciable deposits in subcutaneous, abdominal and cardiac fat tissue. Thirteen of the dead birds varied in weight from 570 to 786 grams. Although comparable weight data were not available for this same time of the year, the 688-gram average weight of these birds was considerably less than the 972-gram average weight for male common murre and 1022-gram average weight for female common murre from Cape Thompson in northwestern Alaska in late June. The weight loss, lack of body fat and some hemorrhaging of the intestines suggest that the birds died from starvation, although all factors that could contribute to starvation may never be completely resolved.

Severe winds and turbulent seas probably precipitated the die-off that was first reported on April 24 by Ken Manthey of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. During the two preceding days, winds reached peak velocities of 104 mph at Adak and 84 mph at Cold Bay, and winds gusted at lower velocities during this time at other reporting stations within the Aleutian Islands and along the Alaskan Peninsula. Three murre found on April 24 in the town of Cold Bay by residents were taken to the headquarters of the Izembek National Wildlife Range, but the incident seemed insignificant at the time because severe storms often blow pelagic birds inland.

"Wrecks of seabirds," occurrences where seabirds are driven far inland and are often found dead and dying along the beaches as a result of severe storms, have been reported frequently. Leslie M. Tuck, Canadian Wildlife Service biologist, summarized many observations of "wrecks of murre" in his monograph on their life history. Mass mortalities of thick-billed murre during stormy weather have been recorded over Anadyr in Siberia and at the Pribilof Islands, both in the Bering Sea. The most significant record of "wrecks of murre" is that of Beals and Longworth as reported for Unimak Island in 1941; they wrote:

"Between April 2 and 4 numerous dead and sick murre were along the beaches. We counted 37 dead birds along 3 miles of beach. The condition was general along the strait, we were told. Oldtimers on Unimak told us that this happens every spring and that some years the beach is black with dead birds. Swimming in close to the waterline many of them appeared to be sick or very weak and hardly able to dive in shallow water. Altogether we saw 38 dead birds and 40 or more very weak ones along 3 miles