

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 22

OCTOBER 18, 1967, TO OCTOBER 31, 1967

(PAGES 29209 TO 30688)

mitted against it—there'll be an uproar, there'll be a lot of 'I told you so.' But that won't prove anything."

There can be no doubting the enthusiasm here. In the officers club the talk is even more enthusiastic, if that is possible, than on the flight line.

"I'll tell you this," Sgt. Hennessee says, "I helped bring the F-4 into the Air Force in 1963, and I wouldn't want to go back."

There are six F-111s in Nellis, Nos. 26 thru 31. The others are elsewhere in the Air Force training and research system. The first five here were hand-built, and there were problems. For one thing, after 1450 miles per hour, they tended to surge and stall. There have been two stalls here, but Gen. Taylor points out, "We've had a worse stall in the F-105."

There were problems with brakes. Treetop speed levels are questionable.

"Surging and stalling have been licked," says George I. Davis of Ft. Worth, the General Dynamics representative here. "The thing now is to incorporate the changes into the production models."

Recent Congressional testimony was that treetop level speeds are one-third of that guaranteed.

"I'll be honest with you," Gen. Taylor grins. "I don't know that was guaranteed. But as a flier I'll say we are eminently satisfied with this bird's speed at all levels."

Col. Dethman flew No. 31 the 1047 miles from Ft. Worth to Las Vegas on automatic pilot—"I touched the controls on landing and takeoff."

"I never missed a turning point by more than a foot or a yard," he said. "It was unbelievable."

George Stonehouse, British Minister of Aviation and a former RAF pilot, flew an F-111.

"It's perfect," he said as he climbed out of the cockpit.

All the men flying the F-111 are Vietnam veterans, and many were skeptical at first.

"Ken Blank came in with a negative attitude," says Lt. Col. Bobby Mead, commanding the 4481st Fighter Squadron. "He's positive now."

Maj. Kenneth Blank, admits he was doubtful: "Who isn't when he's given a new toy to play with?" Maj. Blank was the first F-105 pilot to bag a MIG in North Vietnam.

"I like this bird," he says. "When I came back from over there, all I knew about it I'd read in the papers, and that wasn't good. It has the best avionics I've ever seen. I'm doing things with it I've never done before."

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, Oct. 12, 1967]

**HOT DEBATE CONTINUES: HAVE THE F-111'S CRITICS OVERSTATED THEIR CASE?**

(By Henry Keys)

WASHINGTON.—The F111A—the most hotly debated aircraft since the B52—becomes operational within a matter of days.

This achievement is unlikely, however, to cool down the fierce controversy that has raged throughout the five years it has taken to develop the highly unusual plane to combat-ready status.

Which is unfortunate, for when all's said and done, the F111A—Air Force version of the six-member F111 family—promises to be the most revolutionary and widely capable fighting flying machine ever built.

Witness the fact that Britain and Australia are so impressed with it they rushed to place orders, Britain for 60 and Australia for 24.

Yet there are those who still condemn the F111, like Chairman John L. McClellan, D-Ark., of the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee.

McClellan says the whole family of F111 planes is falling far short of expectations and costing more than twice as much as anti-

dated. "The prospects for the F111A are better than for the others," he adds, "but it is never going to be the plane they thought they were going to get."

#### CONDEMNNS NAVY VERSION

It is the Navy's version of the plane, the F111B, that has incurred the greatest congressional wrath.

"A dog," it has been called by Rep. William E. Minshall, R-Ohio, a member of the House subcommittee on defense appropriations.

To stand off and look back at the political infighting that has raged around the F111 program from its inception is to come to the conclusion that it is coming off the production line, ready for service, almost solely because of the dogged determination of one man—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. It is clear, too, that the row about it is due also to the actions of McNamara.

The dispute over the plane boiled over in Congress, in the Pentagon and in the aircraft industry. It was reminiscent of the explosive fight which erupted in the 1950's over the long-range B52 bomber.

The storm burst in 1962 when McNamara enraged Congress by (1) giving the go-ahead to develop the plane, (2) by the nature of ground rules he established for its design, and (3) by his decision to award the contract for its development and production to General Dynamics Corporation, of Fort Worth, Texas, when his own Defense Department experts unanimously said the contract should go to the Boeing Company.

He aroused inter-service ire particularly in the Navy, by insisting that the plane, then called the TFX or "tactical" fighter experimental, should serve both Air Force and the Navy.

#### ELIMINATE WASTE

The "commonality" thus achieved, he said, would result in a single weapon system capable of use by different services for different missions—would avoid the wastefulness of a multiplicity of weapons serving similar ends and result in an eventual saving of \$1 billion.

Congress and the services joined forces to go after McNamara's scalp. The "commonality" concept was not only impractical but nonsensical, the argument ran.

McClellan set out to prove this, and also that McNamara had been guilty of something unsavory in giving General Dynamics the contract over Boeing. He held committee hearings which amassed 3,000 pages of testimony and provoked McNamara to protest that the committee inquiry was impugning his integrity.

The committee never has produced a report or published any findings, but today, four years later, McClellan and others are still hot after McNamara on the issue.

Actually, though, developers have hit close to their "commonality" target. On design and construction of the "A" and "B", 80 percent of the aircraft components and 27 percent of the electronic gear components are identical.

#### BEHIND SCHEDULE

So far as the program is concerned, the critics have hit where it really hurts—the lagging development of the Navy's F111B.

Production of the first combat-ready F111B already is 2½ years behind schedule because of innumerable difficulties in developing the basic design to aircraft carrier requirements.

Unfortunately, the troubles with the "B" have obscured from the general public the dramatic progress made with the "A", and, indeed, the astonishing nature of both aircraft.

As Air Force Col. Alfred L. Esposito, assistant for F111 programs, says, "We are flying in areas where no one has ever flown before and no one else is even attempting to fly today."

Precise figures relating to speed, altitude and range are top secret. But it is known it is

a supersonic aircraft, with a top speed in the order of 2½ times the speed of sound, or in excess of 1,600 miles an hour. It will be able to fly without refueling to either Europe or Asia.

It can fly at treetop level, under enemy radar, at supersonic speeds, just as it can at altitudes in excess of 80,000 feet.

It is a superbly effective weapon, able to deal with enemy aircraft as effectively as it can place bombs and missiles on ground targets.

#### OEO AND THE RIOTS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, this summer witnessed a score of riots and disturbances in our cities. This was one of the most painful experiences this Nation has undergone. We saw American soldiers battle their fellow citizens and watched as our cities were turned into armed camps. This postriot autumn should be a time of reflection and contemplation, a time in which we attempt to devise programs and strategies to deal with the immediate and long-term causes of the riots.

However, there has been a tendency not to do this, but rather, to fall prey to the temptation to find a scapegoat for the riots. There are always those, who, in times of crisis, prefer to find a scapegoat rather than face the reality of the situation. To these people, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the scapegoat. This is a new agency, with new programs, and without a powerful constituency. It is therefore in a weak position and has been subject to much criticism. It is ironic that this agency, which is dedicated to dealing with the roots of the riots—poverty, ignorance, unemployment, and depravation—has been chosen by these people as a focal point for resting blame for the riots.

The July 31 issue of Barron's magazine contains an article entitled "Poverty Warriors" which catalogs most of the charges that have been made against the Office of Economic Opportunity with regard to the riots. Upon reading this article, I was most disturbed to see a publication of the caliber of Barron's report such a story. I immediately contacted the Office of Economic Opportunity for a report on the allegations made in this magazine. I have now received this report, and it notes that the charges made by Barron's are not substantiated when the facts are explained.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the Barron's article, my correspondence, and the report of the Office of Economic Opportunity be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is something terribly wrong with this country when a dedicated agency is singled out for abusive and false criticism, when the same agency is denied a pay raise because its policies are objectionable to some Members of Congress. Mr. President, I hope that this issue-by-issue refutation of the charges against the Office of Economic Opportunity will assist in clarifying the role of the agency and point up the work that it has done to prevent riots, not to cause them.

There being no objection, the material

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

[From Barron's, July 31, 1967]

**POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED**

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a \$50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top anti-poverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted \$700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smoldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by

experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war of poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive troublemaking potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from \$246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated \$500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harowitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

AUGUST 24, 1967.

Mr. GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,  
Assistant Director for Congressional Relations,  
Office of Economic Opportunity,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MCCARTHY: Enclosed you will find a copy of an article which appeared in Barron's magazine on the 31st of July this year. As you will note, this article is quite critical on the War on Poverty and alleges that OEO has subsidized the recent riots.

I would appreciate it if you could compile a report on the allegations made in this article and send to the attention of John Maguire of my staff.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
October 10, 1967.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter of August 24 with regard to the Barron's article of July 31, 1967. I am sorry for the delay in our reply.

Enclosed is a list of Barron's charges and the facts, which show the false presentation of this article concerning "OEO's connection with the riots."

If you should have any further questions please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. MCCARTHY,  
Assistant Director  
for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
Washington, D.C.

BARRON'S ARTICLE, JULY 31, 1967

The July 31st issue of Barron's, a financial weekly, carried an article attacking the Office of Economic Opportunity: "Poverty Warriors: The Riots are Subsidized as Well as Organized."

The article attempts to line those engaged in the task of fighting poverty with the riots that have appalled the Nation. No attempt is made to be objective or thorough in presentation. Instead, a collection of incidents and allegations are strung together to try to discredit the anti-poverty program.

The following is a list of charges made and the facts which are readily available to all.

**CHARGE**

The riots are subsidized. "Thanks to OEO, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction."

**ANSWER**

No riot is subsidized—by OEO or any other government agency. War on Poverty programs are squarely on the side of law and order. Instead of fomenting disorder, OEO workers are doing all they can to cool things down. Since the overwhelming majority of anti-poverty workers actually live in areas where disorders could, or did occur, the surprising fact is that so few were involved in disturbances.

OEO gathered statistics on 32 cities in which riots occurred this summer. Anti-poverty workers, i.e., employees of OEO-funded agencies, in these cities number 30,565. Only 16 of the 13,050 persons arrested in these 32 cities were paid anti-poverty workers. Only six of these were full-time staff mem-

bers, nine were summer employees, and one was a VISTA.

Most public officials, contrary to *Barron's* view, have lauded the poverty program for being an effective weapon *against* riots.

Hugh J. Addonizio, Mayor of Newark, said, right after his city's riots: "It is my position that anti-poverty programs have been helpful to my city, and that these programs need to be greatly expanded . . . I support the program and all it has done to bring hope to many . . ." Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta wined,

"Recreational funds and EOA CAP centers have contributed greatly to cooling off summer problems. CAP center and personnel provided quick communications facility for easing the explosive situation in the Dixie Hills disturbance."

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, Rhode Island, told a group of poverty workers: "As far as I am concerned there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys." Mayor Robert M. L. Johnson, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, said: "The Community Action Program here, . . . was in a great degree responsible for a calmness and sensibility throughout the Negro community some days ago when most of the white community panicked because of rumors of riot . . . as a result Cedar Rapids did not have any incidents despite the fact that for four days this community was blanketed with every conceivable rumor of race riot potential.

From the Chief of Police of Little Rock, Arkansas: ". . . we have detected a considerable decrease in the vandalism and destruction of property . . . in the poverty areas of our city . . . It is obvious to me that a good portion of this reduction can be attributed directly to the . . . various programs conducted under OEO."

And for one last example, Mayor Sorenson of Omaha wrote to Mr. Shriver: "As you are well aware, Omaha's 'long hot summer' has been kept 'cool' to date by programs we have initiated with your help."

#### CHARGE

The riots are organized. A Cleveland grand jury has found that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion."

#### ANSWER

No responsible person or organization has found that the riots are organized or planned subversion. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has testified that the FBI has found no evidence that the disorders were organized. The Cleveland grand jury heard a great many charges and allegations, but it refused to return a single indictment.

#### CHARGE

Marion Barry is a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Rufus Mayfield is a Black Muslim who has spent most of his last eight years in prison. Together they have found gainful employment working for UPO, the top anti-poverty agency in Washington. (The implication is that OEO hires subversives and dangerous criminals.)

#### ANSWER

The article identifies Marion Barry as a former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Mr. Barry never held such a post. He was former head of the Washington, D.C. branch of SNCC, and resigned sometime ago to devote more time to District affairs. As head of the Free D.C. Movement, Mr. Barry has taken an active role in efforts to bring Home Rule to the District, to increase jobs for minority groups, to oppose transit increase and to fight the blight and decay—both spiritual and physical—of Washington slums.

Because of Mr. Barry's demonstrated ability to effectively organize young people and

channel their energies in constructive channels, he has been employed by the United Planning Organization, the District's anti-poverty agency, to help this group in its work with young people. A national magazine recently said of Mr. Barry: "Barry, after breaking with his SNCC cohorts, is now the mastermind for youth programs in the anti-poverty division and is quietly showing intellectuals how to communicate."

While it is true that Rufus Mayfield has been in trouble with the law, he has been operating what is regarded nationally as an extremely successful anti-poverty effort, hiring more than 1,000 poverty-stricken youths for a neighborhood clean-up program in Washington, D.C. This program, fittingly named "PRIDE", has been so effective—as an example, it killed some 10,000 rats in less than three weeks—that even those who first expressed doubts about the feasibility of the project, are now counted among its warmest supporters. So successful has the project been that the Labor Department has refunded it on a year-round basis. One additional note—Mr. Mayfield is working for the Labor Department, not UPO.

#### CHARGE

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA) received \$700,000 from OEO despite the fact that it numbers among its principals such "subversives" as John Zippert and Shirley Mesher.

#### ANSWER

SWAFCA was granted \$400,000 by OEO, not \$700,000 as *Barron's* erroneously reports. Furthermore, neither Shirley Mesher nor John Zippert is a "principal" or even a member of the cooperative. SWAFCA, incidentally, is a coop project whose membership is composed primarily of poor Negro farmers, who are being provided help to raise their incomes through their own labors.

#### CHARGE

OEO has jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Two examples are John Ross, of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on the anti-poverty board in San Francisco; and Howard Harawitz, a former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, who serves on a similar anti-poverty board in Berkeley.

#### ANSWER

This is a classic example of brutal character assassination. First, neither of these men was on the "federal payroll." Board members serve on a volunteer basis—without pay.

Second, neither of the above organizations, despite the radical beliefs expressed by some of their members, is included on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Finally, OEO has strictly enforced rules and regulations covering the subject of subversives and character qualifications both for board members and for employees.

"Membership in subversive organizations or lack of sympathy with the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, are inconsistent with membership on the governing bodies and police advisory committees of community action agencies. Moreover, all members of such bodies and committees shall be persons of good character; recent conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude shall be considered strong evidence of failure to meet this standard."

Another memorandum, No. 23-A, covers the question of employees:

"Membership in the Communist Party or in any other organization whose objectives include the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence is inconsistent with employment in a community action program."

These memorandums clearly spell out OEO's policy on membership in subversive organizations and in the absence of any proof from *Barron's* that they are being violated, it can

only be assumed that the magazine is more interested in attacking the program, than it is in getting at the truth.

#### CHARGE

New York City's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, was investigated by federal and state officials which found several staff members who were also members of the Communist Party.

#### ANSWER

*Barron's* goes back to 1964 to attack New York's Mobilization for Youth project. The program is not, and never was a "pilot project for the Job Corps." Contrary to what the article says, investigation of the agency disclosed no members of the Communist Party.

#### CHARGE

LeRoi Jones "hate-the-whites" Black Arts Theatre got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-Act before police discovered an arsenal on the premises.

#### ANSWER

The Black Arts Theatre was funded without the knowledge or approval of OEO as part of Project Uplift in the summer of 1965. When it became evident that the theatre was not fulfilling a legitimate purpose, funds were cut off and it was shut down. Later, a private group took over the premises. Following a shooting incident, police did find a number of guns in the building, but there was no connection between this and the defunct anti-poverty project.

#### CHARGE

OEO fights riots with grants.

#### ANSWER

Absolutely untrue. Our purpose is to help people help themselves out of poverty. In a message of July 20 to all Community Action Program personnel, Mr. Shriver said: "Lest there be any misunderstanding about what OEO policy has been and continues to be, let me make it unmistakably clear once again. There will be absolute insistence that every OEO employee and every employee of an OEO grantee scrupulously avoid and resist participation by OEO-funded resources in any activities which threaten public order in any community. I shall insist upon immediate and full penalties for any individuals found guilty of wrong behavior in this connection. Furthermore, I shall insist upon the withholding of OEO funds from any grantee or delegate agency which is shown to be encouraging or tolerating such behavior."

#### CHARGE

"Several" arrests in Newark and five arrests in New York.

#### ANSWER

Only one of nearly 2,000 anti-poverty workers was arrested in Newark. He has not yet come to trial. There were three (not five) Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees, out of more than 30,000, arrested in New York. These enrollees are recipients, rather than workers, in the anti-poverty program. Since these recipients, as residents of slum areas, are among the group most exposed to the possibility of racial disturbances, the relatively small number arrested (.0017 of the enrollees in the cities surveyed) is a strong indication of the effectiveness of OEO programs in helping avoid disturbances. In most cases, including Newark and Detroit, NYC enrollees were highly praised by police chiefs for their role in helping control the riots.

### CRISIS IN LIBERALISM

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, *New Leader* magazine for October 23 contains a think piece which I am sure not all Members of this body, or of my party, will agree with. It is, controversial. It does raise possibilities that some may say