

around, but Bob would stick to the form he was taught, even to the extent of losing a game."

Daniel V. Louchery, Clarksburg attorney and former State Republican chairman, recalled Bob as a serious boy, but added "we did all the things that growing boys do."

Louchery, who practiced law for 5 years with John Vance before the latter went to Rochester in 1960, was a classmate of John F. Kennedy at Choate.

Col. William E. Miller, lifelong friend of Bob Vance, remembers spending endless hours at the comfortable old Vance home. "We must have eaten a million gallons of peanut butter," he grinned, Miller, assistant adjutant general in the West Virginia National Guard, was instrumental in getting Vance to visit Camp Dawson, where he was post commandant, during last summer's special forces training exercise.

According to his mother, Bob Vance likes to wear plain combat fatigues during his visits to military installations. During last summer's giant Operation Big Lift to Germany, Vance startled a number of GI's when he approached them to chat in company with a group of top generals. "They thought he was a lowly private at first," an aide commented.

His working uniform, however, is usually an Ivy League-cut suit, preferably pinstriped, and he wears red ties, badly knotted. Because of his long work hours, he and his pretty blonde wife, Gay, do little entertaining at their magnificent Georgetown home, acquired from outgoing Navy Secretary John Connally, who resigned to run successfully for Governor of Texas. Connally presently is recuperating from wounds incurred during the November 22 assassination of President Kennedy.

The \$22,000-a-year Army Secretary and his wife try to avoid the Washington social swim, preferring to devote their rare hours at home with the children and puttering around in their garden.

An Episcopalian, Vance is a former vestryman in the Church of the Heavenly Rest, looks forward to Sunday services in Washington when time permits. "It's the only time our family is ever completely together," he remarked. His oldest daughter, Elsie, attends St. Timothy School at Baltimore, and the four younger children are enrolled at Potomac School.

A man of Spartan habits, probably inherited from his Welsh ancestors, Vance sips an occasional highball at social functions, and sparingly smokes cigars and cigarettes.

He is painfully reluctant to talk about himself, but he describes with obvious pride the things "we feel we have achieved in the past few years." A team thinker, Vance frequently lapses into the third person when describing his mission.

"We have improved our Army's combat readiness immeasurably in the past 3 years," he says. "Another major achievement has been the development of a strategy of flexible response . . . we are making good progress toward greater mobility involving air assault."

With the job always unfinished, what about his future? "I'll stay on the job as

long as the President wants me to," he answers humbly.

Eventually, however, he hopes to form his own private law firm.

"I feel every person who has had certain advantages should give some thought to public service," he observed. "I've always felt very strongly that all of us have an obligation . . . to me it is just as important to make a contribution at the local level as it is in State or Federal Government. We all have a duty to perform."

That is the man—Cyrus Robert Vance—who is our choice for "West Virginian of 1963."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS,
January 7, 1964.

HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CYRUS: Congratulations on your selection by the Sunday Gazette-Mail of Charleston as "West Virginian for 1963." The fully merited designation places your name on a select honor roll of distinguished natives and citizens of our State who have made vital and important contributions to the progress of West Virginia and the Nation. To have been so appropriately honored in West Virginia's centennial year is another distinction which justifies the commendation which I am privileged and pleased to extend.

May this new year give to you added achievement and a sense of constructive service as you carry forward the vital assignment in our Defense Department.

Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

The President's State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

MR. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed with President Johnson's State of the Union address. I feel that he has the strength of conviction and ideas. He is a man of action with a keen grasp of the Nation's problems. He possesses the leadership and the ability to deal with these problems at this crucial period in our history. I think the Nation is fortunate to have a man of his capacity and talents as its leader.

What specifically appeals to me is President Johnson's strong attack on poverty and his efforts to eradicate this

evil from our country where many millions of people still suffer the ravages of poverty. I am particularly pleased of the way he is continuing the struggle toward realization of the Kennedy program, especially civil rights, tax reduction, and medical care for our elderly citizens.

I am also in accord with the various other proposals advocated by President Johnson today and I trust this will mark the beginning of a highly successful Johnson program in the best interests of the Nation.

The President's statement that "we will not be buried" indicates his awareness of the Communist problem. The strength of our Armed Forces is proof positive that we will not knuckle under to Communist threats.

I am convinced the American people will support President Johnson in all these endeavors, both at home and abroad.

Hon. Howard Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

MR. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of a warm friend whose character you highly respected is always a great shock and impresses one that life on this planet is not eternal. From the first day that I met HOWARD BAKER when he came to Congress, a warm friendship developed and over the years our ties of mutual understanding became stronger and stronger. Quiet and unassuming in his manner, he had an active and most intelligent mind, devoted to service and supported by a courage and strength of will which was extraordinary. It was natural that he made many friends and the respect that they had for him was convincing testimony of his sterling character.

He served his country well as a Member of Congress and contributed much in the consideration of legislation. In meeting his responsibilities to his constituents he was most conscientious and there is no doubt that he will be hard to replace.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his widow and children and I feel sure they will be comforted in the knowledge of the glory of his life of service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 4: 8: *Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to thee.*

O God, our Father, who art the Supreme Ruler of the universe and the

guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, we have entered upon a new day with difficult tasks and grave responsibilities but Thy presence and power are with us.

May this moment of prayer be one of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose. Purge us from everything that dwarfs and deadens our capacities for noble and devoted service.

Unite us with the heroic who everywhere are faithfully and courageously

endeavoring to safeguard our heritage of liberty. May we understand more clearly that freedom can only be the sure and abiding possession of those who have the will to defend it.

Grant that all to the extent of their ability and with equal fidelity may seek to hasten the dawning of that blessed day of prediction when peace and righteousness, concord and amity shall prevail.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 250

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Friday next.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-42, had appointed Mr. KENNEDY to serve as member of the U.S. group of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group at a conference to be held in Washington, D.C., beginning January 14, 1964, vice Mr. Dodd, resigned.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the acting majority leader about the program for the balance of the week and then the program for next week?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, there will be no further program for the balance of this week. As I said yesterday, there are a number of Members who went to Tennessee for the funeral of our late colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Baker. I plan to ask unanimous consent for the House to go over until Monday. There is no program for today.

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills to be considered. We will consider on Monday H.R. 3742, rice acreage allotments, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week we will consider S. 1153, amendments to Federal Airport Act, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 7457, representation of indigent defendants, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have we already embarked in this session of Congress on the Thursday to Tuesday Club arrangement? Can the gentleman tell us when we are going to start doing business 5 days a week so that we may have some assurance of getting out of here next year without having spent 12 months in slow motion?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman would expect us to have business today when we are burying one of our colleagues.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of the Fridays hereafter.

Mr. BOGGS. I can tell the gentleman we are going to schedule legislation as quickly as we can and as quickly as the committees can report legislation. We are asking the committees to cooperate.

Mr. GROSS. As I see it now, I am going to give the leadership an opportunity to schedule business on Friday hereafter so that we can get the legislative machinery in operation. I was in hopes that the Democratic leadership would start immediately in this session and schedule reasonable workweeks—that is, 5-day workweeks—so that we can get the legislative business out of the way.

It will be my purpose during the remainder of this session, unless something happens to change my mind, to do what I can to see that the House meets on Friday so that we can take care of the legislative program and get out of here in reasonable season this year.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the lecture of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately some segments of the press evidently have paid very little attention in prior years to some of the important portions of our subcommittee's hearings on the budget requests for the foreign aid program or to certain statistical statements which, as chairman of the subcommittee handling the money bill for foreign aid, I have issued from time to time with relation to unexpended and unobligated funds on hand to the credit of the program.

Every year since I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, beginning with fiscal year 1956, the foreign aid program has had large unobligated cash carryovers. This fiscal year has been no different in this respect than prior years, other than that for the first time the press has seen fit to give emphasis to this fact.

However, in all fairness, I must say that the officials of the Agency for International Development have not withheld facts in this regard. Specifically, Mr. David Bell, the AID Administrator, should be exonerated from any implication which might have been made that he had been guilty of evasions or cover-ups regarding these particular facts. The truth is that during the hearings held by our subcommittee a tentative figure was established as to the amount of unexpended funds that would be on hand as of June 30 and again, subsequent to closing the hearings, we re-established the amount of unexpended funds that would be available and, of this total, the amount that was in an unobligated category.

So I repeat, motivated by a spirit of fairplay, that there has been no cover-up on the part of AID officials with regard to these facts. The statements that are currently being published with respect to AID's unexpended and unobligated funds are the figures which were given to the Members of Congress and released publicly months ago and which were again restated when the foreign aid appropriation bill was presented to the House in December.

Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations: Foreign aid funds by program and amount from prior years' appropriations on hand unexpended June 30, 1963, revised and certified

TITLE I

Unexpended, June 30, 1963:

Military assistance.....	\$2,421,741,138
Development loans	
(credits)	2,210,008,162
Development grants.....	401,934,508
Alliance for Progress.....	871,506,483
Chilean reconstruction....	17,765,353
Supporting assistance.....	365,561,363
Contingency fund.....	336,251,726
International organiza-	
tions	134,340,178
Investment surveys.....	1,500,000
Acquisition of property...	4,138,154
Investment guarantees....	268,585,914
Borrowing authority, ECA...	544,626
Administrative expenses,	
AID	10,047,137
Administrative expenses,	
State	785,105
Joint control areas.....	4,764

Total 7,044,714,611

TITLE II

Unexpended, June 30, 1963:	
Peace Corps.....	\$34,384,236
Ryukyu Islands.....	4,189,207
Cuban refugees.....	17,207,763
Migrants and refugees.....	8,753,814
International Development Association.....	232,320,000
Inter-American Development Bank.....	200,000,000
Total.....	496,855,020

Grand total, titles I and II..... 7,541,569,631

Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, unobligated funds by program and amount on hand as of June 30, 1963

TITLE I

Unobligated June 30, 1963:	
Military assistance (a).....	\$22,390,013
Military assistance (b).....	3,450,442
Development loans (credits) (b).....	96,169,761
Development grants (a).....	47,399,786
Alliance for Progress (b).....	93,640,773
Alliance for Progress (a).....	2,703,951
Chilean reconstruction (n).....	
Supporting assistance (a).....	6,039,971
Contingency fund (a).....	127,098,666
International organizations (a).....	336,227
Investment surveys (a).....	1,100,310
Acquisition of property (b).....	3,573,308
Investment guarantees (b).....	117,842,760
Borrowing authority, ECA (b).....	544,626
Administrative expenses, AID (a).....	1,971,174
Administrative expenses, State (a).....	15,304
Joint control areas (a).....	4,764
Total, title I.....	524,281,836

TITLE II

Unobligated June 30, 1963:	
Peace Corps (a).....	\$3,863,971
Ryukyu Islands (a).....	9,468
Cuban refugees (a).....	14,082,863
Migrants and refugees (a).....	1,943,262
International Development Association (n).....	
Inter-American Development Bank (b).....	200,000,000
Total, title II.....	219,899,564

Grand total, titles I and II..... 744,181,400

CRIME REPORTS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the last three weekly crime reports I have received for the District of Columbia.

I am certain that the members of the House District Committee and Members of the House consider the pending crime legislation the most important legislation pending for the District of Columbia at the present time.

GOVERNMENT OF THE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
January 7, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning December 29, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

Government of the District of Columbia—
Metropolitan Police Department—Pt. I
offenses reported Dec. 29, 1963, through
Jan. 4, 1964

Classification	Week beginning—		Change	
	Dec. 22, 1963	Dec. 29, 1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide.....		3	+3	-----
Rape.....		1	+1	-----
Robbery.....	66	74	+8	+12
Aggravated assault.....	73	53	-20	-27
Housebreaking.....	173	195	+22	+13
Grand larceny.....	15	23	+8	+53
Petit larceny.....	132	130	-2	-2
Auto theft.....	118	114	-4	-3
Total.....	577	593	+16	+3

GOVERNMENT OF THE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
December 31, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning December 22, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

Government of the District of Columbia—
Metropolitan Police Department—Pt. I
offenses reported Dec. 22 through Dec. 28, 1963

Classification	Week beginning		Change	
	Dec. 15, 1963	Dec. 22, 1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide.....	1		-1	-100.0
Rape.....	1		-1	-100.0
Robbery.....	61	66	+5	+8.2
Aggravated assault.....	44	73	+29	+65.9
Housebreaking.....	173	173		
Grand larceny.....	25	15	-10	-40.0
Petit larceny.....	146	132	-14	-9.6
Auto theft.....	94	118	+24	+25.5
Total.....	545	577	+32	+5.9

GOVERNMENT OF THE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
December 23, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning December 15, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

Government of the District of Columbia—
Metropolitan Police Department—Pt. I
offenses reported Dec. 15 through Dec. 21, 1963

Classification	Week beginning		Change	
	Dec. 8, 1963	Dec. 15, 1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide.....	1	1		
Rape.....	3	1	-2	-66.7
Robbery.....	59	61	+2	+3.4
Aggravated assault.....	44	44		
Housebreaking.....	191	173	-18	-9.4
Grand larceny.....	30	25	-5	-16.7
Petit larceny.....	186	146	-40	-21.5
Auto theft.....	128	94	-34	-26.6
Total.....	642	545	-97	-15.1

FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY AT ITS WORST

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, came into my congressional district last Friday, January 3, and advocated the discredited and overwhelmingly rejected proposal to build another Federal Government dam on the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals.

Mr. Holum did not extend me the usual courtesy of notifying me he was to speak in my congressional district and to sign Federal power contracts. I received no invitation to be present at the contract signing although Hartwell Dam could not have been a possibility without my support.

I first read about Mr. Holum's visit and speech in my district in the newspapers. My office in Washington received a release through the mail on Saturday, January 4.

Mr. Holum came into my district to sign these Federal power contracts, but the real effect of his visit was to peddle Federal Government power which the Department of Interior is finding most difficult to sell to a great majority of municipalities in North Carolina and South Carolina.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I warn and urge any municipality signing this contract to study every clause of this contract very carefully. I believe it is a step toward complete Federal control of our municipalities and local governments.

Mr. Holum, in urging the construction of Trotters Shoals, exemplified high-handed Federal Government bureaucracy at its worst. His action was an insult to the Legislature of South Carolina which unanimously adopted a resolution against Trotters Shoals. His action was an insult to the Governors of South Carolina, both past and present, who have opposed Trotters Shoals. His action was an insult to the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of

Representatives which held hearings last year for a week and which repudiated Trotters Shoals. His action is an insult to the overwhelming majority of the South Carolina congressional delegation who have opposed Trotters Shoals.

Mr. Speaker, as a South Carolina Democratic Representative in the Congress for more than 15 years, I resent this modern-day Federal Government bureaucratic carpetbagger coming down at Government expense to tell the people of South Carolina what they need and what they ought to do. I resent this political conspiracy concocted in Washington against me and the best interests of my people.

Mr. Holum, on November 18, speaking in Nashville, Tenn., where he advocated Trotters Shoals in spite of the fact that it was being rejected by the Public Works Committee, charged that the fight against Trotters Shoals was led by private utilities.

Mr. Speaker, this was a completely false statement. I have led the fight for industry on the Savannah River rather than another Government dam at Trotters Shoals which would completely flood the Piedmont section of the Savannah River Valley and give the Federal Government complete control of the most important section of the river. I am advocating instead of Trotters Shoals the investment of \$300 million in private industry with thousands of jobs, development of our timber resources and millions of dollars in taxes. My people need better schools. Our teachers need more pay. My young people need opportunity. We must eliminate poverty. This can be accomplished through industry, jobs, progress, and tax revenue. I am for prosperity and full employment in the Savannah Valley. Trotters Shoals would create permanent poverty.

Mr. Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, speaking in Cookeville, Tenn., on August 9 last year before the Conference on Resources Development said:

Important as it can be, we must not assume that recreation alone can solve the economic problems of any sizable area. Rarely, if ever, is this true.

I have pointed out that \$156 million has been invested in water-base recreation facilities in the Tennessee Valley. The waterfront docks and resorts directly furnish the equivalent of 2,000 full-time jobs. These are impressive figures.

Yet a single newsprint mill in the valley provides more employment than all of the boat docks, and its investment surpasses the entire investment in recreation on all of TVA's reservoirs. This is an important comparison to remember.

I agree with Mr. Wagner.

It is improper to project himself into the Trotters Shoals controversy just before the South Carolina Democratic primary, and therefore I think Mr. Holum should apologize to the Democrats of South Carolina or resign.

REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I pay high tribute to the inspiring work done here by the beloved Chaplain of the House, Rev. Bernard Braskamp. His daily invocations are more than requests for divine guidance. They are messages of hope and inspiration and guidance which will live on in the annals of the Congress long after we who are here have departed.

His wonderful words help us to begin each day with a resolve for better and higher service. And in the days which lie ahead each prayer will merit careful reading and rereading. They are more, much more than devotions for today.

THE LATE JAMES W. RYAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the Honorable James W. Ryan the city of Chicago, the State of Illinois, and our country have suffered a great loss. He was one of God's noblemen, and his sudden passing has brought deep grief to the thousands of men, women, and children whom he served in countless ways and by whom he was beloved. He was my close, my warm friend for more than half a century, from the time when we in our youth served together in the Legislature of Illinois in the administration of Gov. Edward F. Dunne.

For 38 years he was the Democratic committeeman of the seventh ward in the city of Chicago, the ward of my own residence, and after his retirement as ward committeeman in 1960 remained as president of the regular Democratic organization of the ward, ever active and tireless in promoting the interest of the party of his faith and the welfare of the community and of his neighbors regardless of party. There was no worthy civic activity or work of his church to which he did not give himself unstintingly.

Thirty-eight years as ward committeeman in the great city of Chicago, playing his part all these years in the making of Presidents, of Governors, of mayors, of judges, and of the countless other public officials. The influence of James W. Ryan in the molding of the world in which we live is beyond calculation. No man ever enters and stays in politics, at whatever level, unless he genuinely likes people and in serving them finds an inner satisfaction that is far above monetary evaluation. James W. Ryan, as legislator, as ward committeeman, as president of the ward organization, as chief deputy clerk of Cook County and in recent years as assistant bailiff of the municipal

court, lived by the finest traditions of dedicated public service. He has done to the fullest measure his share in making this a better world for all of us, a better land for our children, and our children's children. His works and his memory will live on.

To his noble wife Helen; his daughters, Mrs. Virginia Ross, Mrs. Patricia Lynch, and Mary Helen; his sisters, Mayme Jung, Norine McNichols and Sister Mary Norine, R.S.M.; his brothers, Police Capt. John H. and Matthew J., and his grandchildren go my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the beloved dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. O'BRIEN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all other Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, lamented today in Chicago is the passing of a distinguished citizen, James W. Ryan.

Jim Ryan, as he was known to an ever increasing circle of friends, was a man of character who had been endowed with a generous nature at birth.

He served his city, his State, and his fellow man with an intense desire and an urge to be helpful.

His service in the Illinois State Legislature began in 1913 and when he had completed two terms his interest in it never lagged.

He was active in promoting the welfare of the Democratic Party in Chicago and in Illinois. In the city he loved and to which he was so dedicated, Chicago, he served as Democratic ward committeeman of the seventh ward from 1922 until 1960. He had been president, too, of the seventh ward regular Democratic organization and in that capacity again demonstrated his forceful and fair nature in civic affairs.

To his widow, Mrs. Helen Ryan, and to his three daughters, let us join their host of friends in extending our sympathy in their bereavement. And to his surviving three sisters, one of whom is Sister Mary Norine, R.S.M., let us say that we, too, share their sorrow in the passing of a worthy brother.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of deputy bailiff of the municipal court, James Ryan, marks the passing of one of the leaders who served in the Democratic ranks to build up the power of political control in the city of Chicago. As the committeeman of the seventh ward, he contributed much to the Democratic strength of the city and county candidates.

He was a gentle and kindly man who knew only one axiom—loyalty to party—and even to his very death, worked at the ward level to insure strong support for the ticket. Upon his retirement from the committeemanship several years ago because of age, he surprised his successor,

the distinguished State committee chairman, James Ronan, in his strong, spirited continued activity.

Jim Ryan was an astute politician and played an important part in the development of many hopeful leaders, both in public and party offices. He had a warm and friendly feeling toward people, and was ever ready to serve the needs of his many friends. His popularity in political circles, and practical knowledge of politics made him an important adviser in party policy, based on public appeal. His whole life was spent in the service of others—many oldtimers will miss his support and services, and young men, aspirants for political preferment, will feel the loss of his guidance and advice.

He was a credit to the people that he represented, and a great leader in civic, political, and spiritual activities of his community.

We of the Illinois delegation mourn his passing and send our heartfelt condolences to his beloved wife Helen, his daughters Mary Helen, Mrs. Virginia Ross, and Mrs. Patricia Lynch, his sisters Mrs. Mayme Jung, Mrs. Norine McNichols, and Sister Mary Norine, R.S.M., and his brothers Matthew J. Ryan and Police Capt. John H. Ryan. The State of Illinois and the city of Chicago have lost one of their most valuable citizens, and the Democratic Party a loyal and powerful leader. May the good Lord grant an everlasting blessed peace to his soul.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply touched by the passing of James W. Ryan. He was a fine man. For many years we were associated in the councils of the Democratic Party of Cook County as committeemen from South Side wards. I shall miss him very much. His was a life of dedication to his party and the public welfare. I extend my warmest sympathy to Mrs. Ryan, his daughters, sisters, and brothers.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my heartfelt sorrow at the loss of my very dear friend, James W. Ryan, and to extend my sympathy to the members of his family who are bereaved by the death of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan was a lifelong resident of the south side of Chicago, and for the past 43 years was very active in the civic and political life of the South Shore community.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan in his position as ward committeeman of the seventh ward, was a member of the Cook County Central Committee of the Democratic Party for 40 years. I was an intimate friend of James Ryan and for 24 years I had the privilege of serving with him on the Cook County Central Committee while I was representing the 17th ward. He was also a close personal friend of my family and that of my wife's family, all of whom were neighbors in the South Shore community.

Mr. Speaker, this man was a lifelong supporter of the ideals and principles of the Democratic Party and one of the great Democratic leaders in Chicago. He was a forerunner in the fight against juvenile delinquency, and a member of

numerous business, civic, fraternal, and religious organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago has lost a man of great stature and dignity—one who was known far and wide for his sympathy and understanding of the problems of his fellow man.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Chicago in expression of deep grief at the passing of James W. Ryan and in tribute to the memory of a dear friend and a dedicated and beloved leader in the councils of the Democratic Party. He had a long and distinguished career in public office, both as a legislator and in later years in administrative posts in the government of Cook County and of the city of Chicago. He was dearly beloved by all who knew him. His place in the history of our State and of the city of Chicago is secure.

Mrs. Price joins me in warmest sympathy to his devoted wife, his three fine daughters, his sisters, his brothers, and his grandchildren.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of James W. Ryan has deeply saddened the Chicago delegation as we gather for the 2d session of the 88th Congress. He was a fine gentleman, a great American, with a heart filled with love for all his fellow men. He served with distinction as a member of the General Assembly of Illinois, as deputy clerk of Cook County and more recently as assistant bailiff of the municipal court. For 38 years he was the Democratic committeeman of Chicago's seventh ward, retiring in 1960 in favor of his close friend, James A. Ronan, the dynamic Democratic State chairman of Illinois and member of Governor Kerner's cabinet. Jim Ryan continued to serve his party and his ward with fidelity and dedication to the last day of his life as president of the seventh ward regular Democratic organization.

To his wife Helen, his daughters and the other members of his devoted family Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late Hon. James W. Ryan of Chicago—a dedicated public servant, whose service to his people will never be forgotten. But most of all I pay tribute to James W. Ryan, the man, who was a friend to me in the early days of my political life. Mr. Ryan's public service began in 1914, 14 years before my birth, and continued until 1960, when he decided to retire and turn the reins of his leadership to men he had groomed to follow in his footsteps. For 38 years this man served the people of the seventh ward as their committeeman and took his rightful seat in the Cook County Democratic Committee. He first took office as an elected representative in the Illinois State Legislature in 1914 and subsequently served as deputy county clerk. His many years of outstanding service in public life are a benediction to his memory and will be an inspiration to those who continue in his absence.

Having had the privilege of knowing this man, whose wisdom I shall long re-

member, I know he will be sorely missed by those who were near and dear to him. However, his ability, his accomplishments, his constructiveness, his noble character, and all that he stood for, will be an everlasting monument of his life on earth. It is with this thought in mind that I call your attention to this man who served the public as we now do to give us strength to carry on with our task.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late concerning firearms legislation. The most knowledgeable and influential group that is directly concerned with this subject is the National Rifle Association.

In the January 1964 issue of their publication, the American Rifleman, they outlined their position which I would like to bring to the attention of all Members.

REALISTIC FIREARMS CONTROLS

The American people and the peoples of the world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy. This was an incredible tragedy which shocked all civilized human beings. To those who treasure the right to keep and bear arms and the other basic American freedoms, the use of a rifle to assassinate our Nation's leader is a calamity added to our grief at his loss.

In this disturbing time, there is a tendency to seek a sweeping solution to crimes of violence. The days following the tragic events on November 22, 1963, saw the eruption in the press, radio, and television of a highly emotionalized reaction to the weapon with which the terrible deed was performed. Never before has there been such a wave of antifirearm feeling or such vocal and almost universal demand for tighter controls over the mail-order sales of guns. Although much of this was hysterical in nature, it has had its impact upon the U.S. Congress and it most certainly will have its impact upon the legislature of each of the 50 States.

No group of individuals has done more over the years, or is doing more now, to evaluate the problems related to firearms and to protect the right of law-abiding American citizens to keep and bear arms, than members of the National Rifle Association of America. The NRA believes that firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restrictions which such legislation places upon law-abiding citizens. Nevertheless, it does not oppose proposed legislation to prohibit the sale of firearms to persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, and other undesirables, or to proposed legislation to make the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

The National Rifle Association is opposed to the registration of the ownership of firearms at any level of government; to the requirement of a license to purchase or possess a firearm; to control measures which levy discriminatory or punitive taxes or fees on the purchase or ownership of firearms; and to legislation which denies or interferes with individual rights of our citizens or is designed

for the purpose of circumventing due process of law.

Reputable gun owners maintain that legislation should not be aimed at the firearm but at its misuse. The NRA does not oppose reasonable legislation regulating the carrying of a concealed handgun, but it does oppose the theory that a target shooter, a hunter, or a collector should be required to meet the same conditions. It strongly supports legislation providing severe additional penalties for the use of a dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime.

It is certain that antifirearm sentiment will remain a vital problem for some time. Regardless of what the U.S. Congress may ultimately do in the way of Federal legislation, it is certain that many State legislatures will attempt solutions of one kind or another. Nothing in the present crisis has changed the fundamental policy of the National Rifle Association of America with respect to the purchase, possession, and use of firearms by law-abiding American citizens for lawful purposes.

It is important that each gun owner formulate a policy to govern his own thinking and that he accept the responsibility, as well as the privilege, of making his views known to his elected representatives. The time for hysteria and name calling is over. It is time now to point out calmly and logically the areas in which legislation is proper and effective in discouraging the ownership and misuse of firearms by criminals and other undesirables. The lawmakers must be enlightened on the views of reputable citizens who believe in the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America and who believe in the preservation of our heritage to keep and bear arms. Then, and only then, will we have the basis for developing realistic firearms controls.

AGRICULTURE IGNORED

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that President Johnson in his state of the Union message on yesterday did not even mention agriculture and its many problems. He made reference to practically every other segment of our economy which leads one to wonder whether or not the President is very much concerned about the welfare of the American farmer and his declining income.

Does not the President know that the cotton producers in this country are in trouble? Has he already forgotten that he himself and the Secretary of Agriculture are urging the Congress to enact new wheat legislation without delay? Does the President not know that increased meat imports from foreign countries are creating havoc and deep concern in the cattle producing areas of the country and that dairy farmers are also looking for some solution of their problems?

Yet the President makes no mention of the plight of the American farmer in his state of the Union message. Some explanation would seem to be fitting and proper.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT HANDLING OF OTEPKA CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, articles in the Des Moines Register which relate interviews with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, John F. Reilly, and Elmer D. Hill, corroborate the allegation of our colleague, Representative CRAMER, of Florida, that Rusk has become a willing partner in the effort to oust a loyal State Department security official, Otto F. Otepka.

Taken together with transcripts of testimony from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, these articles establish:

First. Secretary Rusk has been aware of all the testimony and communications to the Senate subcommittee since the first week of last October when he was served notice that the subcommittee had evidence indicating perjury by some of his top employees.

Second. Secretary Rusk had specific knowledge of the testimony of Reilly, Hill, and David I. Belisle, given last July and August, in which they denied knowledge of any wiretaps or listening devices used on Otepka's telephone or in his office.

Third. With the transcripts of testimony by Reilly, Hill, and Belisle available to him, Secretary Rusk permitted and even approved their letters of November 6, 1963, to the Senate subcommittee, in which they admitted listening devices were used on Otepka's telephone.

In these letters they tried to palm off their earlier testimony as correct; that they were merely seeking "to amplify" the record, but at the same time using this left-handed means of admitting their initial testimony was untrue. In other words, under oath they lied to the subcommittee.

Now there is additional testimony by Mr. Hill in which he admits actual recordings were made of Otepka's conversations, and Reilly and some other officials had knowledge of this.

To this date I have seen no criticism of Reilly, Belisle, and Hill by Secretary Rusk or by Deputy Under Secretary of State William Crockett. But the State Department is busy peddling stories to the public trying to discredit and defame Otepka, whose only offense has been telling the truth to a congressional committee about conditions in the Security Division of the State Department.

The record indicates that Rusk has the attitude that Reilly attributes to him when Reilly says he has not been criticized by high State Department officials for installing the listening device on Otepka's telephone or for giving untruthful testimony about it.

The fact that the inaccurate letters were written in the State Department's legal office, and approved by Secretary Rusk, raises some extremely serious questions about this case—questions more serious than the propriety of the tactics used against Otepka and even more serious than the initial giving of lying statements before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I have long insisted that there should be a thorough and sweeping investigation of the State Department. I renew that insistence today and call upon President Johnson to take such action without further delay.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Dec. 25, 1963]

RUSK INSISTS HE HANDLES OTEPKA CASE (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk is personally responsible for the details of the handling of the Otepka case since October 5, he said Tuesday.

The Secretary said he has read all of the testimony made available to the State Department relative to untruthful testimony of three high State Department officials.

Under sharp pressure from Congress, Rusk forced the resignation of Deputy Assistant Secretary John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill, a special assistant to Reilly.

SPECIAL CASES

David Belisle, chief assistant to Reilly, has been removed from any overall responsibility in the State Department Security Division, and "has been working on special security cases," the State Department reported Tuesday.

Rusk said he did not rely on subordinates to analyze the information on the handling of the Otepka case and the activities of Reilly, Hill, and Belisle. He said transcripts of all testimony and other information was sent to him personally, and was read by him.

Secretary Rusk said he had approved letters Reilly, Hill, and Belisle sent to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee November 6, 1963, to clarify their testimony of late July and early August.

In that testimony all three denied knowledge that wiretaps had been attached to the telephone of Chief Security Evaluator Otto Otepka.

NOVEMBER 6 LETTERS

Their November 6 letters admitted knowledge that a listening device was placed on Otepka's telephone for 3 days, from March 18 through March 20, 1963.

However, the letters denied knowledge of any other incidents that might be considered an effort to use a listening device on Otepka's telephone or to place a listening device in his office.

Since receiving those letters, the Internal Security Subcommittee has taken further testimony from Hill in which he admitted that there was further wiretapping of Otepka at Reilly's direction, and that an actual recording was made of the conversations.

Hill has testified that he turned these recordings over to some other State Department official at Reilly's direction. The State Department admits that Hill has changed his story and has stated that recordings were made, but contends there is still no evidence that knowledge of these recordings went to the Assistant Secretary of State or above.

DETAILS FROM DODD

Secretary Rusk contends that he had no knowledge of the basic allegations of "untruthful statements" by Reilly, Hill, and

Belisle until October 5, 1963, when a memorandum from the Senate Judiciary Committee was delivered to him in New York where he was attending a U.N. session.

Subcommittee Vice Chairman THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, delivered the letter to Rusk and explained the problem.

ORIGINAL STORY

Last July 9, Committee Counsel Jay Sourwine asked Hill:

"Did you ever have anything to do with placing a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?"

"HILL. No, sir."

"SOURWINE. Did you have any knowledge of it, if it was done?"

"HILL. No, sir."

REVISED VERSION

On November 6, Hill wrote to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that on March 18, Reilly asked him to explore the possibility of eavesdropping on conversations in Otepka's office. He said he discussed it with Clarence J. Schneider, chief of technical operation branch, and that they decided they could install a listening device in Otepka's telephone. Hill added:

"Mr. Schneider and I tested the system and found we would be unable to overhear conversations in Mr. Otepka's office, except actual telephone conversations, because electrical interference produced a loud buzzing sound. It was never contemplated that an attempt would be made just to monitor Mr. Otepka's telephone line in order to overhear conversations on it."

Hill stated that an effort was made to get some equipment to eliminate the buzzing sound, but on March 20, Reilly informed him that it would not be necessary to pursue the wiretap further because information had been obtained from Otepka's wastepaper burn bag indicating he was giving State Department information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Hill now admits that he made a recording of conversations on Otepka's wire, and gave the recording to another man in Reilly's presence.

Reilly continues to testify under oath that no actual interceptions of conversations took place.

NOT REBUKED, SAYS REILLY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—John F. Reilly said Thursday no one at the State Department is angered with him despite charges that he wiretapped chief security evaluator Otto Otepka and then lied about it.

Reilly said his resignation as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division was "voluntary," and involved no reprimand or other criticism from Secretary of State Dean Rusk or Deputy Under Secretary William Crockett.

"I resigned because I did not feel I could effectively serve Secretary Rusk in the light of the relations with the congressional committee," Reilly said.

REMAIN FRIENDLY

Despite the charges of the Senate Judiciary Committee that Reilly gave "untruthful" testimony under oath, Reilly said "there is nothing derogatory in my (personnel) record, and I don't believe there is any way in which my acts were regarded as improper by my superiors."

Reilly said he has continued to have amiable relations with Rusk and Crockett.

"I am sure that if you talk with Mr. Crockett, he will tell you nothing I did was regarded as wrong. There is no basic disagreement with my superiors. I don't think we find ourselves in an adversary position."

WIRETAP ISSUE

Reilly said he is "standing by" his testimony before the Senate International Security Subcommittee in which he denied that he had ever ordered a wiretap to be put on Otepka's telephone last March.

He has since admitted that a listening device was attached to Otepka's telephone, but contends it was attached for experimental purposes and with no intention to intercept or record the conversations.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, has said Elmer D. Hill, a former State Department electronics expert, testified he made several recordings at Reilly's instruction and turned them over to Reilly.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Jan. 2, 1963]

TELL OF REILLY'S UNDER-OATH DENIAL THAT HE RECORDED OTEPKA'S CALLS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released testimony Wednesday showing that John F. Reilly made statements under oath denying any recording of telephone conversations of chief security evaluator Otto Otepka.

The transcript shows that members of the Senate committee have charged Reilly, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, with being "evasive" and "misleading" in testimony last August in which he denied any listening devices were connected to Otepka's telephone.

ACTED AS LOOKOUT

Since then Reilly has admitted that he directed Elmer D. Hill, an electronics expert, to experiment with attachments on Otepka's telephone, and acted as a lookout in the hall when Hill and another technician disconnected the wires that had changed Otepka's telephone into a microphone.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has contended that Reilly and other high State Department officials may be involved in perjury in denying the use of a listening device.

The new testimony shows that Reilly insisted on November 15 that there was no actual interception of Otepka's conversations.

The transcript shows that Reilly said "The darned thing (the listening equipment) didn't work."

Throughout his testimony, Reilly insisted that his August testimony was not false because in his mind Otepka's telephone was not "compromised."

Reilly insisted that when he answered questions in August, he regarded compromising of a telephone conversation as actually listening to conversations and divulging the contents of the conversation to others.

AUGUST TESTIMONY

In August, Reilly was asked: "Have you ever engaged in or ordered the bugging or tapping or otherwise compromising telephones or private conversations in the office of an employee of the State Department?"

Reilly answered: "No, sir."

When Counsel J. G. Sourwine asked again: "You never did?" Reilly replied: "That is right, sir."

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, said that Reilly's performance "is a sad commentary" on high officials in the State Department.

"If we call people in high responsible positions in Government down here before this committee, trying to pursue our duties, and trying to get the truth, and then we find such evasion and such withholding and such technical excuses and alibis for not giving the committee the truth, I want to tell you gen-

tleman our task, our job is tremendous beyond comprehension."

Under questioning, Reilly said that when he went to the State Department he might have "semifacetiously" said that one of his duties was "to get Otepka."

However, he insisted that it was not a campaign to "get Otepka" that had resulted in the direction to Hill for the listening device on Otepka's telephone.

Otepka had been involved in policy differences on security matters with Reilly and with Reilly's predecessor, William Boswell.

Otepka objected to what he considered to be lax standards in the use of "emergency security clearance" on 150 occasions in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, compared with only 5 such emergency clearances in the entire Eisenhower administration.

WIELAND CASE

There also was some dispute over the handling of a number of cases, including the case of William Wieland, the controversial head of the Caribbean desk, who was under sharp criticism from Congress for his actions in connection with Fidel Castro's takeover in Cuba.

Otepka found that Wieland had not disclosed some facts in his background and had given misleading information on other matters, and recommended that Wieland be dropped as "unsuitable" because of a lack of judgment and lack of integrity. He did not find Wieland disloyal.

Despite the Otepka recommendations, Wieland was retained in the Department and the case was closed. It is reported that Otepka became aware of some new information, and sought to have the Wieland case opened again.

Reilly states that last March he was not out to get Otepka, but "I was thinking of how I could ascertain whether or not Mr. Otepka was getting me."

Reilly testified that he believed Otepka was cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and was furnishing information to the committee to use in questioning Reilly and others.

Reilly said it is his view that Government employees have a responsibility not to tell Congress things that might embarrass either their superiors or their department.

EFFECTIVE WAY

On March 13, Reilly said he talked with his assistant, David I. Belisle, about ways of obtaining more information on Otepka's activity including a wiretap, a listening device in his room, and an examination of Otepka's wastepaper "burn bag."

On March 18, he said he directed Hill to experiment and find an effective way to monitor Otepka's conversations. At the same time, Reilly started a systematic search of Otepka's burn bag and this search resulted in a carbon paper that showed that Otepka had written a list of questions to be asked of his superiors.

Reilly said that many of these questions were asked of him when he appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee later.

Reilly revealed that when he came to the State Department, in April 1962, his predecessor, Boswell, had indicated that he had been trying to get rid of Otepka because he regarded the veteran chief evaluator as troublesome.

Reilly said when he decided to use the listening devices on Otepka's telephone, he did not consult Deputy Under Secretary William Crockett or higher authority. However, he stated that when he obtained information that Otepka had furnished questions to Sourwine that he had the support of Crockett

and the Department in steps taken to oust Otepka.

He said that Crockett is in sympathy with the effort to oust Otepka, and that he believes it is the Department policy to get rid of Otepka.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Dec. 28, 1963]

JOB HUNTER FEARS TALK ON WIRETAP (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Electronics expert Elmer Dewey (Bud) Hill said Friday wiretaps were used to make "several recordings" of conversations on the telephone of State Department security evaluator Otto Otepka.

However, the 34-year-old former State Department technician said he did not want to discuss the details of conflicts between his story and the story of others in the State Department who deny recordings were made of Otepka's telephone conversations.

"I'm going to have to go out and get a job in private industry, and I don't want to get crosswise with the officials of the State Department," Hill said.

"I'm going to have to depend on the State Department for references and I don't want to make things any more difficult for them than I have to under the circumstances."

COULD BE ROUGH

He said "things could be pretty rough" in getting another job if his testimony makes it difficult for Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Deputy Undersecretary William Crockett, or John F. Reilly, recently resigned Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division.

"Reilly has his position to look out for, so does Crockett, and so does Secretary Rusk," Hill said. "I don't want to do anything that would put them in a more embarrassing situation."

Hill said he gave testimony last July in which he denied listening devices had been attached to Otepka's telephone "because it was what the Department wanted."

CHANGED STORY

He said he has changed his story to admit the actual recording of the Otepka telephone conversations "because I felt I had to tell the truth to avoid trouble."

However, he explained that he did not want to give any explanation of his dealing with State Department officials because this may irritate them and result in bad references.

"I've told the truth to the [Senate Internal Security] Subcommittee, and I don't want to give any more explanations unless I have consulted my lawyer," Hill said.

The transcript of the executive session testimony given by Hill has not been made public yet, but Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has made reference to it in a Senate floor speech.

DENIED KNOWLEDGE

Dodd said Reilly, Hill, and David I. Belisle, an assistant to Reilly, had testified in July and August "that they knew nothing about the installation of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office."

"Reilly and Belisle," he went on, "recalled before the committee (in mid-November), stated that none of Otepka's conversations had been overheard because of electronic difficulties."

Hill testified that tape recordings had been made of several conversations, that Reilly had expressed particular interest in one conversation, and that he had turned the tapes over to an unidentified third party at Reilly's direction.

Reilly continues to claim he had no knowledge that any recordings were made, and to deny that any recordings were ever given to him or delivered to others at his request. He

and Hill resigned from the State Department.

Hill, a native of Los Angeles, Calif., received an M.A. degree from Stanford University in 1957. He had been a research associate at Stanford for more than 5 years when he was hired by the State Department in January 1962 as electronics expert for the Security Division.

BELISLE TALE AN AFFRONT, PROBES SAY: HEDGE ON WIRETAP HELD "INCREDIBLE"

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—State Department Security Specialist David I. Belisle admitted he was told last March of efforts to wiretap the telephone of Chief Security Evaluator Otto Otepka.

A transcript of testimony released Monday by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee showed that committee members regarded Belisle as "evasive" and "untruthful" in making earlier denials that he had any information on the wiretaps.

TAKEN NOVEMBER 14

Belisle's testimony was taken November 14 in a closed session of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee after investigators had obtained conclusive evidence that a wiretap was placed on Otepka's telephone last March.

Although two persons involved in denial of knowledge of the wiretaps have resigned in the aftermath of Senate charges of "perjury," Secretary of State Dean Rusk has allowed Belisle to remain an official of the State Department.

In the transcript released Monday, Belisle told committee members he did not intend to be evasive or to mislead them last July 29 when he stated under oath that he had "no information" relative to a wiretap on Otepka's telephone.

Belisle insisted that he believed his testimony under oath did not require that he give "secondhand" or "hearsay" testimony when asked if he had any "information" about such wiretaps.

He explained that he heard about the wiretap from John F. Reilly, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division. Reilly told him of the wiretapping of Otepka's telephone a few days after the events, Belisle admitted.

"AN AFFRONT"

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator ROMAN BRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, declared that Belisle's testimony was "incredible" and "an affront" to the members of the committee.

MCCLELLAN declared that it was not "hearsay" testimony on the wiretaps when Belisle obtained his information from Reilly, the man who had directed the effort to tap Otepka's wire.

Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, said that under the Belisle theory on "hearsay" a witness could deny having information about a murder, even though he had been told about the crime by the murderer.

The transcript showed that the committee members uniformly regarded Belisle as being "evasive" and "untruthful" under oath in earlier testimony.

They regarded him as also lacking in frankness in continuing to insist that he was justified in not telling the committee "the whole truth" as required by his oath.

Under questioning, Belisle said "the whole intent [of the wiretap and searches of Otepka's office] was to determine what information he [Otepka] was giving to the [Internal Security] Subcommittee."

Belisle admitted that on March 13 he discussed with Reilly ways to determine what

information Otepka might be giving to Congress.

THE CONVERSATION

In this conversation, Reilly discussed the possibility of using some listening device on Otepka's telephone or in his office at the State Department, and also mentioned that he might examine typewriter ribbons and carbon papers in Otepka's wastepaper "burn bag."

Belisle said he was in Costa Rica on March 18, 19, and 20 when Reilly directed Elmer D. (Bud) Hill, an electronics specialist, to experiment with a wiretap device on Otepka's telephone.

Belisle testified that Reilly told him of the effort a few days later and informed him it had not been highly successful.

(Belisle and Reilly continue to claim the wiretap effort was thwarted by a humming sound on the line. However, Senator DODD has made a Senate speech in which he says Hill has changed his story and now says that several recordings were made and were turned over to Reilly.)

In the face of his present admission of knowledge of the attempted wiretap on Otepka's telephone, Belisle continued to insist that he did not lie to the committee last August when he denied any knowledge.

WHAT HE SAID

At that time Belisle was asked by Chief Counsel Sourwine: "Do you have any information with respect to the tapping of the telephone of Mr. Otto Otepka?"

"No, sir," Belisle answered.

"Do you know whether this was done?" Sourwine followed up.

"No, I do not," Belisle answered.

"Did you have anything to do with the placing of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?" Sourwine asked.

"I did not, sir," Belisle answered.

"Do you know if this was done?" Sourwine asked.

"I do not," Belisle answered.

After the State Department was notified that the Internal Security Subcommittee had evidence establishing that a wiretap was placed on Otepka's telephone, Belisle wrote a letter to "amplify" his testimony, saying he had no "firsthand" knowledge.

MR. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

MR. CRAMER. I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his efforts, despite the criticism, toward bringing all the facts to light, as the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body and also certain Members of the other body have been trying to do for some time. The facts the gentleman is putting into the Record at this time, I am confident, will help accomplish that. I, too, of course, have been subject to all sorts of criticism by the State Department for likewise having insisted that the truth of this matter be fully determined and that the American people be advised as to the truth. In my opinion, this is one of the grossest examples of attempted, purposeful coverup of the truth by the State Department in my memory.

Of course, let me say this, the reason I became interested in it and remain interested in it is because of the fundamentals, as I am sure the gentleman is likewise concerned about, that are involved in this particular case. There are

basic fundamental principles involved here. Since when is the Congress of the United States through its properly constituted committees not permitted, because of some regulation in existence or other excuse in the executive branch of the Government, to inquire into the facts regarding information within the jurisdiction of that committee?

Mr. Otepka was called as a witness before the committee, was he not, I ask the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And he answered the questions posed to him by that committee, did he not?

Mr. GROSS. That is right. Under oath.

Mr. CRAMER. And he had no alternative but to answer the questions to the fullest extent of his knowledge, did he, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAMER. It appears to me—and I ask the gentleman if he does not agree with it—that the effort with regard to Otepka appears to be an intended, purposeful effort to try to intimidate other Government employees by making an example out of Otepka. Does it not appear to the gentleman from Iowa that is what it is?

Mr. GROSS. It certainly does.

Mr. CRAMER. It appears to me it is. Setting up Otepka as an example that, under the threat of being publicly discredited, in the future no other Federal employees should come before any committees and give information other than that previously approved by the agency, even though under oath and pursuant to the request of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right and especially so with respect to the State Department.

Mr. CRAMER. And does not the gentleman feel that unless the Congress of the United States, as the Internal Security Subcommittee tried to do and as the gentleman is trying to do and as I am trying to do and as many Members of the other body have been trying to do, fully explores this thing and unless the facts are all brought out and the rights of Congress to investigate are protected, that other witnesses unquestionably would be intimidated with Otepka's firing under these circumstances?

Mr. GROSS. It would certainly have that effect. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman further believe no State Department investigative authority has the right under our separation of powers between the executive and the legislative and the acknowledged necessity for Congress to inquire into matters relating to legislation to investigate members of the staff of a Senate investigating committee, which even the State Department did not deny, when I charged them with that, in their statement in reply?

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, and I compliment him for the information that he has provided to the House on this subject.

Mr. CRAMER. For instance, in reply to my charge that certain employees of the Senate committee had been under

investigation by the State Department, the reply of the State Department was a denial that:

A State Department security officer or that the Department was investigating employees of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

I know the gentleman notices, as I do, how carefully worded that statement is—"was investigating," meaning present tense.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. It does not deny that they have in the past attempted to or in fact had investigated employees of a duly constituted congressional committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Therefore, the State Department did not deny that, but by implication it admitted it. It also admitted that the meeting to which I referred in my memorandum which I placed in the *RECORD* took place. They admitted certain information I placed in the *RECORD* was correct but questioned some of the implications of it otherwise. I ask the gentleman this question further. I further charged at the time that it was my opinion that Mr. Rusk, who admittedly, as Secretary of State, has been in on this matter from the very beginning—and the gentleman from Iowa repeated that statement here today—is hardly an impartial person nor would anyone else in the State Department under his jurisdiction be an impartial person for investigating further all the facts of the Otepka case.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do. And the offer by Secretary Rusk to pick one of six employees within the Department of State to sit on his—Otepka's—appeal is a travesty. Employees of the State Department cannot be prejudiced in this matter in the light of what has happened and has been demonstrated before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Otepka cannot possibly rest his case with any one of six persons or a dozen persons from within the State Department, selected by Secretary Rusk to sit on his case.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree that the State Department by handling it in this manner using a State Department employee as one of the investigators, are themselves opening themselves up to the charge, by their own action, of a whitewash of the entire case?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman feel the simple way to avoid such a charge would be for the President to appoint an impartial review board with no relationship to the State Department and not under the jurisdiction or the control of Secretary Rusk if confidence in the State Department's action in this respect as well as in others among the American people is to be maintained?

Mr. GROSS. That is the only way Otto Otepka could begin to get a fair hearing on his appeal.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman further—and I am sure he is familiar

with the most recent report and release of testimony from the Internal Security Subcommittee with respect to the testimony of Mr. Belisle who, incidentally, even though, as the gentleman said, he lied before the committee—and I concur in the gentleman's conclusion—still the fact is he remains in the State Department. The other two gentlemen, Mr. Reilly and Mr. Hill, who likewise falsified their statements before the committee are no longer with the Department. This is not only my charge, but it is a repetition of charges made in the other body as well—that falsification of testimony is obvious on the record.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And admitted in a left-handed way by the individuals themselves.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, by submitting a memorandum "clarifying" their testimony in the first instance before the committee.

I said in my previous statement—and it has now been confirmed—that those clarifying statements were cleared over the desk of Secretary Rusk. Is that not the gentleman's information?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly correct—and also over the desk of the legal officer of the State Department.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. The Internal Security Subcommittee, based upon sworn testimony, made the evidence available to the press and made certain statements concerning it this week. The committee said that the Belisle tale was "an affront" to the committee; that two persons involved in denial of knowledge of the wiretaps have resigned in the aftermath of Senate charges of perjury; that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has allowed Belisle to remain an official of the Department; that State Department security specialist David I. Belisle admitted he was told last March of efforts to wiretap the telephone of chief security evaluator Otto Otepka, which he had denied in the first instance before the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman if he will ask unanimous consent to make this report on the committee's findings a part of the *RECORD* following his remarks?

Mr. GROSS. I already have that permission.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman on his efforts. It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of the gentleman, that the Johnson administration will take whatever steps are believed necessary as to appointing a truly impartial factfinding group that can get to the bottom of this question, to determine the true facts, and to make certain that the American people are fully informed and to make sure that the power and authority of the Congress to investigate is not prejudiced and that other Government employees are not intimidated by this action and, of equal and perhaps greater importance, that no injustice is done to Otto Otepka who has had more than 20 years of exemplary service in the security division of the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am under the impression that Mr. Otepka now has a case pending in one of the courts. Is that an erroneous impression?

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that he has yet taken his case to any court. He has an appeal pending as a result of his being ousted from the State Department, being fired from the State Department.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am under the impression that the ouster is now pending before the court.

Mr. GROSS. That may be the fact, but I am not aware of it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If this matter does not in fact get into court, would the gentleman be satisfied if an impartial committee were appointed to study all the facts in this matter?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, if a truly impartial committee were appointed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would see no objection to that and I do not believe Secretary Rusk would object. I believe this is a case which certainly has gained nationwide attention. Perhaps it would be an excellent idea to have an impartial committee appointed.

Mr. GROSS. It could not be truly impartial and be composed of anyone from the State Department, under the circumstances.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would have no objection to the appointment of an impartial group, totally disassociated from the State Department, to look into this matter to get to the bottom of this thing. It would not surprise me one bit to see the administration do just that.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

REPORT ON GENEVA SPACE RADIO COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE AND PROGRESS MADE IN ESTABLISHING GLOBAL COMMUNICATION SATELLITE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time today in order that I might give to the House information on some most interesting developments in the field of international telecommunications.

Today I have the privilege of reporting to you, Mr. Speaker, on the results of one of the most important and successful international conferences held in recent years, and the significance of that Conference to the establishment of a global satellite communications system.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last Congress there was enacted a landmark piece of legislation. It was the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. Before beginning my report, I would like to call attention to the declaration of policy and purpose of that far-reaching and important legislation.

In my judgment, those of us who have participated in the formulation, the enactment and finalization of that program during the last Congress helped to make history. In my judgment, the con-

tributions which this program may make to the future of this country and our civilization cannot be anticipated at this moment. This communication program that we in this country developed and that we propose to utilize with other countries of the world may greatly affect the future of this Nation and of other peoples of the world.

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

(b) The new and expanded telecommunication services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provide global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the reflection of the benefits of this new technology in both quality of services and charges for such services.

(c) In order to facilitate this development and to provide for the widest possible participation by private enterprise, United States participation in the global system shall be in the form of a private corporation, subject to appropriate governmental regulation. It is the intent of Congress that all authorized users shall have nondiscriminatory access to the system; that maximum competition be maintained in the provision of equipment and services utilized by the system; that the corporation created under this Act be so organized and operated as to maintain and strengthen competition in the provision of communications services to the public; and that the activities of the corporation created under this Act and of the persons or companies participating in the ownership of the corporation shall be consistent with the Federal antitrust laws.

(d) It is not the intent of Congress by this Act to preclude the use of the communications satellite system for domestic communication services where consistent with the provisions of this Act nor to preclude the creation of additional communications satellite systems, if required to meet unique governmental needs or if otherwise required in the national interest.

It will be recalled that we had some difficulty formulating and finalizing this legislation. Our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings. It was considered over a period of several weeks in executive session. The appropriate committees of the other body and the other body discussed it at length before we finally concluded the consideration of this program. Even though there were serious questions raised during the course of this consideration, I think developments to date have justified the action of our committee in arriving at its decision and they have justified the decision of the Congress in approving the establishment of an early global communication program.

That leads me to make this observation: So many times when we have the far-reaching, important landmark

programs on which we are legislating, we do not proceed to follow through to see how they work out. But I told this House at the time that we were going to follow through. Because of the controversial nature of the program I felt it was the thing we should do.

We have followed through and kept up with the progress of this program. Let me say to you that has been remarkable. In my judgment it is proceeding along the lines that we intended. I am encouraged by the progress made thus far. There have been difficulties, to be sure. Many problems still have to be worked out, and many of them have been worked out. But as the declaration of policy states so positively and specifically, this program requires the cooperation of other countries if it is going to be successful, and we are making good progress toward that objective.

SPACE RADIO COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE

In the fall of last year, I had the great honor of being designated by the Speaker of this great body to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Space Radio Communication Conference held in Geneva, Switzerland, from October 7, 1963, through November 8, 1963. Our esteemed colleague on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, ABNER W. SIBAL, was designated to serve together with me on that delegation, and my good friend and committee colleague, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, was present as an observer during part of the time.

Technically the Space Radio Conference is known as the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunication Union to Allocate Frequency Bands for Space Radio Communications. More specifically, the purpose of that Conference was to secure agreement internationally with respect to the allocation of frequencies in the radio spectrum for satellite communications, space research, navigational satellites, meteorological satellites, telecommand, telemetry, tracking of space vehicles; amateur radio, and radio astronomy.

The importance which the United States attached to that Conference was demonstrated by the composition and size of the U.S. delegation as well as the careful preparations which had gone into the formulation of the U.S. proposals to that Conference.

Our delegation of some 30 persons from Government agencies, the Congress, industry and academic life was led by Mr. Joseph H. McConnell who had been given the status of a U.S. Ambassador. Mr. McConnell, at present president of Reynolds Metals Inc., has had extensive experience in the field of communications while serving from 1941 until 1949 as executive vice president of RCA-Victor, and as president of NBC until 1953. To assist him in connection with foreign policy matters, Ambassador Jacob D. Beam, a career diplomat with extensive experience in dealing with Iron Curtain countries, was assigned as one of the two Vice Chairmen of the delegation. T. A. M. Craven, a former FCC Commissioner, with extensive background in international telecommunications matters

was the second Vice Chairman of the delegation.

Outstanding technical experts and veterans in international telecommunications negotiations such as, William H. Watkins, Harry Fine, Wilfred Dean, Jr., Paul D. Miles, and Carl W. Loeber, were the U.S. spokesmen on important Conference committees. A satellite policy group consisting of Chairman Henry of the FCC, Mr. Gilbert Carter of the State Department, Dr. Joseph V. Charyk, president, and Leonard H. Marks, director of the Communications Satellite Corp., was in constant touch with the delegates of the 70 other nations attending the Conference. Their assignment was to familiarize these delegates with the U.S. plan for a global satellite system open to all nations wishing to participate.

The delegates whom I have named and numerous others, under the superb leadership of Mr. McConnell, worked untiringly, to bring about the successful conclusion of the Conference which the late President Kennedy only 2 days before his tragic death characterized as "one of the most successful of its kind held in recent times."

President Kennedy's statement was made on November 20, 2 days before his assassination, when he received a report from Mr. McConnell on the Geneva Conference. I insert at this point President Kennedy's statement as a part of my remarks:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I received a report today from Mr. Joseph McConnell, Chairman of the U.S. delegation at the recent Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference on Space Communications held in Geneva by the International Telecommunication Union. This Conference has been one of the most successful of its kind held in recent times. Mr. McConnell is commended for the outstanding leadership which he gave to the American delegation and for his many contributions to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

The Conference allocated frequencies for communications satellites and adopted procedures governing their use, thus clearing the way for the establishment of an efficient global communications system. The Conference also allocated frequencies for meteorological and navigational satellites, space research, and radio astronomy.

This Government and the U.S. Communications Satellite Corp. can now take practical steps, in cooperation with other governments and foreign business entities, to develop a single global commercial space communications system. It continues to be the policy of the United States that all countries which wish to participate in the ownership, management, and use of this system will have an opportunity to do so.

Aside from the many political, economic, and social benefits, effective satellite communications can improve international understanding by providing a broad new channel for the flow of information between peoples.

The many delegations which participated in the important work of this Conference are to be congratulated on its successful outcome.

The Conference agreed to set aside 2,800 megacycles for communications satellite services. The United States had proposed 2,725 megacycles while the Soviet proposal was limited to 1,600 megacycles.

For the most part, the Soviet proposal was in frequency bands different from those proposed by the United States. Only 800 megacycles were common to both proposals.

Under these circumstances, it is most gratifying that the 2,800 megacycles agreed to by the Conference include four 500 megacycle bands which were contained in the U.S. proposal.

I believe we may be justified in speculating that the Soviet's willingness actively to work for a compromise at the Conference is due to their intention to offer keen competition to the United States and the free world in the communications satellite field.

At the Geneva Conference, the Soviet delegates remained noncommittal on the question of their willingness to participate in a global satellite system. In the spring of 1963, the U.S. Government had sent a communication to Moscow outlining the U.S. plans for a global communications satellite system and inviting the Soviet to participate. The Soviet Government replied that the plans were premature. When the question was reopened informally with the Soviet at the Geneva Conference, the official Soviet policy position remained unchanged, although there seemed to be considerable interest in the U.S. plans on the part of some of the Soviet technicians.

Incidentally, it should be mentioned that almost all of the delegations, other than our own, consisted exclusively of technicians attached to their respective telephone and telegraph administrations. This, again, is proof of our own policy of considering an early satellite communications system, a vital national objective within the framework of our foreign policy.

Apart from the question of the number of frequencies to be allocated for space communications, the Conference was called upon to consider the procedure to govern the use of the frequencies thus allocated. Several countries, including the Soviet, held out for provisional use only of the allocated frequencies pending a future planning conference. The U.S. position was that the use of the frequencies had to be sufficiently definitive to permit long-range planning and major investments in a global communications satellite system. Many of the nations represented at the Conference feared that the major nations with present satellite capacity might preempt the allocated frequencies, thus leaving the less developed and smaller nations in the position in which they find themselves now with regard to frequencies utilized for other radio services. The position of these nations was supported by a proposal submitted by the International Frequency Registration Board, a permanent organ of the International Telecommunications Union. The Board's proposal called for a future planning conference to decide on the definitive use of the frequencies which, under the Board's proposal, would be allocated only provisionally by the present Conference.

Let me deviate for one moment to say that I spent the better part of 1 day at Geneva visiting the splendid office

building of the International Telecommunications Union, where I had occasion to observe some of the operations of the International Frequency Registration Board. It is the function of the Board to keep up-to-date records of radio frequencies used by member nations and to advise such nations of any actual or potential interference which might be caused by such use. In order to discharge this function effectively, the Board has available to it the most modern electronic computers. It is my understanding that here at home there are plans underway of making similar use of computers for purposes of more effective national spectrum management. It is my hope that these plans can be carried forward, and I shall support these efforts to the best of my ability.

Now, let us come back to the proposal of the International Frequency Registration Board at the Geneva Conference. Our delegation protested the Board's authority to submit recommendations of this kind. The proposal was formally withdrawn. Nevertheless, the existence of such a proposal made more difficult our position at the Conference that the allocated frequencies should be made available for immediate use. Thanks only to the diligent efforts on the part of our delegation to persuade other nations they they, too, would stand to benefit from the establishment of an early system, did the Conference reach the decision permitting immediate use rather than provisional use of the allocated frequencies.

Communications satellites formed an important background at the Conference.

At the beginning of the Conference an exchange of greetings between the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the International Telecommunications Union was televised via Telstar. This event was witnessed by the Conference delegates in Geneva.

At the close of the Conference, a world's first occurred when Mr. McConnell reported from Geneva via Syncom satellite on the results of the Conference to Government officials and press representatives assembled in Washington, and answered questions submitted by them via satellite.

Syncom II, which was built by Hughes Aircraft Co., under contract with NASA, was launched on July 26, 1963. Syncom I, launched about 5 months earlier, ceased transmitting signals upon reaching orbit.

Syncom II is in approximately synchronous orbit over Brazil at an altitude of about 22,000 miles. During the Conference, arrangements were made to permit delegates to the Conference to speak via Syncom from the Conference site with persons in the Delegates' Lounge in the United Nations Building in New York and in the NASA Headquarters building in Washington.

The USNS *Kingsport* which was docked in Rota, Spain, served as the European terminal of the satellite circuit, while the U.S. Army station in Lakehurst, N.J., was the U.S. terminal.

So we had telephone conversations and a press interview via about 1,100 miles

of telephone lines, and 22,000 miles up to Syncom and 22,000 down from the satellite. In view of this historic first, I insert at this point in the RECORD a transcript of the world's first press interview via satellite:

**DEMONSTRATION OF SYNCOM SATELLITE WITH
TRANSOCEANIC NEWS CONFERENCE
PARTICIPANTS**

Geneva, Switzerland: Ambassador Joseph McConnell, Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the International Telecommunications Union.

Washington, D.C.: Leonard Jaffe, Director, Communication and Navigation Programs Division, Office of Space Science and Applications, NASA; E. William Henry, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Department of State; G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State; Dr. Joseph Charyk, president, Communications Satellite Corp.; Joseph McRoberts, public affairs officer, Office of Public Services and Information, NASA.

McROBERTS. As you know, this news conference was called to give you newsmen an opportunity to interview Ambassador Joseph McConnell, Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the International Telecommunications Union, which is now wrapping up its activities in a meeting in Geneva.

We will have short briefings in Washington on the methods of transmission, via the Syncom satellite. Then we will hear introductory briefings, these will be short, on the meaning of the ITU meaning to the United States internationally and economically.

From there we will go directly to Ambassador McConnell, via Syncom. We will have about 5 minutes in which he will announce the latest developments, and then, gentlemen, you may commence your questions. Ambassador McConnell will have Gilbert Carter of the State Department. I don't know whether these gentlemen will answer any questions or not. These are the gentlemen who will be on hand in Geneva.

He will have with him Tam Craven and Ambassador Jacob Beam. Both of these are Mr. McConnell's principal assistants. And also Mr. William Watkins, of the Federal Communications Commission.

When recognized, each newsmen will walk to the right front, where Jack Howard from Goddard Space Flight Center will take you into the control room. There Stewart Ayers is on the telephone and will give you the telephone. Please identify yourself and then ask your question.

We have these two speakers. Remember, there will be a good many who will want to talk to the Ambassador, so try to make it brief on any followup questions. If one question will do it, let it go at one question. I would like to let everyone who has a question be able to ask it. So please don't come back for seconds until everyone has had a chance.

After Ambassador McConnell ends his conference, these gentlemen that you see in front will be glad to answer any questions you may have on the implications of the ITU Conference on their organizations.

I would like to introduce the gentlemen on my left. Leonard Jaffe is Director of Communication and Navigation Programs Division, Office of Space Science and Applications, NASA.

E. William Henry, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Department of State; G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State; and Dr. Joseph Charyk, president, Communications Satellite Corp.

We have Leonard Marx in the audience, one of the Communications Satellite Corp.'s men.

Mr. Jaffe, I wonder if you would like to begin.

JAFFE. Gentlemen, I would like to tell you about the Syncom demonstration that will be involved in this interview, where the satellite is, and precisely what will be going on during the time in which you are talking with Ambassador McConnell.

The Syncom satellite, as you know, was launched on July 26 of this year, and since July 17, approximately, it has been roughly stationary in an orbit which makes it stationary over this position on the Equator over Brazil. The satellite, because it is not in a truly equatorial orbit but in an inclined orbit, moves north and south of the equator.

The ship, USNS *Kingsport* [not printed in RECORD], originally stationed in Nigeria for the early portions of the Syncom program, has been exercised at sea. It has been communicating with the satellite while at sea. Recently the ship has been stationed in Rota, Spain. From Rota we have run telephone lines to Geneva. The other end of this circuit is the Lakehurst station in New Jersey, and we have roughly 200 or 300 miles worth of telephone line between there and Washington.

So we have about 1,100 miles worth of telephone line in this circuit. This is conventional telephone line. And 22,000 miles up to the satellite, and 22,000 miles back from the satellite.

The satellite at the time that you will be talking over the satellite is roughly in this position and headed to the north. You may ask why didn't we hold this Conference a little bit earlier. When the satellite is at its southern excursion, we cannot see the satellite from the present ship position in Spain, therefore we had to wait until this time to start this conversation. You can see that as the satellite goes further north, the distance to the satellite becomes less and communications get better all the time we stall this thing. We won't stall any longer than 3:30.

The Syncom satellite is the satellite that you see here. [Not printed in the RECORD.] It has not moved from that present position, the position that we finally stopped it at on July 17 by more than half a degree since that date and has been operating most satisfactorily.

I think that is all that I have to say.

McROBERTS. Mr. Cleveland?

Question. You used the date of July 17 when it became stationary, and it was launched July 26.

JAFFE. I am sorry. August 17.

CLEVELAND. Let me say a couple of things about where this Conference fits in the stream of bureaucratic and diplomatic history. The story starts, as well as anywhere, with the President's speech to the United Nations 2 years ago, in which he said that the cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war. He went on to propose, among other things, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph, telephone, radio, and television. He also proposed cooperative efforts to do something more through the use of new technology in space with weather prediction and eventual weather control.

He also proposed prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space, and the reservation of outer space for peaceful purposes.

A resolution passed at that same session of the Assembly, 1961—this was a major initiative of course of the President, one of the major initiatives he took in the Assembly that year—that resolution said in effect that there would be no nationalism in space, that in spite of the fact that the Soviets had just planted a flag on the moon

here a little before, they agreed that they wouldn't appropriate and everybody agreed that they won't appropriate celestial bodies or try to appropriate space for national purposes.

The General Assembly told the various specialized organizations involved with weather and communications matters to get on with their parts of the general scheme of things, in effect, that the President had recommended, and set up a hierarchy of committees to worry about this whole problem.

Since that time there has been really a very great deal of activity. The negotiations and discussions went on continuously on a bilateral basis between Dr. Dryden and Academician Blagonravov and among other things talked about the possible cooperation in the field of the use of passive satellites—Echo.

At a world meteorological organization meeting last spring a project for a world weather watch was set up. Essentially the thing there is that you can, given picture-taking satellites and looking at the weather from on top as well as below, given faster and ampler communication facilities, including the communication satellites coming up, and given fast computers, these three different new kinds of technology, it is going to be possible for the first time to draw a world weather map, and a proposal for working up to that over a period of several years has been worked up in the world meteorological organization, again on American initiative.

Meanwhile the political atmosphere was warming up a good deal. The Soviets have stopped clobbering us on observation from space. They have agreed of course to the test ban, including the high level tests in space. They have agreed to a resolution declaring that bombs will not be placed in orbit. They have essentially dropped the criticism of Westford, the so-called needles in space.

We are in the final throes in New York of developing agreement among all of the countries, including the Soviet Union, on a new and broader set of legal principles in the use of outer space, and much of this will be summarized and brought to public attention through the debate on outer space in the United Nations that will start about 10 days or 2 weeks from now, perhaps a little earlier than that.

On the communications side, the story of course, the thread runs through the legislation passed last year on communication satellites, the setting up of the Satellite Corp., and the appointment of its executives, including Joe Charyk here; the informal consultation that has taken place with Europeans and others, mostly by the Satellite Corp., and last but not least, the actual placement up there of Telstar, Relay, and Syncom.

Sometimes those of us who are working on the institutional part of this almost forget to remember that what is making it all possible is the people who are getting these instruments up there to begin with. The Space Radio Conference is the latest step in this rather complex effort. It started with the President's U.N. speech in 1961 to make the most of the international possibilities for peace of the new technologies that are developing in the space program.

The Space Radio Conference itself has the job, the crucial job without which a lot of other things can't be done, of getting an international agreement on the allocation of frequency bands for a number of purposes, including experimentation in communication satellites themselves, and making regulations for the use of those frequencies.

Our delegation has been headed by Joseph McConnell, who is president of Reynolds Aluminum Co., assisted, as you have heard,

by Jacob Beam, former Ambassador to Poland, who is actually assigned to the disarmament agency at the moment, and Tam Craven, a former Federal Communications Commissioner.

I will leave to Griff Johnson the description of the substance of what has been going on at the Conference itself.

McROBERTS. I would just like to inform you that we have been informed by Ambassador McConnell that he is going to have to leave at 4 o'clock, on time. This reinforces this business of making your stuff short when you ask your questions.

JOHNSON. It is pretty obvious, I guess, that this question of space radio communication is at the center of all of these developments in outer space, and it is equally clear that if we are going to have effective radio communication in space that there have to be clear and orderly regulations and agreements as to how the limited spectrum can be used.

For this purpose there have been in past years a number of extensive and very complicated agreements as to the use of the spectrum for purposes of radio. These have taken place under the auspices of the International Telecommunication Union, which is one of the U.N. specialized agencies with somewhere around 120 members at the moment.

The new developments in space, and particularly this gadget here and those like it, have presented some very new and difficult problems with respect to this international regulation of the use of the limited facilities. The Conference that is just closing in Geneva now, the purpose of this was to deal with this very difficult and technically complex task of getting an agreement among 80-odd nations in the world as to how these new scientific developments were going to be worked into these limited facilities.

This task was, of course, complicated by the fact that most of the useful radio spectrum is already occupied by what is euphemistically known as terrestrial services. So the Conference has had to deal with a sort of reallocating of some of the spectrum that has now been devoted to other purposes and allocating the balance of it among the new areas of space research, radio astronomy, communication satellites, aeronautical space communications, weather, and navigation satellites.

Provision has also been made in this agreement for space communication by amateurs as well as for telemetry and command tracking of satellites. In addition to the basic agreements on allocation of the spectrum, the Conference has also taken up and made regulations, agreed upon regulations to govern the use of the allocated frequencies.

I need not dwell on the tremendous importance of this Conference to the United States. It has been the most important Conference in this field in many years. The agreement that is resulting from this Conference will permit the United States, as well as other countries, to go forward with space programs, with the assurance that the space radio communication operations will receive international recognition and will be protected from harmful interference. Without this agreement, and particularly an agreement on satisfactory terms, Dr. Charyk, for example, and his corporation would have been in great difficulty in moving ahead.

I would like to emphasize one other point that Mr. Cleveland made, and that is that the preparations for this Conference have been going on for well over 2 years. They have been going on in several different fields and levels. There has been an extensive intergovernmental interagency group that has been working on the technical aspects, together with representatives of the private industries and corporations in this field.

There have also been many bilateral and multilateral conversations at the technical level with other countries that are active.

Finally, there have been, particularly during the last year, a great many bilateral and multilateral conversations with other countries dealing with the political problems that are involved in the issues before the Conference in order to pave the way for a successful conclusion.

I think that it is fair to say that on the basis of what we know at the moment, from the technical standpoint as well as from the standpoint of our general foreign policy and national policy objectives, that the Conference is coming to a very successful and gratifying conclusion. The American delegation, headed by Ambassador McConnell, is deserving of very great praise indeed.

McROBERTS. Thank you, sir.

I see we are ready. We are open for questions. Who wants to ask questions of Geneva?

JOHN FINNEY (New York Times). I can't ask any questions because I don't know what the agreement is.

McROBERTS. Excuse me, we are not open for questions.

We are going to Ambassador McConnell.

Ambassador McCONNELL. It is most fitting that a communication satellite is being used to transmit this report on the result of the Space Radio Communication Conference in Geneva.

The final acts will be signed in a few minutes. Orderly development and operation of the space programs of the United States and other nations will depend in large measure on the agreements reached by this Conference. Adequate communications, protected from harmful interference, are essential to continued progress.

I will now report to you on the decisions reached by the Conference.

The Conference dealt with communication satellites, space research, meteorological satellites, navigational satellites, radio astronomy, space activities of the amateurs, and aeronautical space services.

In addition, the Conference established regulations and notification procedures for utilizing the allocations as well as technical criteria for frequency sharing. Details of the specific frequency bands allocated for each of the services are available in Washington for those of you who wish to have complete technical data.

Taking up the subjects in order:

Communication satellites: The proposal of the United States for allocations for the communication-satellite service was for 2725 MC/S. The United Kingdom, France, and other countries made proposals similar to ours. The proposal of the U.S.S.R. was for approximately 1600 MC/S, but in frequency bands different from those proposed by us. Only 800 MC/S were common in the two proposals. The Conference has agreed to an allocation of 2800 MC/S, of which 2000 (consisting of four 500 MC/S bands) were included in our original proposal. Our engineers and scientists believe that this allocation should be sufficient to accommodate anticipated traffic growth until the period 1975-80.

Space research: The Conference has recognized that space research has a vital need for protected frequencies. Although we were not able to obtain agreement in all cases on worldwide exclusive allocations for space research, a reasonably satisfactory compromise, which varies in details from band to band, has been achieved, including bands used for the minitrack network and deep space research. We believe that the programs of all nations, including both manned and unmanned space research programs, can proceed satisfactorily insofar as their frequency needs are concerned.

Meteorological satellites: The Conference has made allocations for the meteorological-satellite service which promises to be of benefit to the entire world. The various programs in this field, both national and international, such as the Worldwide Weather Watch program of the WMO, can move forward.

Navigational satellites: Exclusive allocations have been made, along the line of our proposals, for a new navigational-satellite service which should prove to be of substantial assistance to the navigators of all nations.

Radio astronomy: As you know, the worldwide scientific community was most anxious that this Conference adequately protect radio astronomy. The decisions made in this field are of great significance, in particular the agreement reached to clear the 1400-1427 MC/S band for exclusive worldwide use in radio astronomy. This is the famous hydrogen line bend through which the astronomers obtain such valuable information about the universe. The band had been allocated to radio astronomy at the 1959 Geneva Radio Conference, subject, however, to reservations by a number of Soviet bloc countries. They have now agreed that radio astronomy should have worldwide exclusivity in the band.

As you know, the FCC recently decided that in the United States, TV channel 37 (608-614 MC/S) should be reserved exclusively for radio astronomy for a 10-year period. I am happy to report that the FCC decision assisted the Conference in making significant progress on a broad international basis with respect to this channel.

The Western Hemisphere countries, with the simple exception of Cuba, have agreed that for 10 years this band should be used for radio astronomy. To reach agreement it was necessary for many countries to make concessions.

In addition, the status of several of the bands allocated to radio astronomy by footnote at the 1959 conference was considerably improved, varying in detail from band to band.

Space activities of the amateurs: Satellite experimentation by radio amateurs, as typified in the Oscar 1 and Oscar 2 programs, has received recognition by the Conference through the allocation of the band 144-146 MC/S. Although the International Amateur Radio Union would have preferred similar privileges in other bands as well, the value of the amateur experimental work and the widespread interest it has created has been recognized by the Conference.

Aeronautical space services: I am pleased to say that satisfactory provisions were made for aeronautical space services.

Regulations and notification procedures for utilizing the allocations made by the Conference: A particularly difficult issue arose in connection with the matter of regulations governing the use of the allocated frequencies. Several countries proposed that the use of frequencies allocated at this Conference should be considered as provisional pending a future planning conference. In our judgment, the regulations had to be sufficiently definitive to permit the long-range planning and major investment involved in many of our space programs, in particular the communications satellite program.

I wish to report that in the opinion of the delegation the issue was satisfactorily resolved. The allocation of frequency bands and the regulation of their use were effectively established. They are always subject to modification by such future conferences as might be called by the ITU. No new element of impermanency has been added.

Technical criteria: The key to satisfactory space service allocations, particularly the communication satellite program, was the

technical feasibility of space services sharing some of the bands presently allocated to terrestrial communications. The Conference has agreed on technical standards and criteria permitting this sharing. This will permit orderly, simultaneous development of all kinds of communication services without causing harmful interference.

Although, as you know, this was a technical conference and the agenda was limited to frequency allocations and related technical matters, it does have great significance for our commercial communication satellite program. The policy of the United States, established by the President and reflected in the Communication Satellite Act of 1962, is that a commercial communication satellite service should be organized as a single global system with nondiscriminatory access to all nations. During the Conference, members of the delegation explained informally to many delegates of other nations, U.S. policy in this field. Fears had been expressed by a number of the smaller countries that the major space powers of the world would somehow preempt the frequencies allocated by the Conference and thus prevent small-nation participation in a global system. Efforts were made to allay these fears by explaining that the allocations for communication satellites are properly viewed as having been made for the benefit of all nations.

My comments would not be complete if I did not express publicly the recognition due to all members of the delegation, including Ambassador Beam, Commander Craven, Mr. Henry (Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission), and Dr. Charyk (President of the Communications Satellite Corp.).

We also are greatly indebted to those Members of Congress on our delegation, including Mr. HARRIS (chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives), Senators HARTKE and CORTON, and Representatives SIBAL and SPRINGER, whose support meant so much to the delegates.

All of us will agree, however, that the persons who made the greatest contribution to our efforts were the Government industry advisers on the delegation. They are the technical experts and scientists whose work began 2 years before the Conference and who continued their dedicated devotion through the long and tedious hours of this 5-week Conference.

Finally, all delegations are most grateful for the fine leadership shown by the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Gunnar Pedersen of Denmark.

Thank you.

AYERS. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

We now open this meeting to questions by gentlemen of the press.

McROBERTS. Gentlemen?

VERN HAUGLAND (Associated Press). Mr. Ambassador, what arrangements are made for policing this agreement? What penalties are provided?

Ambassador McCONNELL. It has always been under the regulations of the ITU. No different provisions have been inserted in this Conference from those which have always been provided. It is a rather complicated notification procedure by which someone who uses the service first sends in his notification to the appropriate ITU authorities and thereafter there are rather complicated procedures for keeping other people from interfering with the service which originally used the frequency.

EARL ABRAMS (Broadcasting magazine). I understand that there was some discussion about broadcasting directly from satellites to home receivers.

Ambassador McCONNELL. Yes.

ABRAMS. Can you tell us something about it, and what happened?

Ambassador McCONNELL. You perhaps saw the proposal which the United States—I believe as a matter of fact the U.S.S.R.—proposed that we continue to experiment with utilization of satellites for direct broadcasting. The French proposed a prohibition against direct broadcasting coming perhaps from their experience, as you know, from the old, so-called pirating ships outside of France.

The general proposal we made was adopted and the French, after some discussion, I think, saw the overall wisdom of it and withdrew their complete prohibition.

ABRAMS. Thank you.

TOM MALRA (Telecommunications Report). Mr. Ambassador, in reaching this agreement, did the United States give up any frequencies which are important to us domestically or militarily?

Ambassador McCONNELL. No.

LOUIS DEROCHE (French News Agency). Mr. Ambassador, was there much Soviet interest in active American communication satellites? Have the Russians been delaying any Syncom programs in the past?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I am sorry I didn't understand that question.

DEROCHE. Mr. Ambassador, is there much Soviet interest in active American communications satellites?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I don't know that I can say that there is. We exposed them to certain portions of our program, and I think they are interested. I couldn't say the extent of their interest at this time.

JOHN FINNEY (New York Times). Mr. Ambassador, following up the earlier question here, do any of the frequencies which are now being allocated for communications satellites fall within the bands which have been used by the United States or the Soviet Union for military radar or tropospheric scatter radio communications?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I have a fine technical expert with me. I think I know the answer, but I think I will let him address himself to that. He is Mr. Watkins, of the Federal Communications staff.

WATKINS. Mr. Finney, the answer to your question is "Yes," some of the bands involved in the agreement coming out of this Conference do involve bands occupied by radar and/or tropospheric scatter.

We have, however, in the process of arriving at this agreement, established what I would term mutual safeguards so that there will be no problems that we can foresee which will deter the implementation of the allocation.

FINNEY. Thank you.

HENRY SIMMONS (Newsweek magazine). Mr. Ambassador, I understand that the extraordinary Conference did not consider the question of the recommendation by the ITU technical committee against any satellite relay system requiring more than about 0.5 second delay in communications. I wonder why this was not taken up at this particular Conference.

Also, I would like to ask your own reaction to the Syncom system we are using now, as to whether it involves any real delay or difficulty in communication.

Ambassador McCONNELL. I will try to answer the second question first, if I may, sir.

So far as we are concerned, we are getting along fine on this. We hear you on time, and I hope you hear us on time. We have no difficulty with it at all and I hope you don't.

SIMMONS. No, sir.

Ambassador McCONNELL. So far as the first part of your question is concerned, perhaps Mr. Watkins would be kind enough to reply to it.

WATKINS. I believe the answer to the question is simply that it would be outside of the scope of the agenda of this Conference to have gone into any detailed examination of that particular question. It is the type of question that is presently under study by the CCIR and the CCITT, the two technical advisory groups which are permanent units of the ITU.

This would not be at this Conference the proper forum for a highly technical discussion of that kind.

SIMMONS. Thank you, sir.

JOSEPH MYLER (United Press International). Mr. Ambassador, you speak of a new navigational satellite service which should be of assistance to the navigators of all nations. Do you refer to something new that is coming up in the future or to the work this country already is doing along that line?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I will let Mr. Watkins answer that, if I may.

WATKINS. The answer to that question is that the allocations which have been adopted by the Conference provide for two different technical approaches to the radio navigation problem. One of those approaches is based on the Navy's Transit program, and the other is a radio sextant type of approach involving different frequencies. We think that both have possibilities.

MYLER. Thank you, sir.

ROBERT TOTH (Los Angeles Times). Mr. Ambassador, it seems that we got most of what we wanted on the communications satellites and on radio astronomy. What did the Russians get out of agreeing to these things?

Ambassador McCONNELL. Of course, I can't really answer that. All I know is that the Conference started out with some 70 nations here, and this is what we agreed upon. One of the nations which agreed to our credences which were allocated to the communications satellite probe was the Russians. I don't think any of our folks here, certainly not I, would try to presume to suggest to you what the Russians expect they got out of it.

TOTH. Thank you.

STEWART LOORY (New York Herald Tribune). Mr. Ambassador, following up Mr. Toth's question, we were told specifically that the Russians were asking for frequencies for use in communicating with their astronauts and in recovering spacecraft. Did they get those frequencies that they wanted?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I will let Mr. Watkins answer that for you.

WATKINS. The distress frequency problem was one of the more difficult ones for this Conference, even though it did not involve a large number of frequencies. The manner in which it was resolved was to agree to a 20-megacycle distress frequency which had not heretofore been available for that purpose.

The other frequencies requested by the U.S.S.R., however, were not adopted by the Conference, and in lieu of that a resolution was adopted which, in effect, makes a modification of the radio regulations to make available all of the existing distress and emergency frequencies which are provided for in the 1959 radio regulations.

For example, 121.5 megacycles is a familiar number in aeronautical circles.

LOORY. Thank you very much.

JOHN FINNEY (New York Times). Mr. Ambassador, I would like to come back to one passage in your statement here that is a little bit unclear, and that is the question of assignment of these frequencies, and you said this issue was satisfactorily resolved. I wonder if you could elaborate on what the resolution was of this question.

Ambassador McCONNELL. There were several proposals which came from several

sources, including the U.S.S.R. and others, to try to indicate in general terms that this Conference and its work would be on a provisional interim basis. You can understand this because many of the countries here were not as prepared as perhaps some of the rest of us were in the overall space communications field, and we had quite a little discussion about this problem.

In general, what we did was to confirm the present notification procedure, but to indicate that in the future there would be further conferences on the subject, as of course there would be naturally whether we indicated that or not, and that is the way the matter was resolved. I do not think there was any real change in the existing notification procedure except insofar as change was needed to fit them to the problems of the space programs involved.

FINNEY. One other quick point. Where are you now?

Ambassador McCONNELL. I am in the Batiment Electoral, which is where the Conference was held, and in a few minutes I have got to go down and, I hope, sign the final documents.

FINNEY. Thank you.

EARL ABRAMS (Broadcasting magazine). Mr. McConnell, in the bands that were assigned for satellite communication, are they broad enough to handle television?

Ambassador McCONNELL. Yes, sir.

ABRAMS. Thank you.

AYERS. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador. I hope you get back to that other meeting in time.

Ambassador McCONNELL. We are going to have to do that. Thank you very much.

McROBERTS. Gentlemen, before we start any question period, do you want to ask any gentleman here present what has transpired?

JAFFEE. I was just asked to tell you why it was so much better now than when we started. I really don't know, except that I did point out at the outset that as the satellite moves farther north, and it has moved considerably farther north during this half-hour interval, the satellite is closer to the station and we do get a stronger signal at the station, so that consequently things get better as the satellite moves farther north. This may account for part of the reason, but I am not sure that it is all of it.

We do have, as I pointed out, 1,100 miles worth of land line in this circuit, and it has not been the easiest thing in the world to keep clean, either.

McROBERTS. Would anyone like to ask any of the gentlemen here questions?

Question. I am not quite clear, when you allocate frequencies like this—I guess this might be directed to Mr. Charyk—does this mean that the United States has a certain block for itself, or does this mean that anyone in the world can use this for this specific purpose? How do you, in the Communications Satellite Corp., get the frequencies that you specifically want?

CHARYK. In the radio regulations chart adopted, certain frequencies are adopted for certain kinds of services, so that, for example, 3,700 to 4,200 megacycles will now be listed as being used for communications from satellite to earth. In certain cases there will be different allocations made, depending upon the regions of the world that are involved.

In certain cases the regulations will show certain allocations in the Eastern Hemisphere. That means that these frequencies are capable of use for the purposes which are assigned. If a country then proposes to use these frequencies for a specific system or specific installation, then they have to go through certain notification and registry procedures indicating their intentions to do so and how they propose to use these frequencies. These are filed then with the International Frequency Registration Board

and become then a matter of permanent record.

Question. Is it possible, then, that you could ask for all of the frequencies that are now allotted? How would this be apportioned between countries?

CHARYK. You would have to justify your request. In other words, you would have to detail the type of an installation that you propose to make, and why. It requires all of those frequencies.

Furthermore, there are time limitations on when you must file. In other words, you can't file today and say that in the next 10 years I might want to use these frequencies. You have to have very specific plans and there is a certain time period ahead of which you cannot file, ahead of the date in which you are going to go into operation. In the case of the communications satellite business, it is set up as 2 years which is the time period that you need to actually get the system into being, so that 2 years before you expect to have your installation in being you will have had to have filed, with the technical characteristics of your system, and actually there are specific items requested in carrying out your notification. That is, filed with the IFRB, so-called.

Question. Suppose the Russians should put up their own communications satellite system. How do you divide this particular 2,800 megacycles up between what they might use and what you might use? Is there any provision for this?

CHARYK. They would have to file the specific technical characteristics of their system, and it is a kind of a first come first served arrangement. In other words, if they can justify their proposed usage, and satisfy the IFRB that this is consistent with the rules and regulations, and they have carried out proper coordination with other countries, then they are assigned those frequencies for that use. And if another country now wants to come in and operate in the frequency band, they will have to use alternate frequencies or other frequencies.

HENRY. I think we should add to that, though, that the whole effort at the Conference was to get sufficient frequencies, in particular for the communications satellite system, so that this problem would not arise. We certainly do not expect that it will arise, particularly in view of the fact that the IFRB acts as the clearinghouse. There must be coordination procedures in the first place. You can't just grab the frequency without coordinating it. That is one thing that was established. It is expected that those coordination procedures will allow the individual countries to work out their different problems.

Then, further, the IFRB will be a clearinghouse, plus the fact that we do have a considerable number of frequencies here, we think, for some time to come.

Question. Is this Board anything more than a clearinghouse? Does it have authority to say "No, you may not have that frequency"; or, "Yes, you may have it"; and does its decision then represent sort of the international agreement of the ITU?

HENRY. Ultimately, it does not have this power. This, of course, is retained by each sovereign state. It can be called on to use its good offices—it is probably a term of art and probably inapplicable here—but at least to be a coordination and clearinghouse.

CLEVELAND. There is an international agreement to use it in effect.

HENRY. Yes.

Question. Are the number of frequencies so large that you could have two or three worldwide systems?

CHARYK. Actually, the frequencies that we requested were largely based on our best estimates of what would be required to handle satellite traffic through 1980. We did take the best estimates we could on

what the growth would be on message traffic, data traffic, television traffic, and our frequency request was based on that.

CLEVELAND. For a global system.

CHARYK. For a global system to handle all of the traffic of this type throughout the world. We hope, of course, that this can be done through a single system.

Question. Does anyone here have, as Ambassador McConnell suggested, a breakdown of the frequency allocations agreed upon at Geneva? He said they would be available here in Washington.

HENRY. I think the State Department would have it in sort of cable by cable, but we, I think, will have to wait until it is all put together and issue it, I would assume.

Question. That is very important. We need to get what the satellite bandwidths are.

HENRY. I can check that for you. We may have this cable by cable, too, but we don't know what the exact modifications are.

Question. Can you tell us whether these are shared or are exclusive in space service?

HENRY. I couldn't tell you offhand which was which. I think we will have to get something up on it. I would assume our people will be home next week.

Question. Mr. Johnson is over there. Do you know whether these were shared or exclusive?

CHARYK. In the communications satellite area they are shared with microwave radio relay links, with the possible exception of two 50-megacycle bands.

Question. Can you give us an idea of the capacity of 2,800 megacycles, how many voice channels or television channels it will handle at once?

CHARYK. It would be adequate to handle something like 8,000 to 9,000 2-way voice channels and perhaps 4 duplex television circuits.

Question. In other words, each one of those 500 magacycle bands would also handle 1 television channel?

CHARYK. Oh, many, many. More than that.

Question. How would they do that?

JAFFEE. Before you go on, I think there is a misunderstanding about the amount of space here, and this relates to the question of how many people can really use it. Hopefully there will only be one system. The amount of space theoretically can provide over 500 television channels, and 600 times that many telephone calls. So that there is a lot of space and a lot of room for expansion, depending on the kind of system that is evolved.

Question. You said 500 TV broadcasts?

JAFFEE. This is a theoretical limit. You can't approach that practically right now.

Question. I just wanted the numbers. Or 600 times that many telephone conversations?

JAFFEE. One way.

McROBERTS. I wonder if we can get Mr. Nelson to clear up this allocation.

NELSON. Mr. Sterns of my office has this. We have six or seven pages of it. We don't know precisely whether it is complete until we get the final document. But this is what we have gotten from our cables. We would be glad to answer any specific questions to the best of our ability from any of the correspondents here whenever they wish to ask them, although it might be better after the general questions have been answered.

Question. It is not possible to say so many in such a band up so much, down, as you did in your original proposal?

CHARYK. Yes. The major bands of interest here are four bands of 500, of which two are up and two are down.

Question. What does that mean?

CHARYK. Satellite to earth and earth to satellite. In addition, there are 800 megacycles which were not in our original proposal

which have also been adopted for communication satellite use on a shared basis.

Question. Can you give us those four bands, sir?

CHARYK. The specific numbers?

Question. Yes.

CHARYK. 3,700 to 4,200 satellite to earth; 5,925 to 6,425 earth to satellite; 7,250 to 7,750 satellite to earth; 7,900 to 8,400, earth to satellite. That is in megacycles per second.

Question. Was there any indication that the Russians said they would or would not tie into our system? Was anything said about that at all?

CHARYK. They were rather noncommittal on the subject. We discussed the thing in a very general way several times. They are certainly interested in the subject, but were very definitely noncommittal.

Question. May I ask another question along the same lines?

There were reports that there were a group of British companies that seemed to be interested in forming a satellite communications corporation. Can you tell us about that?

CHARYK. Our aim of course is to have a single system to handle all of the world's traffic on an arrangement whereby the various countries would be able to participate in the ownership and use of the system. We have had preliminary discussions with a great many countries as to their association and interest in such a system.

Question. Can you say anything about the report that there is a British group that is planning to do something?

CHARYK. Our discussions, of course, have been with the British Government agency since the telecommunications in Great Britain are handled by the General Post Office.

There are a number of British companies which are interested in the development of hardware for communications satellite systems, but the operation responsibility would rest with the British Post Office as far as England is concerned.

Question. Mr. Jaffee, let's come back to that theoretical limit. How close are we to achieving that theoretical limit if this thing were to go into operation today?

JAFFEE. I think you can divide those numbers by maybe 50 by today's standards.

Question. Then you are talking about an immensely more powerful satellite signal than anything we have now?

JAFFEE. The technology does not permit approaching these things today, these limits that I have talked about. However, this does still represent many hundreds of channels, many hundreds of television channels worth of capacity, and thousands, literally thousands of telephone channels worth of capacity. So there is a lot of room here.

Question. Is anybody familiar with the additional footnote protection for radio astronomy? To what extent was radio astronomy strengthened in these hydrogen lines?

CHARYK. I think in the hydrogen line area there had been a reservation in the regulations previously, primarily by the bloc countries. They wanted these frequencies shared with other services. At these conferences these reservations were removed.

It is my understanding that we now have agreement worldwide on the exclusive use of those particular frequencies for radio astronomy. That is the 1,400 to 1,427 hydrogen line.

HENRY. The availability of channel 37 also was strengthened in this region, whatever this region is, 1 or 2 I believe it is, with Cuba, I believe he said, being the only one taking reservation to its exclusive use. Before this there was no exclusivity.

Question. I would like to ask Mr. Jaffee if his trained ear detected any difference in the quality of Syncom's performance today and

that of Relay or Telstar, and what the difference was, if any.

JAFFEE. The answer is sort of difficult. You mean today?

Question. Yes.

JAFFEE. Obviously today it was not as good as we would have liked to have had it. I have spoken over Syncom when we were not connected to as much telephone lines as we were today, and I could tell no difference between the quality of that service and any other service.

Question. It was better when you have fewer lines?

JAFFEE. I think this is the case. I think that the contribution today was partly as a result of the amount of line that we had.

Question. Sir, were there echo suppressors in this circuit?

JAFFEE. No, sir. This was what we call a four-wire connection, which artificially avoids the echo problem. In other words, the telephone speaker was connected directly to Ambassador McConnell's earphone, and his speaker was connected directly to your earphone, so that there was no interconnection which would permit an echo, and there was no echo suppressor then necessary in the circuit.

Question. So then this is not really a fair test of the circuit of this length with echo suppression?

JAFFEE. This is a fair test of a circuit in which echo suppression can be adequately achieved. We have reason to believe that echo suppression can be effectively achieved. It is a fair test of time delay alone. In other words, the time delay was involved, the six-tenths of a second up to and back from the satellite was involved.

Question. Dr. Charyk, could you please give an example of the kind of problem you would have had if this Conference hadn't gone so well? Maybe using half the spectrum space. Would it simply be a question of the date? Would it be 1968 instead of 1975 to 1980, that type of thing?

CHARYK. If it was just a question of getting less space than we actually reached, that means we would use it up sooner.

I think a more significant item is the ability to move ahead on a solid foundation. In other words we now have agreement as to the frequencies, we have agreement as to the procedures to be used in utilization of these frequencies. So that there is now a basis for, if you will, an investment based on some assurance that the whole thing isn't going to be upset by another look at the matter in a few years without any positive decisions having been taken here.

Question. On this question of the authority of the ITU, has the United States and the Soviet Union and the rest of the world gone along with the ITU in terrestrial communications and in space astronomy so far? In other words what is their real power and so on?

HENRY. Yes, they are parties to the agreement establishing the ITU and they are members in good standing, dues-paying members of the ITU. It has been entirely satisfactory to date, insofar as coordination and registration procedures are concerned.

Sometimes there hasn't been enough frequency space, and this is one thing, in shortwave radio, for example. This is one reason we wanted to get as much frequency space as possible now for space.

Question. Mr. Cleveland, is it the intention of the United States to ask that some of these frequencies be assigned for a military communications satellite system being developed by the Defense Department?

CLEVELAND. It is not a question of assignment, it is just a question of some of them will be used for that purpose.

Question. This brings us back to this question again of how this goes about, and I

think some of us are still unclear. What do we do? We go to this Board, and we say we are going to take such a band of these frequencies for our own communications satellite system?

HENRY. I am not too familiar with this. But as I understand it, first there is what is called a coordination procedure, and I am not sure but I think this is the first time we have had a coordination procedure injected into the overall registration procedures, and that says that you look at the technical features of what you are proposing to do.

CHARYK. I might elaborate on that a little bit. It simply says if I am going to locate an earth station for a communication satellite system, I have to be careful where I locate it because there will be a certain region around that earth station that will have to be clear of any other communication means with which there might be interference. So that I cannot locate that earth station without giving due consideration to existing facilities. And if there are existing facilities, I am going to have to coordinate with the owners of those facilities to make sure that the existence of my earth station is not going to interfere before I can actually locate that earth station.

As far as the satellite is concerned, this conference has agreed on certain power density levels at the ground. In other words, it set certain limitations on the power that I can put into a satellite so that on the ground I am not going to be interfering with other services which are sharing the same frequencies.

HENRY. It is after those coordination procedures have been effected that you then go to the IFRB to register.

CHARYK. Saying it another way, if I do not locate any earth stations close to installations with which they might interfere, and if I live up to my power limitations in my satellite, there may not be any coordination necessary with anybody.

Question. You can just go then and use that frequency?

CHARYK. Simply notify the IFRB that I am using it.

CLEVELAND. I think, John, a way of saying it, in general parlance, would be that the problem in this conference was to make sure of a wide enough band so that it wouldn't be necessary to give an international organization a whole lot of arbitral power to settle the resulting conflicts. It looks as if there is going to be a wide enough band for a long enough time so that the conflicts of interest, if you will, and of operation, don't require a sort of czar in the middle.

Question. In other words we would go along sort of in the past pattern whereby mutual consent we use this and the Soviets use that?

CLEVELAND. Where you have an international agreement not to get in each other's way and an international agreement to work with this central board, frequency allocation board, frequency registration board, so that there is one place where everybody knows what everybody else is doing. That is really all you need as long as there is enough room. Our problem in this conference was to make sure that there would be enough room in this new field to make it.

CHARYK. Exactly right. Also, to establish rules under which you would have to coordinate with someone else.

HENRY. Plus the fact that underlying these with respect to a commercial satellite system, our whole policy has been, and I think there is general support of this policy, to have one global system, which would naturally require extensive coordination procedures.

Question. We have no assurance though that we are going to have one global system?

HENRY. No assurance. As I say, there is fairly general support for this approach.

Question. What we were getting at is that no other nation has veto power over the use of these frequencies?

HENRY. That is correct.

Question. Isn't the agreement to abide by international squatters' rights, recognizing that you can't squat on somebody else's property that he is using?

CHARYK. You can't do anything that is going to interfere with somebody else's service.

Question. If he refused you the use, then you can't get in.

CHARYK. Who is there first has a priority, so to speak.

HENRY. I think there is a 6-month provision in there somewhere, too, about prospective uses of the same frequency. I think you have to show that you are going to use it within 6 months and you get into the act.

Question. How soon do you expect the corporation to get into the filing stage?

CHARYK. We would have to do it 2 years before we actually expect to have the system in operation. With this thing out of the way, our next step is actually to work out the arrangements with other countries for their participation in the system, and their agreement on the nature of their participation, and on the technical characteristics of the system. At that stage of the game we would be ready to file, if the FCC approves it.

I forgot that very important point.

Question. This is just on the radio astronomy thing in the State Department statement by Mr. McConnell. There were two things mentioned specifically, the 1,400 bank and also the channel 37. Were there other frequencies allotted to radio astronomy?

CHARYK. Yes. It is quite an extensive list. I don't have it. It may be in the yellow sheets over there.

Question. Summing it up, this doesn't really sum it up as to how many megacycles were given to it or how many bands.

CHARYK. I think they can provide that. It is a rather large list.

Question. Mr. Charyk, you outlined what you would have to do. How far away are you from completing all of these arrangements and filing your request for use of these frequencies?

Would this take a month or a year or 5 years or what?

CHARYK. Oh, no, I think the working out of detailed arrangements with other countries will take a little time. We are moving ahead into design studies which will take place over the next 6 to 9 months, to come up with the final technical characteristics. We would use the same period of time to pursue our detailed discussions with other countries.

Question. Mr. Charyk, can you tell us when the corporation expects to put its stock on the market?

CHARYK. We would hope early next year.

Question. Anything more specific?

CHARYK. I am afraid not.

Question. Are you going to be putting your stock on the market well before you could specify your final operation?

CHARYK. In detail, yes. We would have to give, of course, some indications of the nature of the system and the form—

Question. Do you mean whether it would be medium altitude or—

CHARYK. At least we would have to indicate the options that are possible, and the steps that we are going to go through before we arrive at a final determination.

Question. What are you aiming at in terms of an operating system? A year? How long from now?

CHARYK. We feel from purely technical considerations we can have a complete system in 1966.

McROBERTS. Gentlemen, we have been running more than an hour now. Do you have any more questions? One or two more.

Question. One more.

Mr. Henry, are you on friendly terms again with the Communications Satellite Corp.?

HENRY. Yes. I don't think we have ever been on unfriendly terms. We had some difference of opinion, but I think that has been resolved.

McROBERTS. Is there anyone from the Hughes Aircraft Co. here? I understand someone in Geneva would like to talk to the Hughes Aircraft designer and builder of this satellite.

(No response.)

PRESS. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 4:28 p.m., the Conference was concluded.)

Subsequently, Chairman McDonnell submitted a detailed report to the Secretary of State on the activities of the Geneva Conference. In view of the importance of this Conference to future developments in space radiocommunications, I insert the report at this point in the RECORD:

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE EXTRAORDINARY ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE TO ALLOCATE FREQUENCY BANDS FOR SPACE RADIOCOMMUNICATION PURPOSES, INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, OCTOBER 7, 1963, THROUGH NOVEMBER 8, 1963

DECEMBER 15, 1963.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference to allocate frequency bands for space radiocommunication purposes, I have the honor to submit this report on the activities of the Conference, the results of its work, and the participation therein of the United States. The Conference was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from October 7 through November 8, 1963, and was under the auspices of the International Telecommunication Union.

I. BACKGROUND

The Radio Conference held in Geneva in 1959 to revise the Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) was the first worldwide radio conference to recognize two new radio services: Space radiocommunication and radio astronomy. That Conference, however, acknowledged that these new services were still in an early stage of development and that therefore only preliminary provisions regarding radio frequency allocations and corollary regulations could be adopted.¹ Appreciating that further action would be required, the Conference adopted Recommendations Nos. 32 and 36. The first of these recommended that, in preparations for a subsequent administrative radio conference, consideration be given to more adequate allocation of frequency bands for the radio astronomy service. The second recommended the convening of an extraordinary administrative radio conference (EARC) during the latter part of 1963 which should have as its principal task "the allocation of frequency bands for the various categories of space radiocommunication." Subsequently, it was agreed by a majority of member countries, upon recommendation of the Administrative Council of the ITU, that the frequency allocation needs of both of these new services should be considered at the EARC in 1963.

Preparations for the 1963 Conference were begun in the United States in 1960 and continued unabated until mid-September 1963.

¹ See pp. 24 and 25 of the report of the chairman of the U.S. delegation.

This intensive effort was required since developments in space exploration and research were taking place throughout this period. It was necessary to incorporate the radio frequency requirements of these new radio services and a large body of newly developed technical information in the United States preparatory documents.

The Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC), working with the staff of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), had by October 1961 completed a document entitled "Preliminary Views of the United States of America for the Allocation of Radio Frequencies to the Space and Earth-Space Services." A similarly titled document dealing with radio astronomy was completed somewhat later. These documents were included in a series of public inquiries by the FCC to determine the views of the public, including radio astronomers, research organizations, industry, and the communication common carriers. They were also distributed by the Department of State through diplomatic channels to practically all other governments with a request for comments.

Beginning in April 1962 and continuing until the opening of the Conference, a program of coordinating the views of the United States and those of other countries was followed. Four meetings were held in Europe, principally with the civil and military representatives of the NATO countries; two meetings with more limited participation were held in Washington; special teams were sent out to confer with the officials of selected countries in Europe and Central and South America; and two international meetings of radio experts provided opportunities for contacts with still other countries. In addition, an invitation was extended to the U.S.S.R. in August 1962 for a comprehensive exchange of views, either in Washington or in Moscow. Unfortunately, the Soviet authorities did not find an appropriate time for such an exchange. However, a brief 2-day meeting with very limited participation by experts from both the United States and the U.S.S.R. was held in Geneva in January 1963 immediately before the opening of the 10th Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR). Discussions were also held with experts from Japan who were in Geneva at that time.

As in the case of the preliminary documents developed by the United States in preparation for the 1959 Conference, the "Preliminary Views of the United States" were the principal and initially the sole agenda items at international pre-Conference coordination meetings.

Based upon the information developed by these varied activities and with the invaluable guidance received from various research organizations, including the space research groups within private industry, the Department of Defense, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the IRAC/FCC group undertook the preparation of the U.S. proposals for the Conference. These were submitted formally to the ITU in June 1963. Because of careful preparation and extensive international coordination, the proposals had the general support of many countries, particularly those of Western Europe.

In anticipation of the Space Radiocommunication Conference and in response to recommendation No. 36 of the 1959 Radio Conference, the CCIR at its Tenth Plenary Assembly early in 1963 adopted important technical recommendations which laid the foundation for the Space Radiocommunication Conference, particularly with regard to the sharing of frequency bands between the communication-satellite service and the terrestrial fixed and mobile services. The U.S. CCIR preparatory group, composed of government and industry experts, made the major contribution toward these recom-

mentations. Had they not been available, the Conference would very probably have failed since agreement on sharing of allocations would have been very difficult to obtain.

II. AGENDA

The agenda of the Conference, adopted pursuant to article 7 of the International Telecommunication Convention (1959), was the following:

(i) To examine the technical progress in the use of radiocommunications in the space, earth-space, and radio astronomy services, and to examine the results of the technical studies made by the CCIR and other organizations, and the proposals of administrations concerning these services;

(ii) In the light of this examination (a) to decide on the allocation of frequency bands essential for the various categories of space radiocommunications and for radio astronomy; (b) To consider whether there is a continuing need for the allocation of each of the bands designated for space research and take appropriate action in this regard;

(iii) In accordance with Nos. 61 and 249 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Geneva, 1959, to revise only such provisions of the Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, as are essential for the effective implementation of the decisions of the Conference relating to the allocation, notification, recording and use of frequencies for space, earth-space, and radio astronomy services;

(iv) In accordance with Nos. 61 and 249 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Geneva, 1959, to adopt such provisions additional to those contained in the Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, as are essential for the effective implementation of the decisions of the Conference concerning the technical characteristics of the space, earth-space and radio astronomy services;

(v) To make such recommendations and to adopt such resolutions related to the foregoing as may be necessary.

III. PARTICIPATION

At the time of the Conference the Union consisted of 122 member countries and one associate member (Kenya). The number of member countries participating in the conference was 70, of which 4 were ineligible to vote and 3 were represented by proxy. The member countries were represented by 339 delegates, advisers, and observers.

Present as observers were 6 private operating agencies, the United Nations, 3 of its specialized agencies, and 11 nongovernmental international organizations. A list of the countries and organizations in attendance is attached as annex A. Attention is invited to the meager representation from Latin America and Africa south of the Sahara Desert. (See pt. IV, Committee 2.)

The United States holds full membership in the Union for itself and also for the territories of the United States. Such dual membership is also held by France, Spain, United Kingdom, and Portugal. The U.S.S.R. has full membership for itself and also for Byelorussia and Ukraine.

A list of the persons comprising the delegations of the United States and the territories of the United States is attached as annex B.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE, COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

There being no inviting government for the Conference, the Secretary General of the ITU, Mr. G. C. Gross, called the Conference to order, after which Sr. Jose Garrido Moreno (Spain), the dean of the Conference, took the chair. Mr. Clifford Stead of the ITU headquarters staff was designated Conference secretary. As recommended by a preliminary meeting of the heads of delegations, the Conference elected Mr. Gunnar Pedersen

(Denmark) as Conference Chairman. Ambassador Joseph H. McConnell (United States) and Mr. Ashot Badalov (U.S.S.R.) were elected Vice Chairmen.

Seven committees were designated to under take the work assigned to the Conference. The committees and their officers were:

Committee No. 1, Steering: Chairman, Mr. Gunnar Pedersen (Denmark); Vice Chairmen, Ambassador Joseph H. McConnell (United States); Mr. Ashot Badalov (U.S.S.R.).

Committee No. 2, Credentials: Chairman, Dr. F. Nicotera (Italy); Vice Chairman, Mr. L. M. Harris (Australia).

Committee No. 3, Budget Control: Chairman, Mr. G. Marin (Rumania); Vice Chairman, Mr. S. H. Butler (Liberia).

Committee No. 4, Technical: Chairman, Mr. Erik Esping (Sweden); Vice Chairman, Mr. M. Zahradnick (Czechoslovakia).

Committee No. 5, Frequency Allocations: Chairman, Mr. W. Klein (Switzerland); Vice Chairman, Mr. S. Fujiki (Japan).

Committee No. 6, Regulations: Chairman, Mr. Juan A. Autelli (Argentina); Vice Chairman, Mr. A. B. Eld (U.A.R.).

Committee No. 7, Editorial: Chairman, Mr. Y. Place (France); Vice Chairman, Captain C. P. Booth (United Kingdom); Mr. J. Garrido Moreno (Spain).

V. U.S. DELEGATION PARTICIPATION

The delegation consisted of two groups. One of these was known informally as the Satellite Communications Policy Group. The other, while not known by a specific name, could be termed the Conference Group.

The first group, consisting of four delegation members, concerned itself with the matter of acquainting other delegations with the objectives of the United States in the field of commercial global satellite communications and the role of the Communications Satellite Corp. From the beginning of the Conference it was clear that many delegates had grossly distorted ideas regarding the motives of the United States in this area. Fears were frequently expressed that the United States and other leading countries would freeze out the less-developed countries and that within a short time all of the frequencies allocated by the present Conference for satellite communication would be preempted, leaving none for those countries which might require a longer time to avail themselves of the benefits of communication via satellites. The Satellite Communication Policy Group played a very important role in dispelling such fears and in engendering a proper regard for the plans of the United States and other countries for a single commercial global communication satellite system which will serve the needs of all countries on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The second group, consisting of all other members of the delegation, engaged in the substantive work of the Conference by advocating adoption of U.S. positions, defending such positions when required, and effecting necessary compromises. Principal spokesmen were appointed for each committee. These spokesmen, in turn, designated other delegation members as spokesmen at meetings of working groups and subworking groups. All delegation members were given specific assignments to Conference committees and working groups, either as spokesmen or as advisers to spokesmen. The successful outcome of the conference from the standpoint of the United States is a clear indication of the effectiveness of the delegation as a whole as well as of the individual members. A list of the assignments of delegation members to Conference committees is given in annex C.

Substantial congressional interest in the Conference and the work of the U.S. delega-

tion was evidenced by the attendance of distinguished Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives in meetings of the Conference and the delegation. The following were officially members of the delegation:

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE, U.S. Senate.
The Honorable NORRIS COTTON, U.S. Senate.
The Honorable OREN HARRIS, U.S. House of Representatives.

The Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, U.S. House of Representatives.

In addition, the Honorable WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, U.S. House of Representatives, also was in attendance.

VI. WORK OF THE COMMITTEES

The Conference followed the precedent established by the 1959 Radio Conference of not appointing subcommittees, thus obviating the need for minutes of meetings below committee level. This procedure also eliminated the need for a large number of reporters who normally are recruited from national delegations.

Report of the work of Committee No. 1 (Steering)

The Committee was composed of the Conference Chairman and Vice Chairman in addition to the chairmen and vice chairmen of all other committees. It was the responsibility of this Committee to insure the timely completion of the work of the Conference. The Committee formulated the weekly schedule of meetings and advised the Conference Chairman concerning policy questions.

Report of the work of Committee No. 2 (Credentials)

Dr. F. Nicotera (Italy) was Chairman of the Committee. Ambassador J. Beam was the U.S. spokesman. The position of the credentials of the delegations attending the Conference is set forth in Document No. 179, supplemented by the oral report made to the November 6 plenary meeting by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee that the Philippines had ratified the 1959 Convention and that the credentials of the delegation of Monaco were in order. In all, 66 duly accredited delegations participated.

No especially unusual problems arose over credentials. None of the African countries challenged the status or the right to speak of Portugal or South Africa. A resident of East Germany, serving on the International Broadcasting and Television Organization (IBTO), endeavored to speak "on behalf of the German Democratic Republic" when called upon to report to the Allocations Committee. This phrase was eliminated from the record but, since the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany let it be known informally he would not object, a brief reference to certain telecommunication arrangements in East Germany was permitted to stand.

By common consent the perennial question of Chinese representation was not allowed to become an issue which would disrupt the Conference technical work. During the opening days, the delegations of the U.S.S.R., Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Cuba circulated statements to the effect that they opposed recognizing the credentials of the "Chiang Kai-shek clique," pointing out that the Chinese Peoples Republic was the only legitimate representative of China. No formal motion, however, was made for the expulsion of the Republic of China.

In the November 2 meeting of the credentials committee, the delegations of the United States and Korea made strong statements for the record that the Republic of China was duly authorized by the convention to participate in the Conference. The following vote was taken in the Committee on the question whether the credentials of the delegation of the Chinese Republic were

in order: For (10): Australia, Korea, Canada, Denmark, Spain, United States of America, Italy, Japan, Federal Republic of Germany, and the Vatican; against (6): Cuba, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the U.S.S.R.

On the motion of Canada, seconded by Japan, the plenary meeting on November 6 adopted the report of the Credentials Committee without discussion of the statement therein that "Committee 2 considers that the credentials of China are in order." An exchange ensued, however, when the Indonesian delegate argued that Malaysia should submit to admission as a new member, since it is comprised of Malaya, which is an ITU member, and Singapore-British North Borneo, an ITU associate member. Malaysia, supported by the United Kingdom, counter-argued that Malaysia had been elected to the United Nations Security Council without its identity being questioned. The delegates concerned requested their remarks be incorporated in the record.

The record likewise contains Argentina's customary reservation regarding its claim to the Falkland Islands, and the British rejection of the claim.

Report of the work of Committee No. 3 (Budget Control)

Committee 3 had as its Chairman Mr. G. Marin (Rumania). Mr. C. M. Loeber was the U.S. spokesman.

The terms of reference of the Committee are set forth in paragraphs 572-575 of the Convention of the ITU (Geneva, 1959). In brief, the Committee was charged with the responsibility of determining the organization and facilities available to the delegates and the examination and approval of the accounts for expenditures incurred by the Conference.

These terms were carried out and a report was presented to the plenary meeting just prior to the close of the Conference showing the estimated total expenditure to be 1,070,000 Swiss francs. This amount was 5,000 Swiss francs less than the budget approved by the administrative council, owing to the fact that the duration of the Conference was not in excess of the 5 weeks estimated to be necessary.

Report of the work of Committee No. 4 (Technical)

A. The terms of reference for the Technical Committee were as follows:

1. To examine:
 - (a) the technical progress in the use of radiocommunication in the space, earth-space, and radio astronomy services;
 - (b) the results of the technical studies made by the CCIR and other organizations concerning these services (other than those dealt with by Committees 5 and 6);
2. In the light of this examination to establish the technical criteria to be applied in the operation of these services.

B. Organization of Committee 4

Mr. Erik Esping (Sweden) was Chairman of Committee 4, with Mr. M. Zahradnick (Czechoslovakia) as Vice-Chairman. Mr. H. Fine was the U.S. spokesman for this Committee. At its first meeting, the Technical Committee was subdivided into the following working groups:

- Working group 4A: Terms and definitions.
- Working group 4B: Review of technical progress as related to allocations.
- Working group 4C: Coordination procedures and sharing criteria.

C. General

The terms of reference and the organization of these working groups, are described below in some detail. The work of Committee 4 proceeded smoothly and rapidly in practically all areas. The only delays occurred over issues which had political overtones, such issues being relatively few in the

Technical Committee. The output of Committee 4 is contained in Document No. 207.

D. Working Group 4A

Working group 4A dealt with the definition of new terms pertinent to space radiocommunication and radio astronomy and consequential changes resulting therefrom in article I of the regulations (terms and definitions).

The working group was chaired by Col. Jean Lochard, France. Mr. P. M. Bouchier, Belgium, served as temporary chairman during the second week of the Conference when Colonel Lochard was absent from the conference site. Mr. S. M. Myers was U.S. spokesman.

The basic text considered was Report No. 204, adopted by the Xth Plenary Assembly, CCIR, Geneva, 1963. Formal proposals on terms and definitions were submitted to the Conference by the United States, France, Australia, and Israel. Pertinent suggestions were also made by the IFRB. All proposals were based on CCIR Report No. 204 except those from Israel. The latter proposals represented a complete departure from CCIR terminology, received no support and may be disregarded insofar as this report is concerned.

Following a general discussion of all proposals by the main body, drafting group 4A1 was established to prepare a consolidated list of terms and definitions. The work of the drafting group was hampered seriously from the outset, first by the size of the group and second by the different philosophies prevailing within the group. Although proposals were considered from only six sources (four administrations, CCIR and IFRB), drafting meetings were invariably attended by 35 to 40 individuals representing 20 to 25 administrations. While most favored the CCIR approach, a small but vocal group consisting of Portugal, Belgium, France, and Spain favored an approach diametrically opposed to the CCIR-approved philosophy. The latter group would have defined all space services in terms of their terrestrial counterparts, i.e., fixed space service—fixed service; aeronautical mobile space service—aeronautical mobile service; etc. The United States had considered this approach in its initial planning but had rejected it in favor of that later adopted by CCIR, which afforded better administrative control over the application of space radiocommunication techniques.

Since neither 4A1 nor 4A could reach a decision on the basic philosophy to be followed, the matter was put to a vote in the parent body, Committee 4, where the CCIR approach won overwhelming support. After a 2-week delay, the work of 4A1 then proceeded at a reasonable pace, was approved without incident by Working Group 4A and Committee 4 and was accepted without change by the Plenary Assembly at both the first and second readings. The approved text, with all U.S. objectives achieved, appears in the final acts of the Conference.

E. Working Group 4B

Working group 4B, chaired by Mr. P. Bouchier (Belgium), had the following terms of reference: "To review technical progress and to report on the technical factors affecting frequency allocations in the light of: (1) the studies of the CCIR; (2) proposals and reports on technical aspects (other than those dealt with by Committees 5 and 6) by Administrations and international organizations."

The U.S. spokesman for this working group was Mr. F. Altman.

The Chairman considered the underlined phrase above as the first part of his task and reported in Document 91 that all relevant documents had been accepted in full without change.

All the CCIR documents considered were listed in Document 115 for submission to

Committees 5 and 6. Two draft recommendations to the CCIR from Australia were forwarded to Committee 4 which considered them unnecessary (Document 129).

The most important question considered by working group 4B was that of direct broadcasting from satellites. The following two proposals were considered:

(1) The French proposal to amend paragraph 422 of the radio regulations to prohibit the establishment and use of sound broadcasting and television broadcasting stations on any space object.

(2) The U.S. proposal that (a) the Conference adopt a recommendation urging the CCIR to expedite its studies and recommendations regarding the technical feasibility of broadcasting from satellites, what bands would be technically suitable for such broadcasting, and whether and under what conditions those bands could be shared between broadcasting satellites and nonspace services, and that (b) pending the allocation of frequency bands for direct broadcasting from satellites, experimental programs for the development of a broadcasting-satellite service be carried on in technically suitable bands now allocated to the broadcasting service on conditions that no interference be caused to establish broadcasting services operating in such bands.

During the course of the working group's consideration of the foregoing, the U.S.S.R. submitted a proposal to the group which was essentially the same as that of the United States. The group therefore combined these two papers and considered them as a single proposal.

A small ad hoc group was then designated to attempt to bridge the gap between the French proposal and the combined U.S./U.S.S.R. proposal. This group was composed of representatives of France, United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. France offered to withdraw its proposal provided the second portion of the U.S./U.S.S.R. proposal was withdrawn. It was agreed by the conferees that administrations could conduct experimental broadcasting from space in conformity with the Radio Regulations (paragraph No. 115) without calling specific attention to this fact. Accordingly, it was agreed to delete this provision from the U.S./U.S.S.R. proposal. This compromise was adopted unanimously and appears in the final acts of the Conference as recommendation No. 5A.

F. Working Group 4C

The terms of reference for working group 4C are given in document No. 64: "To advise on technical aspects of coordination procedures, including the determination of sharing criteria and the consequent revision of the relevant articles of the Radio Regulations."

This working group was under the chairmanship of Mr. W. A. C. Schultz (Canada). Mr. H. Fine, assisted by Lt. Col. E. Wright, was the U.S. spokesman.

Working Group 4C was further subdivided into subgroups 4C1 (sharing criteria) and 4C2 (coordination procedures). Subgroup 4C1 was chaired by Mr. R. Marchand (Canada) and subgroup 4C2 by Mr. H. Fine (U.S.A.).

Working group 4C adopted the following sharing criteria for use only in the 1-10 Gc/s frequency range; details of these are given in Document No. 207:

(1) Maximum power limitations were adopted for fixed and mobile transmitting stations operating in shared bands used for reception by space stations in accordance with CCIR Recommendation No. 406.

(2) Minimum angle of elevation and maximum radiated power density limitation in the horizontal plane were adopted for transmission by earth stations in the communication-satellite service.

(3) To accommodate passive communication satellite systems in the bands allocated to active systems, special total radiated power limitations were adopted for the passive earth station transmissions in the shared bands otherwise used for reception of signals from satellites.

(4) Maximum power flux density limitations at the earth's surface were adopted for satellite transmissions in the communication-satellite and meteorological-satellite services in accordance with CCIR Recommendation No. 358.

(5) CCIR Recommendation No. 351 on cessation of emissions from a satellite was adopted verbatim.

Procedures for calculating coordination distances between earth stations and terrestrial stations sharing the same frequency bands in the range 1-10 Gc/s, were developed and adopted for controlling (a) interference from an earth station to terrestrial station receivers; (b) interference from terrestrial stations to a communication satellite or meteorological satellite earth station receiver; (c) interference from terrestrial stations to a space research earth station receiver.

Recommendations to the CCIR were prepared, requesting that organization to study sharing criteria involving other types of terrestrial services as well as FM line-of-sight radio relay systems in the 1-10 Gc/s frequency range, so that equitable sharing limitations and suitable coordination distance procedures may be developed for sharing between these other types of service and space systems for all frequency bands involved. CCIR was also requested to reexamine the provisional sharing criteria it had developed at its 10th plenary meeting.

Report of the Work of the Committee No. 5 (Allocations)

The chairman of the committee was Mr. Willy Klein, of Switzerland, the vice chairman was Mr. Sakae Fujiki, of Japan, the rapporteur for English was Lt. Col. James P. West, and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. William H. Watkins.

Terms of reference. To examine proposals for amendment of the table of frequency allocations contained in article 5 of the Radio Regulations.

In the light of this examination and, when appropriate, on the basis of findings of Committee 4: (a) to propose the allocation of frequency bands essential for the various categories of space radio communications and for radio astronomy; (b) to consider whether there is a continuing need for the allocation of each of the bands designated for space research and propose appropriate action in this regard.

At its initial session, Committee 5 decided to organize its work on the basis of the various space services for which frequency allocations had been proposed. Accordingly, the committee organized three working groups, as follows:

Working group 5A was assigned all allocation proposals dealing with the communication-satellite service plus all proposals dealing with the support functions of tracking, telemetering, and telecommand where the support function was not clearly identified with one of the space services assigned to a different working group. The chairman of working group 5A was Mr. Per Mortensen of Norway, and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. William H. Watkins.

Working group 5B was assigned all allocation proposals dealing with the space research service and the radio astronomy service. The Chairman of Working Group 5B was Mr. Venkat V. Rao, of India, and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. Wilfrid Dean. Although much of the work was conducted in the working group, its Chairman found it convenient to establish two subworking groups: (a) Subworking Group 5A1 dealt

will all allocation proposals involving the space research service. Its Chairman was Mr. Desta Beyene of Ethiopia and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. Wilfrid Dean; (b) Subworking Group 5A2 dealt with all allocation proposals involving the radio astronomy service. Its Chairman was Mr. William A. E. Nielsen of Australia, and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. Wilfrid Dean.

Working group 5C was assigned all allocation proposals not assigned to Working Groups 5A and 5B. Accordingly, proposals in the following areas were considered: (a) Meteorological-satellite service; (b) radio-navigation-satellite service; (c) distress frequencies for astronauts and space vehicles; (d) application of space techniques in the aeronautical radionavigation and aeronautical mobile (R) services; and (e) application of space techniques in the amateur radio service.

The Chairman of Working Group 5C was Mr. J. T. Penwarden (U.K.). The U.S. spokesman was Mr. S. M. Myers.

The working group found it expedient to establish a subworking group 5C1 to deal with the aeronautical and distress frequency proposals. The Chairman of 5C1 was Mr. Maurice Chef of France and the U.S. spokesman was Mr. Charles A. Brooks.

Work of working group 5A (Communication Satellite Service and Tracking, Telemetering and Telecommand): The working group decided to review all of the tracking, telemetering, and telecommand (TTT) proposals before taking up any of the communication satellite proposals. The purpose of this procedure was to obtain agreement on less controversial proposals first. Since agreement on communication-satellite service proposals was not reached until the next to the last (4th) week of the Conference, the decision probably was a wise one.

With respect to the number of frequency bands proposed for telemetering, telecommand, and tracking and their location in the radio spectrum, all of the United States proposals were accepted. With respect to the status of existing services in the bands proposed for these functions, however, existing services will continue with greater rights than the United States had thought to be necessary.

One unexpected proposal was made by the U.S.S.R. for a 5 kc/s channel at 30.005-30.010 Mc/s for satellite identification. The U.S.S.R. delegation explained that they intended the channel to be used by all satellites, although their particular concern was with communication satellites. On the basis that use of the frequency would not be compulsory, the Conference accepted the proposal, although there was some doubt that the part of the spectrum involved is the most suitable for the purpose.

Frequency allocations for the communication-satellite service gave considerable difficulty, and the compromise of conflicting proposals on this subject should be regarded as one of the key decisions of the Conference.

The proposals of Canada, France, and the United States for the communication-satellite service were substantially identical. The proposals of the United Kingdom also corresponded, except that they proposed an additional 500 Mc/s at 1750-2250 Mc/s. The difficulty was that, whereas the United States proposed a total of 2725 Mc/s, the U.S.S.R. proposed only 1600 Mc/s, of which in turn only 800 Mc/s corresponded with the CAN/France/UK/USA proposals. An additional point of difference was that the proposal of the U.S.S.R. did not include provision for any part of the communication-satellite service allocation to be exclusive, whereas the CAN/France/UK/USA proposals allowed 100 Mc/s of exclusive spectrum space, to be located at 7250-7300 and 7975-8025 Mc/s. As the Conference concluded its third week, there was a complete impasse in the Working

Group, with no concessions having been offered by anyone.

To determine whether there might be a possibility of reaching an agreement, exploratory talks were held over a period of several days by the heads of the French, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. and United States delegations. A joint compromise proposal subsequently was introduced to the Working Group during the fourth week of the Conference which became the basis for the decision of the Conference on this subject. The compromise, however, let open the status of the proposals for 100 Mc/s of exclusive space. This question was decided by secret ballot in Committee 5, a decision not reopened in the Plenary. The majority decision supported the concept of exclusivity, with existing operations to be removed by January 1, 1969. Countries unable to accept this decision (approximately 20) indicated by footnote to the Table of Frequency Allocations that in their countries the fixed and mobile services would continue to have primary status, sharing the bands 7250-7300 and 7975-8025 Mc/s coequally with the communication-satellite service.

Although the compromise solution has many aspects, perhaps the most important to reaching agreement were: (a) The willingness of the U.S.S.R. to agree to more spectrum space for the communication-satellite program than they felt to be necessary during the life of the present agreement, and the corresponding willingness of Western delegations to reduce the amount of readily useful spectrum space in their proposals from 2725 Mc/s or more to 2000 Mc/s; and (b) agreement that certain bands containing high-powered operations be exempted from the technical criteria and coordination procedures prescribed under the regulations for spectrum space shared by the communication-satellite service with existing services.

The resulting communication-satellite service allocations (shared with existing services except as noted) are as follows:

	Band	Megacycles
Region 1.....	3400-3700	300
	3700-4200	500
	4400-4700	300
	5925-6425	700
	7250-7300	50
	7300-7750	450
	7900-7975	75
	7975-8025	50
	8025-8400	375
Total.....		2,800
Region 2.....	3400-3700	300
	3700-4200	500
	4400-4700	300
	5925-6425	500
	7250-7300	50
	7300-7750	450
	7900-7975	75
	7975-8025	50
	8025-8400	375
Total.....		2,600
Region 3.....	3400-3700	300
	3700-4200	500
	4400-4700	300
	5850-6425	575
	7250-7300	50
	7300-7750	450
	7900-7975	75
	7975-8025	50
	8025-8400	375
Total.....		2,675

¹ Exclusive.

Work of working group 5B (Space Research Service and Radio Astronomy Service): The United States of America proposals to the Conference included seven bands for exclusive use of the space research service, as well as a few additional bands for which exclusivity was not proposed. Although discussion with a number of countries prior to

the Conference had indicated that the concept of exclusivity would be difficult for many countries to accept, the extent of the difficulty was not fully appreciated until the Conference convened. In summary, no bands were allocated to the space research service on a world-wide exclusive basis. This, however, is by no means as bleak a result as at first appears. In some bands, for example, the allocation is exclusive worldwide except in the case of a few countries where a footnote to the table of frequency allocations preserves the status of their existing services. In other bands, the existing services were downgraded from primary to secondary status. In still other bands, agreement was reached on exclusivity in region 2 (Western Hemisphere), with co-equal status for existing services in the rest of the world. For this last case, examples are the bands 136-137 Mc/s and 2,290-2,300 Mc/s, to which the United States of America attaches great importance.

It is significant that, despite the difficulty in obtaining agreement for exclusivity, agreement was reached on some status in the table of frequency allocations for every band proposed by the United States of America, although many delegations believed that their countries have no foreseeable role in space research activities, at least in most of the bands concerned.

A number of bands not included in the U.S. proposals for space research was given secondary status.

In assessing the decisions of the Conference on the space research service, it is important to recognize that space research has at least coequal primary status in all bands for which the United States of America proposed exclusivity. Although extensive bilateral and multilateral negotiations with other administrations well may be required in implementation abroad of future cooperative space programs, this status of equality of right to operate should provide a firm technical basis for such negotiations.

RADIO ASTRONOMY SERVICE

The U.S. delegation came to the Conference with a strong program for improving the status of radio astronomy. In arriving at this position, the opinions of the radio astronomy community in the United States had been given extensive consideration. The one major area in which the U.S. position did not initially coincide with the wishes of the radio astronomy community was in the matter of television channel 37 (608-614 Mc/s). However, soon after the beginning of the Conference, instructions were received to propose that channel 37 be cleared on a worldwide basis for radio astronomy for the next 10 years. This proposal considerably strengthened the posture of the United States vis-a-vis the radio astronomy service.

The Soviet bloc strongly opposed in almost every case the U.S. proposals for exclusive bands for radio astronomy. This position coincided with the interests of many delegations which were anxious to preserve the status of their existing operations in these bands and resulted in defeat of the U.S. proposals for exclusivity. The one exception is in the frequency band 1400-1427 Mc/s (the hydrogen line band) which was allocated exclusively to radio astronomy. This band, which is probably the most important one for radio astronomers, now will be completely clear of other services on a worldwide basis, a very significant result of the Conference in the area of radio astronomy.

The band 608-614 Mc/s (TV channel 37 in region 2), except in Cuba, has been allocated exclusively to radio astronomy in region 2 for at least 10 years. A somewhat similar allocation has been made for other regions of the world; however, these allocations do not enjoy exclusive status.

The frequency band 73.0-74.6 Mc/s has been effectively cleared in region 2, with the proviso that existing services (fixed and mobile) may continue to operate on the basis of no harmful interference being caused to the radio astronomy service. The frequency band 150.05-153 Mc/s which was not provided for, so far as radio astronomy is concerned, in the U.S. position, continues in the radio regulations unchanged except for the lower limit of the band, which formerly was 150.0 Mc/s. However, the United Kingdom is giving improved status in the band for its radio astronomers on a national basis by means of a footnote to the table.

In the band 404-410 Mc/s the U.S. proposal provided primary status for radio astronomy on a shared basis with meteorological aids in the portion 404-406 Mc/s on a worldwide basis. The international radio astronomical community, as represented at the Conference by the Inter-Union Committee for Frequency Allocations for Radio Astronomy and Space Science (IUCAF), objected to this position as providing too narrow a band. The preference was to retain the existing provisions in the 1959 regulations. The U.S. delegation reluctantly agreed to this arrangement in the face of overwhelming opposition from most other delegations present. There thus has been no change in status for radio astronomy in this band.

In the band 1664.4-1668.4 Mc/s, the U.S. proposal was for secondary status for radio astronomy on a worldwide basis, with the meteorological aids and meteorological-satellite services as primary services. This band was proposed in the expectation that radio astronomers might someday detect spectral lines of the hydroxyl radical (OH) in interstellar space. Such spectral lines had not been observed prior to the opening of the Conference. After the U.S. proposal had been adopted by the working group, the news was received that absorption lines of the hydroxyl radical had been detected by radio astronomers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This new development was announced to the Conference immediately by Mr. Rao, Chairman of the working group, and caused a considerable stir in Committee 5. The U.S. delegation and the radio astronomers present did not feel, however, that it would be practical at that late date to press for improvement in the status of radio astronomy in this band. Instead, a footnote to the allocation table was suggested by the representative of IUCAF and approved by the Conference, urging administrations to give all practicable protection in the band 1664.4-1668.4 Mc/s for future research in radio astronomy.

The band 2690-2700 Mc/s had footnote status in the 1959 regulations and has been elevated to primary status in the table of frequency allocations in accordance with the U.S. position. However, there are many footnote exceptions in regions 1 and 3. A somewhat similar situation exists with regard to the band 4990-500 Mc/s, except that in region 2 the allocation is exclusive for radio astronomy, with the exception of Cuba.

The band 10.68-10.7 Gc/s had footnote status in the 1959 regulations. It now is allocated exclusively to radio astronomy in the table. However, footnotes in the table preserve the status of fixed and mobile services in numerous countries.

The bands 15.35-15.4 Gc/s, 19.3-19.4 Gc/s and 31.3-31.5 Gc/s have been elevated from footnote status to exclusive status for radio astronomy on a worldwide basis. Again in the case of the Soviet bloc and Cuba, footnotes to the table provide exceptions to protect fixed and mobile services in those countries.

It was not possible to obtain full agreement on the U.S. proposals for the radio as-

tronomy service. It would have been helpful, however, if there had been a greater measure of agreement in world scientific circles on allocation objectives for both space research and radio astronomy.

At least seven delegations had someone concerned directly with radio astronomy as a member of the delegation. Unfortunately, delegations from some other countries which have active radio astronomy programs came to the conference relatively unaware of the special problems of radio astronomy. They were skeptical of the claims made concerning the sensitivity of radio telescopes and their susceptibility to interference. All of the astronomers present at the Conference accordingly collaborated in an intensive educational program which is believed to have produced useful results, as shown by the substantial overall enhancement of the allocation status of radio astronomy to which the Conference finally agreed.

WORK OF WORKING GROUP 5C

All administrations favored establishment of a radionavigation-satellite service and were willing to accept the frequency bands proposed by the United States. Disagreement arose on the manner in which to accommodate the service, with the Soviet bloc opposing exclusive allocations as a matter of principle. The U.S. position for exclusivity was finally achieved. The frequency bands 149.9-150.05 Mc/s and 399.9-400.05 Mc/s were allocated on a worldwide basis to the radionavigation-satellite service with a footnote permitting fixed and mobile stations to continue in the bands until January 1, 1969. Those countries which were unable to accept this cessation date will continue to operate fixed and mobile services on an equal status with the radionavigation-satellite service. There are 13 such countries at 150 Mc/s and 10 at 400 Mc/s, with Cuba included in each group. Recommendation No. 8A calls attention to the lack of CCIR studies relating to frequency sharing between radionavigation-satellite and terrestrial services and urges administrations to remove their fixed and mobile stations as soon as practicable from these two bands. The frequency band 14.3-14.4 Gc/s was approved on a worldwide exclusive basis for radionavigation satellites, without footnotes. No formal proposals before the Conference for this service differed from those of the United States.

The desirability of accommodating meteorological satellites met no opposition. Problems did arise, however, because of conflicting proposals by the United States of America and U.S.S.R. Nevertheless, the U.S. objectives in this area were achieved almost completely. Although the meteorological-satellite service at 7 Gc/s is accommodated by footnote rather than in the table, it appears to provide adequate flexibility to meet U.S. goals. The 50 Mc/s provided by footnote at 10 Gc/s for precipitation detection, as opposed to the 100 Mc/s proposed by the United States of America, is the only serious departure from the overall U.S. position for meteorological satellites. This was the best that could be achieved in a compromise with the Soviet position. The conference also placed an unexpected limitation against the permissible power flux density for meteorological satellites at 1,660-1,670 and 1,690-1,700 Mc/s. However, since this is the same limitation applied to meteorological satellites and communication satellites in bands above 3 Gc/s, it is not expected to create serious difficulties. U.S.S.R. proposals at 460-470 Mc/s and 1,770-1,790 Mc/s met strong opposition and were accepted only on a secondary basis.

Also dealt with in the working group was the use of space techniques in the amateur service. In response to a United Kingdom proposal, and only after lengthy debate, the conference adopted footnote No. 284A stat-

ing "In the band 144-146 Mc/s, artificial satellites may be used by the amateur service."

Working group 5C1 was established to deal with the application of space techniques in the aeronautical radionavigation and aeronautical mobile (R) services, and with proposals of the U.S.S.R. for distress frequencies for astronauts and space vehicles. All U.S. objectives were achieved in this area, including rejection of proposals to set aside 114.1-114.3 Mc/s for distress or emergencies involving astronauts or spacecraft. The following paragraphs, while dealing with some subjects not treated in Committee 5, working group 5C or working group 5C1, are included to provide a composite picture of results achieved relative to the aeronautical services: (a) The U.S. position for the aeronautical services can be considered as completely achieved. This position involved the frequency bands 117.975-136, 1,540-1,660, 4,200-4,400, 5,000-5,250 and 15,400-15,700 Mc/s. The footnotes proposed in the U.S. position for these bands, namely 273A, 352A, and 352B were adopted with generally the same language as proposed by the United States. The U.S.-proposed footnote 273A was expanded to include the phrase "space techniques" in addition to communication satellites. It is felt that this expansion was desirable; (b) the U.S. proposal to amend the definition of aeronautical station was adopted; (c) in addition to the U.S. proposals, the U.S.S.R. made certain proposals which were consistent with the overall U.S. aviation thinking of merely extending the aeronautical bands to provide for air-space vehicles. The following specific proposals were made in that light and adopted by the conference:

(1) Modification of the definition for an aircraft station to include air-space vehicles;

(2) Augmentation of the emergency frequencies for astronauts and space vehicles to include the frequency 20,007 kc/s plus or minus 3 kc/s;

(3) Adoption of a recommendation on the use of high frequencies (4-22 Mc/s) by air-space vehicles as required. This recommendation was referred for action to the ITU Aeronautical Conference convening in January 1964;

(4) Adoption of a resolution on the use of existing emergency frequencies by astronauts and air-space vehicles.

(d)(1) A proposal for use of the band 114.1-114.4 Mc/s by the U.S.S.R. and bloc for emergency crash locator beacons on spacecraft was not adopted by the Conference.

(2) A U.S.S.R. proposal to use the band 900-1000 Mc/s for experimental purposes in connection with space research was reduced to the band 900-960 Mc/s and accepted on a secondary basis only.

Ad Hoc Working Party

There were several frequency allocation proposals for the bands 136-137 and 137-138 Mc/s which did not agree and overlapped the work of all three of the working groups of Committee 5. Accordingly, it was decided to establish an ad hoc working party of Committee 5 to deal with these two bands. Dr. Popovic of Yugoslavia chaired the working party and Mr. Wilfrid Dean was the U.S. spokesman. The principal differences to be resolved were between the U.S.S.R. and the Western delegations. The working party was able to reach agreement fairly early in the Conference.

Report of the Work of Committee No. 6 (Regulations)

A. Committee 6

The officers of this Committee were Chairman Juan A. Autelli (Argentina) and Vice Chairman A. B. Eid (United Arab Republic).

Mr. Paul Miles was the U.S. spokesman. The terms of reference were to draw up:

(1) Revised texts for only such provisions of the Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, as are essential for the effective implementation of the decisions of the Conference relating to the allocation, notification, recording, and use of frequencies for space, earthspace and radio astronomy services;

(2) Texts of such provisions additional to those contained in the above regulations as are essential for the effective implementation of the decisions of the Conference concerning the various aspects of space, earthspace, and radio astronomy services.

At its first meeting, Committee 6 established two working groups: 6A under the chairmanship of Mr. J. M. Power (New Zealand), to consider all proposals concerning the coordination, notification and recording of frequency assignments and directly related matters; and 6B under the chairmanship of Mr. P. E. Willems (Netherlands), to consider those proposals assigned to Committee 6 which were not within the purview of Working Group 6A. Mr. Paul D. Miles and Mr. James P. Veatch were the U.S. spokesmen on Working Groups 6A and 6B respectively.

B. Working Group 6A

Working group 6A met on October 10, and after reviewing the proposals assigned to it, established subworking group 6A1 to draft the necessary texts. The working group held a second meeting on October 31 to consider and approve the texts which had been submitted to it by Sub-Working Group 6A1.

C. Sub-Working Group 6A1

Subworking group 6A1 met almost daily from October 14 to 30, under the chairmanship of Mr. Yves Place (France) to draft texts for a new article 9A and appendix 1A and to revise as necessary article 9 and appendix 1. Nine administrations participated actively in the work, with three others in attendance to observe its progress.

D. Working Group 6B

Working group 6B met October 10, 17, and 30 to consider the proposals which had been assigned to it. These included revision of articles 3, 14, 15, 19, and 20, and appendixes 9 and 10.

Revisions Made to the Radio Regulations

A. Article 9A and Appendix 1A

Article 9A and appendix 1A were added to the radio regulations to provide for the coordination, notification, and recording of assignments to stations in the space service, and for the optional notification and recording of assignments to radioastronomy stations. For the space service, the basic provisions agreed were:

(a) Assignments to earth stations in those bands between 1 and 10 Gc/s shared with equal rights with the fixed or mobile service must be coordinated with those neighboring countries which are located within a defined coordination distance;

(b) Such coordination may be conducted through the IFRB under certain conditions;

(c) Both the transmitting and the receiving frequencies of earth and space stations are notified to the IFRB;

(d) Notices must be received by the IFRB from 2 years before to 6 months before the assignment is brought into use, with less restrictive provision for assignments to certain space research stations;

(e) Notices are examined by the IFRB for conformity with the Convention and the radio regulations, and, in those cases where coordination of a proposed earth station has failed, for the probability of harmful interference to the fixed or mobile stations within coordination distance and sharing the same bands;

(f) There is no required formal coordination or technical examination of frequency assignments in one space system versus those of another space system;

(g) The remaining features are similar to those contained in article 9 for other services operating above 30 Mc/s. For the radioastronomy service, the basic principles agreed are similar to those contained in article 9 for other services operating about 30 Mc/s, except that the date of receipt of a notice by the IFRB is recorded in the remarks column instead of column 2d, and, since the radioastronomy service is a receiving service only, it is never necessary for the IFRB to determine the probability of harmful interference to the service rendered by other stations.

B. Article 9 and Appendix 1

Article 9 and appendix 1 were revised to include a coordination procedure for terrestrial assignments in those bands between 1 and 10 Gc/s which are shared with equal rights between the space service and the fixed or mobile service. This procedure is the reciprocal of that in article 9A and appendix 1A for the space service described in A above. The basic provisions of the procedure are:

(a) Assignments to stations in the fixed or mobile service in the above-indicated bands must be coordinated with neighboring countries which have previously coordinated assignments to an earth station located within the defined coordination distance of the proposed station in the fixed or mobile service;

(b) Such coordination may be conducted through the IFRB under certain conditions;

(c) Such assignments may be notified to the IFRB up to 2 years prior to use, in lieu of the 90-day period allowed other terrestrial assignments;

(d) Notices are examined by the IFRB for conformity with the Convention and the Radio Regulations, and, in those cases where coordination has failed, for the probability of harmful interference to the earth station concerned;

(e) The remaining features are, similar to those contained in article 9 for other services operating above 30 Mc/s.

C. Article 3

An editorial revision was made to No. 114 and a new paragraph, No. 116A, was added:

(a) To provide that for cases of harmful interference the radio astronomy service would be treated as a radiocommunication service, and

(b) To include the substance of a footnote concerning protection of the radio astronomy service from interference which heretofore had appeared in several bands in the Table of Frequency Allocations.

D. Article 14

No. 695, concerning the avoidance of harmful interference, was revised to provide that space stations shall be fitted with devices to quickly terminate emissions whenever required to do so under the provisions of the Radio Regulations.

E. Article 15

Nos. 711A and 711B were added to establish additional procedures to be followed in cases of interference involving stations in the space service.

F. Article 19

No. 735.1 was revised and Nos. 737A and 773A were added to provide for the formation of call signs used by earth and space stations, and to permit identification of space stations by means of orbital data when it is not possible to use identifying signals.

G. Article 20 and appendix 9

Modifications were made to provide for the Secretary General of the ITU to publish periodically a "List of Stations in the Space Service and in the Radio Astronomy Service."

H. Appendix 10

New symbols for stations in the space and radio astronomy services were added to the list of station symbols.

I. Recommendations and resolutions

(1) The procedure prepared by the Technical Committee for determining the coordination distance from an earth station was included as an annex to a Recommendation (1A) prepared by the Regulations Committee. It provides that a procedure be used until such time as the CCIR may recommend a different procedure for the purpose, and it invites the CCIR to study the question of coordination distance and make suitable recommendations to replace the procedure contained in the annex.

(2) The Conference adopted a Recommendation (9A) relating to the review of progress in the field of space telecommunication and the holding of future conference thereon. It also adopted a Resolution (1A) relating to the "provision and use of information regarding international satellite systems," which included a means for the informal worldwide coordination of space systems. Both of these are discussed in detail under items C and D below.

Major Problems Encountered

A. Notification of all terrestrial assignments in the shared bands

The French proposals for the notification and recording of frequency assignments included a paragraph which would have made it mandatory to notify to the IFRB all assignments to terrestrial stations to be operated in bands shared with the space service. The United States, United Kingdom, and Canada successfully opposed this feature because of the heavy administrative burden it would have created.

B. Coordination of proposed space systems as a whole

France would have required not only the coordination of proposed earth stations with the neighboring countries, but also the coordination of entire proposed space systems with all members of the ITU. This was opposed on the grounds that it was unnecessary, although France argued it was necessary in order to obtain parity in the treatment of space and terrestrial services. The disagreement was ultimately resolved by an extensive revision of article 9 which assured equitable treatment of the space service and the fixed and mobile services in the applicable shared bands.

C. Interim decisions and a future planning conference

The proposals and attitude of the U.S.S.R. were directed toward considering the decisions of the Conference regarding the notification and recording of space frequency assignments as interim, and looking to a future planning conference which would determine in detail how frequencies would be used for space radiocommunication.

This position was supported by a document submitted by Israel which stated that space radiocommunication is "both the privilege and the exclusive possibility of great countries only," that the duty of the "Space Conference is to abandon or at least modify the present practice of first come first served," and that "some form of a Space Communication Administration may be set up entrusted with the responsibility for insuring the global interests . . . of all member states of the Union."

In addition, the IFRB submitted a draft resolution as a part of document 22 (which was withdrawn and later reissued as document 42 under cover of a memorandum from the Conference Chairman stating it was for information and did not signify any addition to the agenda) which would have established the basis for a conference to prepare "world-

wide frequency plans for the various categories of space services."

The U.S. delegation took a strong stand against these viewpoints and stated that the decisions of the Conference were not to be considered as interim and that it would not now agree to a future planning conference.

The proposal to consider the decisions of the Conference as interim was defeated in Committee 6 by an informal vote of 18 to 4, the minority view being taken by the U.S.S.R. and three bloc countries.

The proposals for a future planning conference were resolved by means of a recommendation (9A) which grew out of a draft recommendation proposed by the United States (Document 109). The approved recommendation provided: (a) that the notification and registration procedures adopted by the present Conference would be effective until revised by a subsequent conference; (b) that ITU members make available to organs of the ITU their data and proposals resulting from space radiocommunication experimentation; (c) that the Administrative Council review annually the progress in space radiocommunication; and (d) that the Council, in the light of its annual review, and at a date it will determine, recommend the convening of a conference to work out further agreements on the use of bands allocated to the space service.

D. Coordination of space systems versus space systems

The U.S.S.R. proposed that article 9A include provisions requiring the coordination with all ITU members of proposed space systems with respect to all other existing or planned space systems. The proposal would have permitted an administration to effectively block the space plans of another administration. A compromise was reached in a resolution (1A) which provides for: (a) informal coordination through the IFRB of proposed space system frequencies with other members of the ITU; and (b) the submission of comments from other members concerning the probability of harmful interference to their space systems in being or those which had been previously coordinated.

Miscellaneous

(A) The following proposals, with which the United States was not in agreement, were withdrawn by the proponents.

(1) Canada: Revision of No. 115 to exclude from its provisions all bands allocated on either an exclusive or shared basis to the space or radio astronomy services.

(2) India: Revisions to article 8 to provide for an appeal by administrations to the CCIR from decisions of the IFRB based on the IFRB technical standards, and to the administrative council from certain other decisions of the IFRB.

(3) Australia: (a) Revision of No. 119 to prohibit special arrangements between countries concerning communications in the space service; (b) Change to notification procedure (raised in the plenary during the last week of the Conference) which would have considered resonant passive reflectors as space stations.

(4) Mexico: Revision of article 13 to require submission of satellite orbital data to the monitoring services.

Report of the work of Committee 7
(Editorial)

Committee 7 was chaired by Mr. Yves Place of France. Mr. S. M. Myers was the U.S. spokesman.

The function of this Committee was to edit the texts of decisions of Committees 4, 5, and 6 and to prepare the Final Acts of the Conference. Proposals of the United Kingdom and suggestions submitted by the International Frequency Registration Board regarding the format of the final Conference document were considered.

Based on these proposals and the work of the above-named committees, Committee 7 introduced to the plenary meeting of the Conference a document entitled "Final Acts of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference to Allocate Frequency Bands for Space Radiocommunication Purposes." This document, after the third reading, was approved.

VII. WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

The principal tasks assigned to the Conference by its agenda were performed by Committees 4, 5, and 6 and concerned the technical aspects of space radiocommunication and radio astronomy, frequency allocations, and radio regulations respectively. The accomplishment of this work has been described in detail in previous sections.

VIII. DEMONSTRATIONS OF COMMUNICATION VIA SATELLITES

Arrangements were made to cover the opening session of the Conference by means of television relay via the satellite Telstar. An exchange of greetings between the Secretary General of the United Nations in New York and the Secretary General of the ITU at the conference site had been programed. Because of a misunderstanding regarding cabling, the demonstration failed. However, the program was carried out successfully on October 9. Stations at Pleumer-Bodou, France, and Andover, Maine, were employed for the trans-Atlantic transmission. Many delegates expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to witness the program.

To demonstrate the operation of the satellite Syncom which is in an approximately synchronous orbit over Brazil, arrangements were made to permit delegates to the Conference to speak via Syncom from the conference site with persons in the delegates' lounge in the United Nations Building in New York and in the NASA Headquarters Building in Washington. Such conversations were carried on successfully for several evenings prior to the close of the Conference. The demonstration was closed with a press interview between Ambassador McConnell in Geneva and representatives of the press in Washington. The U.S.S. *Kingsport* which was docked at Rota, Spain, served as the European terminal of the radio circuit, while the U.S. Army station at Lakehurst, N.J., was the U.S. terminal. To eliminate echo, four-wire lines were employed between the radio terminals and the circuit terminals. The large number of delegates who spoke over the circuit were highly gratified with the results and expressed their thanks to the delegation for affording the opportunity to participate in the experiment. The time delay in transmission caused the users no difficulty judging by the favorable comments.

IX. RESERVATION TAKEN BY THE U.S. DELEGATION

For the first time in the history of international radio regulation, a delegation from ITU region 2 (Western Hemisphere), Cuba, deviated from the radio frequency allocations agreed to by all other region 2 delegations. Cuba associated itself in many cases with the allocations desired by the U.S.S.R. and other delegations of Eastern Europe. This was largely accomplished by means of footnotes to the table of frequency allocations.

Because of important radio and space operations in the Caribbean area which are dependent upon frequency bands agreed to throughout the hemisphere, the U.S. delegation could not place the United States in the position of having to honor Cuban radio operations which do not conform to the frequency allocations acceptable to all other delegations from region 2.

Accordingly, the U.S. delegation inserted in the additional protocol as a part of the final acts of the conference a declaration that it "cannot accept on behalf of the Government of the United States of America any obliga-

tion to observe the exceptions claimed by Cuba in those footnotes to the table of frequency allocations which were adopted by the present conference and which specifically named Cuba."

This action was taken reluctantly since it was the first time that the United States took a reservation on decisions of any worldwide international radio conference.

X. FUTURE MEETINGS

Conference recommendation No. 9A provides that the ITU Administrative Council, in light of its annual review of the progress in space radio communication, and at a date it will determine, recommend the convening of a conference to work out further agreements for the international regulation of the use of radio frequency bands allocated for space radiocommunication by this present Conference.

Conference recommendation No. 11A provides that the next Ordinary Administrative Radio Conference should give further consideration to the provision of improved frequency allocations for radio astronomy.

At this time no information is available regarding the scheduling of either conference referred to in the recommendations.

XI. FUTURE STUDIES BY CCIR

As indicated in the reports on the work of Committees Nos. 4 and 6, the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) was requested by the Conference to pursue technical studies looking toward the development of interference criteria for space and terrestrial systems in addition to those already developed for communication satellite systems sharing frequency bands between 1 and 10 Gc/s with line-of-sight radio relay systems. These new studies are to include various types of modulation systems. Frequency sharing criteria for frequencies above 10 Gc/s and below 1 Gc/s are particularly desired.

The possibility of interference caused by scattering from different forms of precipitation (e.g., rain, snow, hail) requires investigation.

XII. FORM OF RESULTS AND ENTRY INTO FORCE

The final acts of the Conference consist of amendments to the Radio Regulations and certain appendixes thereto (Geneva, 1959), 4 resolutions, 11 recommendations, and the additional protocols containing the declarations, reservations, and statements of individual delegations.

The Chairman of the delegation signed the final acts on behalf of the United States and the territories of the United States. The Chairman of the delegation of the territories of the United States countersigned on behalf of the territories.

The amended Radio Regulations will enter into force on January 1, 1965.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS

A. Accomplishments

From the standpoint of frequency allocations for space communication and radio astronomy, the overall objectives of the United States were approved by the Conference which adopted the majority of the U.S. proposals in substance. Allocations for communication-satellite, meteorological- and navigation-satellite services, space research, telecommand, tracking, and telemetry were adopted such that the U.S. programs in the various areas of space radiocommunication can proceed satisfactorily. While the allocations for radio astronomy are not as adequate as the United States had desired, a substantial improvement was made in the protection from harmful interference afforded to radio astronomical observations throughout the world and particularly in the Western Hemisphere.

On the technical side, the Conference largely succeeded in accomplishing the diffi-

cult task of superimposing the allocations for the communication-satellite service on those already made to terrestrial fixed and mobile services by prescribing technical criteria essential to the avoidance of mutually harmful interference. Owing to the dearth of experimental data and detailed technical studies, it will be necessary to reexamine the technical conditions laid down regarding the sharing of frequency allocations between terrestrial radio services and the meteorological- and radionavigation-satellite services. Several recommendations were adopted which request the CCIR and national administrations to undertake further studies.

The Conference adopted the U.S. proposals in all important particulars with regard to the notification and recording of frequency assignments to space radiocommunication services and to terrestrial services which share frequency bands with these space radio services.

The delegation, with the assistance of other delegations, was successful in having the Conference agree that the regulations concerning the notification, registration, and use of frequencies in bands allocated to space radiocommunication should have the same status as the 1959 regulations which were amended or modified. At one stage of the Conference, there appeared to be some support for the proposals of some administration that these regulations be considered interim and subject to review by a special planning conference. Had such proposals carried, the effect upon the development of space communication programs could have been serious. Inasmuch as the status of frequencies involved would have remained uncertain and the present state of the art does not permit the changing of frequencies in use on board unmanned objects in space, these proposals did not provide a sufficiently firm basis for going forward with costly long-term programs.

A subject of considerable significance to future aeronautical radiocommunication was the matter of allocating frequency bands for the use and development of aeronautical communication systems using space communication techniques between earth stations in the aeronautical mobile service and air-space craft and aircraft flying near or beyond the limits of the sensible atmosphere. For this purpose the Conference made available three frequency bands on a shared basis with the aeronautical radionavigation service and two bands on a shared basis with the aeronautical mobile (R) service. The latter bands are limited initially for use by satellite relay stations of the aeronautical mobile (R) service. In addition, four of the aeronautical radionavigation bands were also made available for satellite-borne electronic aids to air navigation. The Conference recommended that the 1964 Conference to revise the (R) plan contained in appendix 26 to the Radio Regulations take steps to provide the high-frequency channels necessary for routine flight of transport air-space vehicles intended to fly between points on the earth's surface both within and beyond the major part of the atmosphere.

B. Value of pre-Conference international coordination

I cannot conclude this report without calling attention to the benefits derived from the thorough international coordination of views and proposals in which the U.S. preparatory group engaged for many months prior to the Conference. There can be no doubt that this effort was in a large measure responsible for the expeditious manner in which the Conference undertook its complex and difficult tasks. This is understandable in light of the fact that at least 19 European countries with extensive worldwide telecommunication interests had full knowledge of and strongly supported all major U.S. pro-

posals. In addition the delegations from Japan and Latin America were effective in this regard. There is no question in my mind that without this coordination the Conference could not have successfully completed its agenda in the time allotted. I strongly urge the Department of State to encourage and support such pre-Conference coordination prior to any future telecommunication conferences.

I understand that by previous standards for U.S. delegations to telecommunication conferences, my delegation was a small one. However, I should emphasize that the number of persons on my delegation and their outstanding qualifications provided me with a group which was fully adequate to cope with all aspects of the work. A larger delegation would have been more difficult to control and weld into a cohesive unit, while a smaller delegation would not have been able to cover the conference work adequately.

In closing, I wish to express to you my appreciation for having provided me with an outstanding delegation to assist me in the work of the Conference. I am indebted to each member for his loyal cooperation and for completely subordinating agency and industry interests to the overall interests of the United States. It was an honor and privilege to serve as Chairman of the delegation.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH H. MCCONNELL,
Chairman, Delegation of the United States of America to the ITU Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference.

ANNEX A

LIST OF COUNTRIES AND ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

A. Countries: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia,¹ Canada, China, Cyprus, Vatican City, Colombia, Congo (Léopoldville), Korea, Costa Rica,¹ Cuba, Denmark, French overseas territories, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece,¹ Guatemala, Hungary (RP), India, Indonesia, Iran,¹ Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, New Zealand, Uganda, Pakistan, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Spanish provinces in Africa, United Arab Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Yugoslavia (FSR), Ukraine (RSS), Rumania (RP), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanganyika, Czechoslovakia (RS), U.S. territories, United Kingdom territories, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Kenya.²

B. Private operating agencies: Companhia Portuguesa Radio Marconi, Italcable, Cable and Wireless, American Cable & Radio Corp., France Cables et Radio, Compagnie Generale De Telegraphie Sans Fil.

C. United Nations and specialized agencies: United Nations Organization (UNO), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

D. International organizations: International Air Transport Association (IATA), International Chamber of Shipping, International Radio Maritime Committee (CIRM), Inter-Union Committee for Frequency Allocations for Radio Astronomy and Space Science (IUCAF), Committee on Space Research (COSPAR), International Council of Scientific Unions (CIUS), International Federation of Editors of Journals and Publications (FIEJ), International Broadcasting

¹ No vote.

² Associate member.

and Television Organization (IBTO), European Broadcasting Union (EBU), International Amateur Radio Union (IARU), International Scientific Radio Union (URSI).

ANNEX B

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE ITU SPACE RADIO COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE

U.S. delegate: The Honorable Joseph H. McConnell (chairman), president, Reynolds Metals Co., Richmond, Va.

Alternate U.S. delegates: The Honorable Jacob D. Beam (vice chairman), Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; T. A. M. Craven (vice chairman), former Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

Senior adviser: The Honorable E. William Henry, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Advisers:

Frederick J. Altman, director, system engineering division, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.; Allen Barnabel, Communications Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce; Charles A. Brooks, Chief of International and Allocation Branch, Frequency Management Division, Systems Research and Development Service, Federal Aviation Agency; William G. Carter, Special Assistant for International Space Communications, Department of State.

Joseph V. Charyk, Ph. D., president, Communications Satellite Corp.

Wilfrid Dean, Jr., Director, Navy Radio Frequency Spectrum Division, Office of Naval Communications, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy.

Harry Fine, Assistant Chief, Research Division, Federal Communications Commission.

Lyman G. Halley, Chief, International Coordination Branch, Office of Emergency Planning.

David W. Holmes, Technical Assistant to the Director, National Weather Satellite Center, Department of Commerce.

George Jacobs, Chief, Frequency Division, Office of the Engineering Manager, International Broadcasting Service, U.S. Information Agency.

John Kelleher, Communications System, Office of Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Carl W. Loeber, Chief, Telecommunications Division, Department of State.

Lee R. Marks, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State.

Leonard H. Marks, member, board of directors, Communications Satellite Corp.

James McElroy, Deputy Chief of Communications and Frequency Management, Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Paul D. Miles, Chief, Radio Spectrum Division, Office of Emergency Planning.

S. Meredith Myers, Assistant Chief, Frequency Allocation and Treaty Division, Federal Communications Commission.

George W. Swenson, Jr., professor of electrical engineering and research, and professor of astronomy, University of Illinois.

James P. Veatch, director, Frequency Bureau, Radio Corp. of America.

William H. Watkins, Assistant Chief Engineer in Charge of Frequency Allocation and Treaty Division, Federal Communications Commission.

H. E. Weppeler, radio engineer, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

James P. West, lieutenant commander, USAF, Frequency Branch, Office of the Director of Command Control and Communications, Department of the Air Force.

Nathaniel White, Special Assistant for Frequency Management, Office of the Chief Signal Officer, Department of the Army, Department of Defense.

Edward N. Wright, lieutenant colonel, USAF, Communications Satellite Project

Office, Defense Communications Agency, Department of Defense.

Congressional advisers:

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE, U.S. Senate.
The Honorable NORRIS COTTON, U.S. Senate.

The Honorable OREN HARRIS, House of Representatives.

The Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, House of Representatives.

Secretary of delegation: Bernard J. Rotklein, Office of International Conferences, Department of State.

Members of the staff:

Margaret M. Barrett, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Katherine Glazer, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Stuart Lippe, Geneva, Switzerland.

Alyce Carey Moss, Office of International Conferences, Department of State.

Sandra R. Pectol, Telecommunications Division, Department of State.

Arlene Rouillard, Geneva, Switzerland.

Irene E. Scher (documents officer), Office of International Conferences, Department of State.

Alice O. Whittier, Bureau of International Relations, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

DELEGATION OF THE TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Delegate: The Honorable James T. Devine, U.S. Mission, Geneva, Switzerland.

Adviser: Mr. William Denny, U.S. Mission, Geneva, Switzerland.

ANNEX C

PRIMARY CONFERENCE RESPONSIBILITIES—U.S. DELEGATION

NAME AND ASSIGNMENTS¹

Ambassador J. H. McConnell: (1) Chairman, U.S. delegation; (2) U.S. delegate; (3) U.S. spokesman, Steering Committee.

Ambassador J. Beam: (1) Vice Chairman, U.S. delegation; (2) alternate U.S. delegate; (3) spokesman, Credentials Committee.

Commander T. A. M. Craven: (1) Technical Vice Chairman, U.S. delegation; (2) alternate U.S. delegate.

Mr. E. William Henry: (1) Senior Adviser, U.S. delegation; (2) leader of communication satellite policy group.

Mr. F. Altman: Technical Committee.

Mr. A. Barnabel: Allocations Committee.

Mr. C. A. Brooks: Allocations Committee.

Mr. W. G. Carter: (1) Communication satellite policy group; (2) Editorial Committee.

Dr. J. V. Charyk: Communication satellite policy group.

Mr. W. Dean, Jr.: Allocations Committee.

Mr. H. Fine: U.S. spokesman, Technical Committee.

Mr. L. G. Halley: Regulations Committee.

Mr. D. W. Holmes: (1) Allocations Committee; (2) Technical Committee.

Mr. George Jacobs: Technical Committee.

Mr. J. Kelleher: (1) Technical Committee; (2) Allocations Committee.

Mr. C. W. Loeber: (1) U.S. spokesman, Budget Committee; (2) organize liaison with foreign delegations; (3) delegation coordinator.

Mr. Lee Marks: Legal adviser to U.S. delegation.

Mr. Leonard Marks: Communication satellite policy group.

Mr. J. McElroy: Allocations Committee.

Mr. P. D. Miles: U.S. spokesman, Regulations Committee.

Mr. S. M. Myers: (1) U.S. spokesman, Editorial Committee; (2) Allocations Committee; (3) Technical Committee.

¹ Except for the Chairman and Vice Chairmen, all accredited members of the U.S. delegation were advisers.

Prof. G. W. Swenson, Jr.: (1) Adviser on radio astronomy; (2) Allocations Committee; (3) Technical Committee.

Mr. J. P. Veatch: Regulations Committee.
Mr. W. H. Watkins: U.S. spokesman, Allocations Committee.

Mr. H. E. Weppeler: Allocations Committee.
Lt. Col. J. P. West: Allocations Committee.

Mr. N. White: Regulations Committee.
Lt. Col. E. H. Wright: Technical Committee.

Mr. J. T. Devine: Chairman of delegation, Territories of the United States.

Mr. W. E. Denny: Vice Chairman, delegation of Territories of the United States.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM: PROBLEMS TO BE FACED

The establishment, at the earliest possible date, of a global satellite communications system is a matter of national policy of the United States. This policy was approved by the Congress and incorporated in the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. By means of that law, Congress declared the policy of the United States to establish in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable, a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive not only to public needs but also to—and note this particularly—national objectives. The national objectives are spelled out further in the act; namely, to contribute to world peace and understanding, to provide telecommunications services for economically less-developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed; to make efficient and economic use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum; and to reflect the benefits of this new technology in both quality of service and charges for such services. Our committee has submitted to the House during the first session of this Congress a report on the activities which have transpired during the first year since the enactment of that act. It is House Report No. 809, 88th Congress, 1st session.

Since the successful conclusion of the Geneva Conference, efforts at making a global communications satellite system an early reality have shifted in high gear both here in the United States and in other countries. On the other hand, it should not be overlooked that there are many factors both at home and abroad which may have a tendency of hindering the early realization of these ambitious plans. It is well nigh impossible to present a reasonably complete catalog of the favorable and unfavorable factors in the picture.

In giving consideration to these factors it must not be forgotten that the will to accomplish this task, if only strong enough, can overcome even the largest accumulation of unfavorable factors. And, please remember—it is the declared policy of the legislative and executive branches of our Government, to use our best efforts to accomplish this task at the earliest practicable date. I trust that our Government, in turn, can expect all interested private groups in this country fully to support this declared governmental policy.

Let us start with a look at the picture abroad. The interested European countries decided earlier to form an inter-governmental group called the European Conference on Satellite Communications to act as a single European spokesman in dealing with the United States. This group has several subgroups to deal with technical, organizational, and other problems.

It is the purpose of the group to determine whether, and if so, in what form and under what conditions the European countries will be willing to participate in an early satellite system.

In order to give the Members of the House and the interested public an adequate picture of European communications satellite developments, I include at this point in the RECORD a summary which has been prepared based upon briefings of this committee by officials of the Department of State:

SUMMARY OF EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATION IN THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE FIELD¹

NASA EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

Early and intense interest in the developing technology of communication satellites was displayed by various European countries. Initial technical activities were conducted largely within the framework of the experimental program developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Council in cooperation with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

In February 1961, the British Post Office entered into a memorandum of understanding with NASA providing for the construction of ground receiving facilities at Goonhilly Downs, England. A similar agreement was made soon after with the French National Telecommunication Research Center (CNET) providing for French participation in the experimental program through a station to be installed at Pleumeur-Bodou in Brittany.

These two stations, together with the A.T. & T. installation at Andover, Maine, provided the ground environment for the highly successful Telstar experimental program. Subsequently, arrangements were made with Italy, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Brazil, Japan and others for participation in the NASA experimental program using both the Relay and Telstar satellites.

ORIGINS OF REGIONAL COOPERATION

During 1962 a number of European telecommunication officials began considering the desirability of regional European cooperation in this field. It was appreciated that a large number of ground stations to serve Western Europe could not be justified technically or economically. It was further felt that in view of the technological advance demonstrated by the United States, European interests would be best protected if the European countries could speak with one voice rather than many.

EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF POSTAL AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS ADMINISTRATIONS (CEPT)

The first concrete manifestation of a regional approach took place in December 1962, within the framework of the organization of operating agencies called the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (commonly referred to as the CEPT).

The following countries belong to the CEPT: Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, The Netherlands,

Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Austria, Cyprus, Liechtenstein, and Monaco.

CEPT AD HOC COMMITTEE

At its plenary meeting in Cologne on December 12-14, 1962, the Telecommunications Committee, one of the permanent organs of the CEPT, set up a committee, known thereafter as the CEPT Ad Hoc Committee, with the following terms of reference:

1. To study all the problems relating to the organized participation of all European countries desiring to do so in the establishment and operation of a single world network of telecommunication by satellite.

2. To establish particularly the basis of discussions to be held between the countries of the CEPT and the United States of America with a view to the possibility of establishing and operating a single world network of telecommunication via satellite.

3. To study the basis for a world organization for the management of such network.

The CEPT resolution establishing the Ad Hoc Committee was the first expression of European views in favor of the U.S. policy which, for technical, economic, and political views, calls for a single global communication satellite system rather than a multiplicity of separate competing systems of different national or regional sponsorship. The first meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee took place in Paris, March 11-15, 1963. A subcommittee structure was set up and a number of technical and traffic questions were formulated for transmittal to the U.S. Communications Satellite Corp.

GROWING POLITICAL INTEREST

By this time a number of governmental departments other than the telecommunications administrations had become increasingly interested in the field of communication by satellite. Typically, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and those Ministries dealing with space technology became involved in the policy and organizational aspects of the work of the CEPT ad hoc Committee. This tendency culminated in an intergovernmental meeting convened in Paris in May 1963 to which the Foreign Ministries of all CEPT member countries were invited. Some 15 countries attended the meeting. For the most part the delegations were headed by senior foreign ministry officials and included representatives from the space-oriented ministries in addition to the telecommunications administrations.

This was the first European regional consideration of communication satellites on an intergovernmental political level, rather than on the telecommunication administrations level.

The Conference considered a number of basic policy considerations in a preliminary fashion and decided to convene a further meeting in London in July.

EUROPEAN CONFERENCE ON SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

The next intergovernmental meeting was held in London July 16-18, 1963. It entitled itself the "European Conference on Satellite Communications" and set up a committee structure consisting of: Steering Committee, Organizational Committee, Space Technology Committee, and CEPT ad hoc Committee.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE AND THE CEPT AD HOC COMMITTEE

One of the most important decisions reached by the Conference at London was that henceforward the CEPT ad hoc Committee should serve as telecommunication advisers to the Conference and that the primary jurisdiction of the ad hoc Committee would be technical and operating questions, with organizational, financial and legal matters to be dealt with by the European Conference on Satellite Communication.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND CONTACTS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Subsequent to the July session, each of the committees of the Conference held a number of meetings in preparation for the third plenary meeting of the Conference which took place in Rome. At a number of committee meetings preliminary exchanges of views with the United States took place, specifically: Key executives of the Communications Satellite Corp. together with a representative of the Department of State attended a meeting of the Steering Committee of the Conference held in London, October 14-15, 1963, during which organization ideas were exchanged in a preliminary fashion. It was there agreed that representatives of the corporation should attend the meetings of the ad hoc Committee of the CEPT in Bonn on November 14-15 and of the Space Technology Committee in London on November 19 to discuss various technical and operational aspects involved in the planning for a single global communications system.

ROME MEETING OF THE EUROPEAN CONFERENCE ON SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS, NOVEMBER 26-29, 1963

A consensus developed at this meeting that a new European regional organization should be created to represent Europe in a global commercial system of satellite communications. It was agreed that the organization should be set up to provide, to the extent possible, a counterpart to the U.S. Communications Satellite Corp. It is expected that each member would contribute a share to the capital requirements.

Recognizing that formal creation of such an organization would be a lengthy process, the Rome meeting constituted the European Conference as the provisional European regional organization and changed the name of the Steering Committee to the Committee of Deputies, a body which will serve as the executive of the provisional organization.

The Rome meeting approved the action taken by the CEPT ad hoc Committee at its November 14-15 meeting in Bonn in setting up a subcommittee to prepare a plan for a regional European approach to ground-station environment, including distribution of satellite traffic from ground stations to those participating countries not having ground stations on their territories.

At the Rome meeting, Cyprus, Greece, and Ireland, all members of the CEPT, participated for the first time in the deliberations of the Conference. Australia attends the meetings of the Conference as an observer due to its membership in ELDO, the European Launcher Development Organization. ELDO itself is also represented by an observer.

FUTURE CONTACT WITH THE UNITED STATES

The Conference decided it would be advisable to have a further exploratory meeting with the United States and Canada prior to its next plenary meeting to be held in March 1964.

GLOSSARY OF EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATION IN SPACE COMMUNICATION

CEPT

The European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT) is a regional group of operating administrations formed by treaty executed at Montreux, Switzerland, in 1959.

One of its permanent organs is the Telecommunications Committee. At the plenary meeting of the Telecommunications Committee, held in Cologne, Germany, in December 1962, an ad hoc committee (referred to as the CEPT Ad Hoc Committee) was set up to study the various questions relating to organized European participation in a worldwide satellite system. The December

¹ Source: Briefings by officials of Department of State.

1962 meeting can be considered as the formal beginning of European cooperation on a regional basis in the field of communication satellites for commercial application.

European Conference on Satellite Communication

This was originally an informal intergovernmental discussion group composed of member countries of the CEPT. At its third plenary meeting in Rome, November 26-29, 1963, it declared itself to be the provisional European regional organization for participation in a global system of commercial communication satellites.

Copers

Copers (the European Preparatory Commission for Space Research) was formed at Geneva, Switzerland, in November 1960 to study, plan, and propose a cooperative space program for Europe, to be known as the European Space Research Organization (ESRO). Specific questions assigned to Copers for study were:

1. Should ESRO conduct purely scientific extraterrestrial projects such as those conducted during the IGY or should it enter the technological side; that is, research and development field of space flight rockets, including the motors and equipment.

2. How should it be financed? The membership of Copers consisted of representatives of Belgium, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland.

As a result of the studies by Copers, it was agreed that there should be established an organization known as the European Space Research Organization (ESRO) for the purpose of furthering space research for peaceful purposes, to enhance science, commerce, and prestige.

The ESRO agreement was signed in Paris on June 14, 1962. Copers will cease to exist when the ESRO agreement comes into force.

ESRO

In January of 1960 at Nice, France, discussions at a Committee of Space Research (Cospar) meeting resulted in the formation of the Group d'Etudes Européennes pour la Recherche Spatiale (GEERS), a study group formed to investigate space research. As a result of this study, a protocol was drafted in Paris on February 21, 1962, and was signed by the following countries: Federal Republic of Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France, Italy, Norway, Netherlands, United Kingdom, Sweden, and Switzerland. The formal establishment of the European Space Research Organization (ESRO) took place in Paris on June 14, 1962. The Convention has not yet come into force due to insufficient number of ratifications.

The purpose of ESRO, as stated in the Convention, is to provide for and to promote collaboration among European states in space research and technology, exclusively for peaceful purposes.

ELDO

Early in 1961, at Strasbourg, the United Kingdom and France proposed the formation of a European Launcher Development Organization (ELDO) using the Blue Streak missile as the first stage of the launching vehicle. The protocol for this organization was established in London on May 9, 1962, and was signed by the following countries: Australia, Belgium, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The Convention for establishing ELDO was held in London from March 29 to April 30, 1962. To date the United Kingdom and Australia have ratified the Convention. The Convention has not yet come into force due to insufficient number of ratifications.

ELDO hopes to provide a launching vehicle which can be sold to ESRO or others for launching satellites for peaceful purposes.

The first stage of the ELDO launcher will be the British Blue Streak missile which owes its existence to American technology in developing the Atlas missile.

The second stage of the ELDO launcher will be developed by the French.

The third stage is to be developed by the Federal Republic of Germany.

Although European by name, the ELDO organization proposed provides for outside membership, thus permitting Australia to contribute the use of its test range at Woomera.

Cospar

The Committee on Space Research (Cospar) is a committee on the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). It was established at the time of the eighth general assembly of ICSU in Washington, D.C., in October 1958, to further the international cooperation in space science research initiated during the ICSU program for the International Geophysical Year.

The members of Cospar include representatives of adherent national scientific institutions and representatives of international scientific unions affiliated with ICSU.

The organization of Cospar includes a bureau, an executive council, and a finance committee. Scientific working groups have been established to develop the basic recommendations of the scientific program of Cospar and these, in turn, include special subgroups, correspondents, and ad hoc panels to deal with special problems.

Eurospace

This is a nonprofit association composed of industrial concerns which have joined together to assist the development of a European space effort. The aim of Eurospace is to promote space research development in Western Europe as well as to clarify technical, economic, and legal questions of importance to the industry. Eurospace will attempt to represent the interests of European industry in connection with ELDO/ESRO and national programs.

At present 90 companies or affiliates are members from the following countries: United States of America affiliates, 5; national industrial associations, 6; France, 34; Great Britain, 14; West Germany, 12; Belgium, 7; Italy, 5; Switzerland, 4; Netherlands, 2; and Norway, 1.

Some European countries evidently are more interested in an early satellite system than are others, and the group may turn out to be not quite as monolithic as it hopes to be.

Different European countries may find themselves in different positions. The British, for example, may desire to protect their traditional position of dominance in telecommunications which is based on their ownership of undersea cables and the routing of cable traffic through London where cables to different geographical regions interconnect.

Vice versa, some other European countries may desire to take advantage of the new satellite technology for the purpose of challenging the traditional British position. In some respects we may witness here a repetition of the Common Market situation.

Ground stations are actually in existence in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. Stations are being built elsewhere. Multiple-ground stations located within comparatively small geographical areas present technical and

economic problems with regard to satellite operations. The operation of multiple ground stations requires provision for noninterference with each other and, therefore, is wasteful of frequencies which otherwise would be available for providing additional circuits. Multiple ground stations therefore make satellites economically less attractive than they otherwise might be. There is, therefore, the problem of reaching a European solution of the problem of ground stations which is technically and economically satisfactory yet politically acceptable to the several European nations involved. Similar problems will arise in other geographical regions of the globe as the global system comes into being.

Next, there is the technical problem— which of several satellite systems is to be adopted: a medium high-altitude system or a synchronous high-altitude system, a random system or a controlled system, and so forth. Also there are in the picture competition and rivalry among enterprises located in different countries which hope to supply equipment for the ground stations and the space segment of the satellite system.

Here at home, while we are dealing with a single nation, the factors, if anything, are even more complex. Traditionally, in our country we have held to the policy concept of insisting on competition between record and voice communications by wire or radio. Technological developments have created a new twilight zone between these two, such as data and facsimile transmission. Potentially, these are as important as, if not more important from an economic point of view, than the traditional voice and record fields. Therefore, these twilight areas are claimed with considerable emphasis by both contenders.

Formal proceedings which involve some aspects of this basic issue are now pending before the Federal Communications Commission both in the domestic and international fields.

Suggestions have been made that the traditional concept of voice versus record communications should be abandoned, at least in the international field, and that all U.S. international telecommunications facilities, including satellites, be merged in a single "chosen instrument." Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had extensive experience with similar proposals in the field of international aviation. Other persons have suggested a merger of all U.S. international record communication carriers in order to strengthen these carriers in their competition with the A.T. & T., the only U.S. international voice communications carrier.

Additionally, there is the question of ownership and control of satellite ground stations in the United States. The question of whether the Satellite Corp. or one or more carriers should be permitted to own and control ground stations was heatedly debated in the Congress. Under the provisions of the act, the decision on this question has been left to the FCC to be determined in the public interest.

To further complicate the situation, there is the question, which must be re-

solved, of whether the Satellite Corp. shall be a carriers' carrier serving only certificated carriers, or whether it should be permitted to deal directly with ultimate users, governmental and private, who own their own systems or who lease circuits from established carriers. This question involves the broad issue of governmental and private communications systems versus common carrier systems. A look at the transportation situation in the United States shows that the growth of private transportation can erode if not destroy high quality and economical common carrier services. This should not be permitted to happen in the case of communications. Additionally, private communications systems are wasteful of radiofrequencies because they require more valuable spectrum space than is required for common carrier service.

It can readily be seen that all of the foreign and domestic factors which I have mentioned and many additional ones which time does not permit me to discuss, are likely to be given different weight by different nations and interest groups. The outcome of the struggle for the establishment of an early global satellite communications system, therefore, is difficult to predict.

If the system is to become an early reality we must do both at home and abroad what the eminent chairman of the board of the A.T. & T., Mr. Kappel, stated he was doing within his own company, namely, to assume:

No one person can know all the answers . . . Working together, though, we can collectively come up with the best answer to the problems that confront us. The answer, then, lies in people—in their working together cooperatively and creatively. It's my job to foster an atmosphere in which that can happen.

What is being done successfully within the A.T. & T. must be attempted in the much larger arena of global communications. It will not be easy to achieve equal success in this larger arena. The Geneva Conference was an excellent beginning. We must now follow through and we must be able to count on all Americans to support the policy of their Government which looks to the establishment of an early global communications system.

This will require a great deal of flexibility and it may also require some adjustment of personal interests on the part of some Americans. How can we, however, I ask you, expect foreign nations to cooperate with us in this venture if we ourselves cannot bring about cooperation here at home?

I am sure such cooperation will be forthcoming and I am counting on all men of good will both in Government and in industry to do their very best in the hope that their contributions will be of some help in improving understanding among the peoples of this world.

It is most gratifying to me that on the basis of discussions between officials of the Communications Satellite Corp. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an excellent beginning has been made in this respect. On December 6, 1963, Mr. James E. Dingman, executive vice

president of A.T. & T., addressed a letter to Mr. Leo Welch, chairman of the board of Comsat, expressing A.T. & T.'s preference, for diverse reasons, for using, by 1966 or early 1967, satellite circuits instead of placing additional cables until the North Atlantic cross section is made up of approximately equal numbers of cable and satellite voice channels. Furthermore, A.T. & T. promises to take all reasonable steps to assist Comsat in obtaining agreement to this effect with European communication agencies.

As I understand the situation, if these basic propositions are adhered to by the two companies, significant progress will have been achieved in the direction of the early establishment of a viable satellite communications system.

In view of the importance of this letter for future developments in this field, I insert the text of this letter at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICAN TELEPHONE &
TELEGRAPH CO.,
New York, N.Y., December 6, 1963.

MR. LEO WELCH,
Chairman of the Board,
Communications Satellite Corp.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELCH: We should like to review discussions we have had with you and others of your company about the effect of high capacity undersea cable upon our requirements for satellite communications channels.

In summary, the point can be stressed that we see a place, and a need, for both cable and satellite communications. Two things make this apparent. One is the rapid and continuing increase in the volume of transoceanic communications. The other is the value in diversity of communications—from the standpoint of day-to-day service integrity and from the standpoint of national security. We have a keen interest in using communications channels both in cable and in satellite systems.

Our discussions have covered other facets of this overall subject, and these might be highlighted here.

There are two basic factors in every decision we make. First, underlying everything we do is our responsibility to meet the growing needs of our customers for good service, which includes having channels of good quality available when required. Second, in behalf of our customers and our shareholders, we must give careful consideration to costs.

The plans you have reviewed with us indicate that satellite facilities are expected to be available late in 1966 or early 1967 with the further possibility of a somewhat earlier limited capacity that might be obtained by means of synchronous satellites. If suitable satellite circuits are available to meet our additional needs at that time in the North Atlantic section, which is an area where high capacity cables could be attractive, we would prefer, for diversity reasons, to use satellite circuits instead of placing additional cables. As it looks now, this preference would continue in subsequent years until the North Atlantic cross section was made up of approximately equal numbers of cable and satellite voice channels. By "suitable satellite facilities," we mean circuits that are satisfactory in quality and have costs bearing a reasonable relationship to alternative methods of getting the circuits.

Obviously, the communication agencies at the other end would have to agree to this. We would take all reasonable steps to assist in obtaining this agreement. Additionally, the authorization of the FCC would also

have to be obtained in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

In planning to meet future customer requirements, we would need to be assured during 1964 whether satellite circuits will be available in 1966 or early 1967 because if there is to be any serious delay we would need at least 2 years to implement other plans for meeting our customers' requirements until satellite circuits did become available.

In the North America-South America section we need 50 to 60 improved voice channels now and the need is continuing to increase. Our studies indicate a need in 1966 for over 80 voice circuits from the United States to these South American points—Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Peru. While preliminary cable plans have been made to serve these countries, if suitable satellite facilities could be assured by 1966 or earlier, we would immediately initiate discussions with our South American communications partners with a view to using satellite facilities initially, with cables possibly coming along later.

We expect to continue development of improved undersea cable systems and undoubtedly other organizations can be expected to do the same. It would be reasonable to expect, then, that both cables and satellite circuits will be used to meet overseas requirements just as both cables and microwave radio circuits have been used to meet domestic requirements. Diversity of routes and facility types is the best method of assuring service integrity and that is one of the major reasons for our interest in utilizing satellite circuits for overseas service as soon as possible.

The high capacity cable will have many important applications but we see no basic reason why it should prevent satellite usage from reaching an economical and profitable level.

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. E. DINGMAN.

On the other hand, let there be no doubt that in matters where the national interest is at stake and where interested private parties cannot reach voluntary agreements, Congress can act effectively and expeditiously in order to protect the national interest. The prompt enactment of legislation to ward off the threatened railroad strike is a recent example showing congressional capabilities.

It is my sincere hope that such action will not be necessary in order to bring about agreement on the part of the domestic groups who may have divergent private interest with regard to the establishment of an early global satellite system. We are fortunate indeed and we can be proud of the fact that in this country of ours we have been able to count on private enterprise to keep up with the rapidly rising demand for high quality communications.

Congress has not had frequent occasion to reexamine our present national telecommunications policies or to establish new policies in this field. For a long time it has been our well established policy that commercial domestic as well as international telecommunications services shall be rendered by private companies in competition with each other and subject to Government regulation in order to protect the public interest. The timetable of congressional action during the last four decades in this field indicates that Congress has not found it necessary to modify these traditional basic

principles, and has been called upon to act only whenever outstanding changes have occurred in telecommunications technology which have made supplemental congressional policy action imperative.

The advent of radio broadcasting and the resulting confusion in the ether were responsible for the enactment of the Radio Act of 1927, pursuant to which the Federal Government assumed responsibility for the orderly assignment of radio frequencies for governmental as well as commercial purposes. In 1943, the shrinking volume of telegram messages in favor of communications by telephone and other speedier methods of communications necessitated the enactment of legislation providing for the merger of Postal Telegraph with Western Union.

The advent of space communications to which private industry has made such outstanding contributions has necessitated the formulation of additional national telecommunications policies.

I remember only too well how some members of private industry at first sought to persuade Federal agencies, the Congress, and the American people, that communications satellites were simply an equivalent of telephone and telegraph cables hung in outer space instead of being buried on the ocean floor.

The implication was, of course, that there was no need for modifying our traditional national policies of letting private companies conduct international commercial telecommunications in competition with each other and subject to Federal regulation, and permitting these companies to negotiate bilateral business agreements involving satellites with the post and telegraph administrations of individual foreign nations just as had been done for many decades in the case of undersea cables.

Numerous factors—too many and too complex to discuss here—persuaded the Congress and the executive branch that the role to be played by communications satellites in global telecommunications was likely to go far beyond the traditional commercial use of undersea cables.

As a consequence, after considerable controversy and debate, Congress enacted the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, which was signed into law by the late President Kennedy on August 31, 1962. That act reiterates our traditional policy of relying on private enterprise in providing international telecommunications services subject to Government controls. It also stresses, however, the importance of an early satellite communications system as a means of furthering our efforts in exercising leadership in world affairs. In other words, an improved global telecommunications system has become an indispensable ingredient in the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy.

Anybody who has had occasion to watch television coverage of the events following the late President Kennedy's assassination, some of which were broadcast internationally via satellite, will not be inclined to challenge this estimate. Radio and television by satellites, in addition to other satellite communica-

tions, can tie the peoples of the world together more closely than any other technical developments produced by man.

I have infinite confidence that men in this Nation and other nations will live up to the challenge of making global satellite communications an early reality. Certainly I shall do my share to make this dream come true.

Incidentally, the absence of an adequate global telecommunications system during the days of the Cuban crisis when this Nation sought to rally behind her other nations to bring about the prompt removal of Russian missiles from Cuban soil, was an outstanding lesson which we have learned from that crisis. As a consequence the executive branch ordered the establishment of a National Communications System to tie together all Federal telecommunications services for the purpose of making these services available in the case of an emergency—national or international.

I must apologize for having taken so much of your time to share with you some of my thoughts on vital domestic and international telecommunications problems. I have done so in the firm conviction that international communications will play an increasingly vital role in world affairs, and that, therefore, this body should be properly apprised of important recent developments in this field.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULTER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko there will be this universal inscription: "To the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All the Captive Nations." This represents the manifest significance of Shevchenko and his works in behalf of world freedom. It is this crowning achievement of Shevchenko that the Soviet Russian imperiocolonialists and their puppets rebel against and seek to have eliminated from the forthcoming unveiling of the Shevchenko statue in Washington.

In following this whole significant episode on the Shevchenko memorial, I believe my colleagues will find these additional items of absorbing interest and importance, and I include them in the Record in the following order:

First. The January 7 Washington Post report "Red Embassy Joins Row on Shevchenko."

Second. A striking letter to the Post's editor by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University, which evidently has been the source of the Post's most recent semieditorialized report—January 7.

Third. A letter from the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States.

Fourth. Letters to Mrs. Rowe and Secretary Udall by the orthodox archbishop of New York, the Most Reverend Mstyslav S. Skrypnyk.

Fifth. Letters to Mr. Wiggins and Mrs. Rowe by the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European descent.

Sixth. The editorial "Is This the Voice of 'The Washington Post?'" which appeared in the authoritative periodical the Ukrainian Bulletin.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1964]

RED EMBASSY JOINS ROW ON SHEVCHENKO

The Soviet Embassy entered the Shevchenko controversy yesterday by releasing a letter endorsing the proposed statue of the Ukrainian poet in Washington.

In the five-page letter, signed by 36 Soviet Ukrainians and forwarded to the Embassy by an official Soviet press agency, the signers offered to take part in the statue unveiling scheduled for next spring. The site is the triangle formed by P, 22d and 23d Streets NW.

The signers, described by the Embassy as "prominent Ukrainian public figures," also volunteered to "send to the American continent some sacred soil from the Chernychya hill where Taras (Shevchenko) sleeps the eternal sleep."

They applauded the poet, as do Americans of Ukrainian descent, but added: "We are resolutely against the malicious attempts of the enemies of the Soviet Union to use the poet's works against our country, against the cause of all humanity—the struggle for peace."

This was a reference to the anti-Soviet aims of some American sponsors of the Shevchenko statue. Because of these sponsors' tactics in gaining congressional approval for the statue, and because of the poet's questionable stature and significance, the project has become a matter of dispute.

The National Capital Planning Commission has been asked to review its approval of the statue at its February meeting.

SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, INC.,

New York, N.Y., January 3, 1964.

To the Editor, WASHINGTON POST, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following is written as a supplement to my first letter to you of November 25, 1963. It is written in the spirit and hope of bringing informed and intelligent understanding to the debate regarding the proposed Washington monument to Taras Shevchenko. It is written, too, with the knowledge that editorial writers are sometimes prone to oversimplify problems that are extremely complex both in historical context and contemporary meaning. The great failure of such editorial writers is that they neglect to take the time to make the type of informed and intelligent analysis required of such multifactor problems and events.

In the interests of bringing complete truth to the formation of intelligent public opinion on this and other vital questions, I feel sure that the Washington Post is among those important American newspapers who are responsibly dedicated to the people's right to know. It is in this sense that I feel assured that you will in fairness print this letter. My comments here and in my first letter are specifically directed against basic statements of misinformation and distortion contained in your editorials of October 18 and 25 and November 1 and 12 as well as your most recent news story of November 29, 1963.

I have waited patiently—but disappointingly—for the publication of my first letter,

the complete text of which has already been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This second letter, however, like its predecessor, is based on the weeks of careful research needed to compile an intelligent reply borne of facts rather than emotion.

I

You presented the following arguments in opposition to the erection of this monument: (1) that it would be a memorial to a poet who knew nothing of this land (U.S.A.) and (2) that Taras Shevchenko spoke neither to its past nor to its present generations (Nov. 1). Both statements are contrary to fact.

(1) In his short life and in spite of the Iron Curtain of the czars, Taras Shevchenko was exposed to basic American political thought and key American personalities in our history. One can, in fact, cite four specific instances through which Shevchenko came to understand the American ideal: (a) with the biography of George Washington by the American writer, Washington Irving, (b) with the text of the American Declaration of Independence, (c) with the American Negro actor, the famous Shakespearean player Ira Aldridge, of Philadelphia, when a close friendship developed between them in St. Petersburg, and (d) with the invention of the steamship by an American. When he was returning from his Asiatic exile on one of these boats navigating the Volga River, Shevchenko prophetically addressed this great American in his diary as the great Fulton and foretold the victorious march of the industrial revolution and republican democracy.

(2) Shevchenko did speak to the past generations of Americans of Ukrainian descent, and, moreover, the voice of his ideas and inspiration continues to echo loud and clear to the present American generations; the projected monument in Washington is the best proof of it. He has spoken to Americans since 1865 when the Reverend A. Honcharenko, a Ukrainian Orthodox priest, landed in Boston as a political exile, having in one hand the Gospel and in the other Shevchenko's "Kobzar" (folk minstrel). After the United States bought Alaska, Father Honcharenko became editor of a paper sponsored by the American Government, the Alaska Herald. In its inaugural issue he published Shevchenko's fiery political poem against Russian imperialism, "Caucasus," which defended the freedom-loving Caucasus nationalities. He also propagated there freedom for Siberia.

Since that time Shevchenko has been the people's champion, the Ukrainian George Washington, to more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent. Do not forget our leading daily newspaper in the United States, *Svoboda*, is 70 years old and that it has been publishing history for a period that dates back more than one-third of the existence of the American nation.

In this same connection, the Ukrainian National Association in New Jersey was also founded some 70 years ago and it, together with hundreds of other cultural organizations in the United States, has had Shevchenko as its patron.

Thus for nearly a century there has existed in this country a cult of Shevchenko. He is remembered each year by manifestations, by concerts, and celebrations wherever Americans of Ukrainian descent live. A monument of Shevchenko by the world-famous American-Ukrainian sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, is in the Cultural Garden, Cleveland, Ohio. There is also a monument at the summer resort of the Ukrainian National Association in Kerhonkson, N.Y. And the Ukrainian Congress Committee has established Shevchenko freedom awards. This same cult exists in Canada where not too long ago a monument to him was unveiled in the presence of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Metropolitans of Canada.

CX—13

But Shevchenko also speaks very loudly to all Americans of Slavic descent, and the interest in his legacy shown by the honorable Congressmen of Polish descent, DERWINSKI, DULSKI, and LESINSKI is not an accident but a continuation of the fight for freedom of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, the leaders of the Bar Confederation which centered in Ukraine and struggled against Russian imperialism.

Shevchenko speaks not only to those of Polish descent but also to those of Czech, Slovak, Slovenian, Croatian, and especially of Byelorussian, Bulgarian, and Cossack descent, a total of at least 20 million Americans. Therefore, according to the distinguished American scholar of Czech descent, Joseph Roucek, of the University of Bridgeport, "Shevchenko is universally regarded as the greatest of the Ukrainian authors and one of the great poets of the Slavonic world." (Slavonic Encyclopedia, Philosophical Library, 1949.)

That Shevchenko's ideas and his popularity have penetrated into the intellectual circles of Anglo-Saxon-originated Americans is evident from the bibliography of translations and articles. When we consider further the 20 million Afro-Americans who would be interested, if they had the opportunity, in the friend of their great Ira Aldridge, the sheer number of Americans involved is most impressive.

II

Your next argument is that "as a poet Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans." Truly! This I find a preposterous void of reason and understanding. Can it be insignificant for American history that there existed in czarist Russia a poet who a century ago hoisted the banner of George Washington's "just and new law" upholding the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence? Has the ideological radiation of this great American contribution to humanity and of the name of the Father of this Nation far into Eastern Europe really no universal significance for Americans? Is it possible that in today's world this fact is unable to compete with Coca-Cola? Are the names of Goethe, Mickiewicz, Tolstoy, Ibsen, Voltaire, Strindberg better known to the American man in the street? If so, the monument of Shevchenko has a great educational mission to perform for the whole of Eastern Europe.

But in the term "universal significance" there is still a broader meaning borne of the fact that the American nation is a part of mankind. The point, of course, is obvious: whatever is of "universal significance" for all of mankind is also shared in by many Americans—even in spite of the fact that an editorial writer lacking in a true and complete understanding of history insists upon the repudiation of the American ideological contribution to East European history. Leading scholars of nations the world over agree that Shevchenko's works and life are of universal significance for mankind. From an abundant backlog of materials may I select scholars from these nationalities for whom the name of Shevchenko, according to your editorials, should be an "affront" or "offensive."

The late and renowned Russian authority, D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky, member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, said in a speech entitled "National and Universal Human Elements in the Poetry of T. Shevchenko" which was delivered on February 27, 1911, at a festive meeting in honor of Shevchenko at the Imperial Academy of Sciences:

"Shevchenko can be regarded as a national poet and as a universal human poet, and in such way we can explain the value (importance) of Shevchenko for Ukraine, for Russia, and for the whole of mankind. To transform national (matters) into universally human, elevating them to the universal-human level, that is the secret of this genius."

One of the best German experts on Shevchenko, Gustav Specht, evaluates Shevchenko in an article whose title speaks for its content: "Shevtschenkos Sonderstellung in der Neueren Weltliteratur" (Shevchenko's Special Place in the New World Literature) in the Symposium on Taras Shevtschenkos, der Ukrainische Nationaldichter, Berlin, 1937.

The American-Polish expert, Prof. M. Giergielewicz, one of the leading specialists of Slavic literature in our country, now at the University of Pennsylvania, analyzes Shevchenko's work in his article "Shevchenko and World Literature" (symposium in memory of Taras Shevchenko, on the centenary of his death, 1861-1961, Shevchenko Scientific Society, library vol. 9, Philadelphia, 1962). Professor Giergielewicz writes:

"Freedom was the guiding motif and the main concern of Shevchenko's poetry. Whenever he looked into the past, his purpose was to trace and to acclaim the spontaneous struggle against any kind of tyranny, slavery, and oppression (p. 24).

"In world literature Shevchenko's place is among those poets who succeeded in impersonating the essential tendencies and longings of their respective countries. He contrived to reconcile the closest possible unity with the nation, and those universal ideals of mankind. He belongs to those exceptional artists whose deeds and words were so closely interwoven that both became a national legend" (p. 32).

The leading American authority in the Slavic field, Prof. Clarence Manning, former active executive officer, Department of Eastern European Languages, Columbia University, published a volume, "Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine, Selected Poems, Translated With an Introduction," 1945, Jersey City, N.J. There he writes:

"In his lifetime many of the most penetrating critics in Russia saw fit to place him above Pushkin and Mickiewicz for his mastery of language and for the depth and sincerity of his ideas * * *. He formed part of that great flowering of poetry which commenced with the period of romanticism in Europe and he was one of those men who passed by a natural evolution to the great period of realism and of sensitivity to the social problems of the day. Now in the 20th century we are learning as never before to judge him for himself, as a flowering of the Ukrainian character and as a man who has a message not only for his own times and country but also for the entire world. He has stood the test of time and he deserves one recognition in these days when the entire world is sunk in war and desolation. There is no doubt today that Taras Shevchenko is one of the great Slavonic poets. He is one of the great poets of the 19th century without regard to nationality or language and his fearless appeal to right and justice speaks as eloquently in the New World as it did in the Old."

Consider yet another evaluation of Shevchenko by one of the best translators of Slavic poetry into English, Prof. Watson Kirkconnell, president, Acadia University, a renowned Milton scholar and one of Canada's foremost linguists, and his coauthor, Prof. C. H. Andrusyshyn, University of Saskatchewan. We read in the "Ukrainian Poets, Selected and Translated Into English Verse" by C. H. Andrusyshyn and Watson Kirkconnell (University of Toronto Press, 1963) p. 89:

"Although his work appeals in the first place to his own people, in it clearly flame universal ideals that apply to any people on earth who strive for liberty and justice. He is unique among world poets in that he restored singlehandedly a submerged folk's consciousness of its separate identity and roused it to assert itself supremely as a nation."

"His great poem, 'The Neophytes,' one of the pearls of world literature, is a compendium of his entire life's mission and reveals

him as a Christian seer proclaiming the eventual triumph of truth, goodness, justice, and fraternity over the forces of evil, and the emergence of humanity above tyranny and bestiality. As in the Old Testament one may read the entire history of the Hebrews, so in Shevchenko's 'Kobzar,' are to be gathered the essentials of Ukraine's vicissitudes in her thousand years of history."

Finally, I want to mention a UNESCO evaluation of Shevchenko "The UNESCO Courier," July-August, 1961, by Pauline Bentley entitled: "Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's Poet of Freedom," which significantly starts:

"A hundred years ago a poet who was one of the world's great champions of freedom died in St. Petersburg. This year his centenary is being celebrated not only in his own land, Ukraine, but throughout the Soviet Union, and in many great cities of the world including the American capital, Washington, where a statue is to be raised in his commemoration. This man's name is T. Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and patriot who not only established his country's literature high among world letters, but who actually lived his poetry. A torchbearer of liberty, his whole life mirrored the sufferings of his oppressed country and the unconquerable, indomitable will of its people for freedom."

With the support of the American delegates and all the delegates of the free world, UNESCO has dedicated 1964 as Shevchenko's 150th birthday anniversary for commemorations to him throughout the world. This is without doubt the best testimonial to Shevchenko's universal significance for mankind which, in spite of your editorials, we believe also includes the American nation, the more so as Shevchenko's fight for liberty was stimulated by George Washington.

The universal significance of Shevchenko is formulated even more deeply by the refugee poet from Soviet Ukraine, T. Osmacka, the excellent Shakespearean translator, who died in New York last year. Writing in Slovo, a symposium of exiled Ukrainian writers, New York, 1962, page 294, he said:

"I am sure, if Shevchenko would appear before Shakespeare and Goethe, they would before their spiritual eyes see him as a God-inspired, saintly man because Shevchenko increased the glory of the Saviour as a lover of human beings."

"After Jesus Christ there is in the world no dearer human being than Shevchenko in spite of the fact that he is not such an expert of the heart and human beings as Shakespeare and in spite of the fact that he is not such a deep individualist as Goethe."

This is the deepest and finest tribute paid to Shevchenko by a contemporary writer who went through the hell of Stalinism and communism to eventually reach the freedom of America.

I trust this abridged selection of excerpts from the vast library of materials dealing with Taras Shevchenko will be sufficient for you to see his "universal significance" not only for Americans but for the entire world. I trust, too, that you will see these statements as an intelligent, scholarly, and factually based refutation of your statement of October 18 that "there is no legitimate reason why a 19th century Ukrainian poet . . . should be honored with a statue . . . in the Nation's Capital."

III

I now address myself to a correction of the gross lack of understanding expressed in your next argument against the monument contained in the editorial "United States, Russia To Share Ukrainian Hero" of October 25. To that editorial you appended on November 1 that "The poet is the idol of Communist Party members" and on November 12 that "The real irony of the matter, of course, is that Shevchenko is a hero to the Soviet Union where his name is memorialized in literally hundreds of place names. His monuments there are annually the object of Communist adulation."

Thus you say that Shevchenko is "the hero," "the idol" of Communists, and "the object of Communist adulation"; consequently you conclude that our free and democratic Nation cannot share him with the country of Communist despotism.

Evidenced in this bit of mental gymnastics is that contemptible technique of "guilt by association" popularized by the late Senator Joseph McCarthy with the able assistance of the American newpress and their standards of news evaluation which earns front page and bold face attention for the sensational—with little or no responsible regard for complete truth and fairness. By employing this McCarthyite method you reflect a gross lack of understanding of the basic principles of Communist cold war tactics against the free world. And to correct such a distortion it will be necessary to outline the entire background of these complex problems. That explanation begins with an understanding of the term "semantics" as that special branch of modern linguistics which investigates the meaning of words, their evolution, formation, changes in meaning, and the reasons for those changes.

The chief reason why the free world was cheated and deceived by Russian Communists for more than 40 years was America's lack of understanding that the same words of international terminology have completely different meanings in the Soviet Union than they do in America. From *Izvestia* comes the quotation, "To deceive your enemy is the true revolutionary method of the true revolutionary struggle." We exiled scholars from European universities became conscious of this fact immediately after coming to America in 1947. That is the reason why in 1949 I published a short dictionary of international terms having completely different meanings in Moscow and Washington. Under the title, "Soviet Semantics," this article appeared in volume V of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*.

The Russian Communists developed a "double talk" vocabulary, devised to mislead and confuse non-Communists, a real "upside-down" language. For instance, the Communist meaning of the word "democracy" is actually our meaning of dictatorship; "liberation" means the Communist takeover of a free country; "aggressor" means any person or nation opposing Soviet imperialism; "militarism" means the creation of non-Communist armed strength; "colonialism" means possessing territory that Moscow wants, and so on.

In America only Norman Thomas was aware of this fact and warned of it in a good number of speeches. In substance he said, "The Communists plundered the whole terminology of European liberalism, democracy, and humanitarianism and changed their meaning into the very opposite." (See Roman Smal-Stocki, *Captive Nations*, 1960. Bookman Association, p. 44.)

It was of fundamental importance that our late President, John F. Kennedy, with his grasp for ideological conception in the conversations with Khrushchev in Vienna in 1961 immediately became aware of this fact, in his television report (Time, June 16, 1961) he publicly stated:

"The facts of the matter are that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: War, peace, democracy, and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong, of what is an internal affair and of what is aggression. And, above all, we have wholly different concepts of where the world is and where it is going."

You, Mr. Editor, cannot say that you know nothing about the "Soviet double talk"; the more so, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk

also warned American journalists in his address at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on July 10, 1961:

"The underlying crisis of our generation arises from the fact that the Soviet Union did not join the United Nations in fact, as well as in form, and lend itself to the commitments they and the rest of us made in the midst of a great war. The possession of power was transformed once more to ambition for more power."

"The capacity to defy law became a contempt of law. Doctrines were revised and adopted to promote an imperialism as old as the tragic history of man. An entire people was sealed off from the rest of the world, and secrecy became a prime strategic weapon. The institutions of the international community were either ignored or undermined from within. In the process the very language of international intercourse became distorted and contrived. 'Peace' became a word to describe whatever condition would promote their world revolution. 'Aggression' is whatever stands in its way. 'People's democracy' is a term applied to regimes no one of which has been chosen by free election. 'Self-determination' is loudly espoused but only in areas not under Communist control; the central issue of the crisis is the announced determination to impose a world of coercion upon those not already subjected to them." (U.S. News & World Report, July 24, 1961.)

Consequently, your statements that "The United States and Russia are to share the Ukrainian hero," that "Shevchenko is the idol of Communist Party members and is the object of Communist adulation" are the worst kind of public misinformation, unworthy of American journalism. They are journalistic crimes.

The only thing that the United States and the Soviet Union will share is the common word "Shevchenko"; and this word will be shared in the same sense that we share the common words: "democracy, imperialism, self-determination, aggression, peace, elections," etc. The content of the meaning, however, of this word "Shevchenko" in the free world (and this is the true meaning) represents the complete antithesis of the Russian Communist meaning. The Shevchenko of the free world is the antithesis to the Russian Communist falsified "upside-down" Shevchenko. The Russian Communist Party attempts in the Shevchenko case to commit in its old specialty, the continuous deceitful political-psychological warfare, its newest semantical fraud and ideological deceit by semantic tricks against the free world. Gullible American journalists have become Russian communism's victims.

Also, from another broader point of view your statements are unpardonable. Every college freshman knows that in the Soviet Union all liberal arts and sciences, fine arts, and literature have been under the dictatorship of the Russian Communist Party since 1922. American scholars (see the Symposium edited by Prof. C. E. Black, Princeton, "Rewriting Russian History," "Soviet Interpretations of Russia's Past," Frederick A. Praeger, 1956, 2d revised edition, 1962) analyzed how the principle of "Soviet Methods of Teaching History," expressed by M. A. Zinovlev, was realized in the field of history. "History is a powerful weapon of Communist education and it must wholly serve the cause of the struggle for communism."

The same principle was applied with even greater emphasis, however, to literature in the Soviet Union under the Russian Communist dictatorship; excellent evidence for this generally well-known fact is presented in the book by Maurice Friedberg "Russian Classics in Soviet Jackets" (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962). If that happened in the Soviet Union with

the classical Russian authors like Pushkin, Turgenev, and Tolstoy, one can imagine what happened to the Ukrainian Shevchenko. Like the great Russian writers, Shevchenko also was degraded to an adornment of Russian Communist tyranny by making him a weapon of ideological warfare in the service of specific Soviet ideals through the use of different techniques including tampering with the originals, as was done with letters of Chekov and Dostoevsky. What happened to Pasternak and Yevtushenko is also a good example.

But Shevchenko was not always an "idol," and "hero" for the Russian Communists. From the beginning they were very suspicious of his works. Then in the years 1930-33 the Shevchenko scholarship in Soviet Ukraine underwent full destruction; in 1934 Shevchenko studies were put under complete party control. The Communist Party published an official interpretation of Shevchenko in the "Theses of the Section of Culture and Propaganda of Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine on the Occasion of the 120th Anniversary of the Birthday of T. H. Shevchenko." (Published in the Red Way, Nos. 2-3, 1934.)

(A good survey of the fate of Shevchenko under Russian communism is contained in the article of the exiled Soviet scholar, Petro Odarchenko, "Shevchenko in Soviet Literary Criticism," in the book *Taras Shevchenko 1814-61*, a symposium edited by V. Mijakovskiy and George Y. Shevelov (Columbia, Mouton & Co., 1962, 's Gravenhage, Holland)). In these theses the Central Committee explained that Shevchenko embodied in his works "the strength and weakness, the power and limitations of the peasant movement which was anathema to Karl Marx," and that Shevchenko's "political inexperience" was stressed and he was subsequently classified as a "bourgeois democrat."

Thus you can see that by 1934 Shevchenko was for Communists nearly an "enemy of the people." But since 1939, the falsification of Shevchenko went into full swing. He was "reinterpreted"; his biography was "rewritten" for promoting Soviet patriotism and Russian nationalism by making Shevchenko a kind of "forerunner" of the glorious Soviet era—as "the first revolutionary democrat in Ukraine and Russia."

Not until after 1950 did there appear in Soviet Ukraine some cautious criticism of those Communist falsifications of Shevchenko; a distinguished scholar, the late Bilecky, even had the courage to reveal that Shevchenko's only pronouncement on communism in his short novel *Progulka* had an "ironic and derogatory meaning."

Such a "Communist idol, hero, and object of adulation" was Taras Shevchenko even according to the opinion of a Communist authority on Ukrainian literature and Shevchenkoology and to the Russian Communist Party.

IV

Up to this moment the action directed against Shevchenko's monument in Washington has been carried out along meticulously planned phases. The question is who has been doing the planning?

1. The first phase begun early in 1961 had Muscovite Communist action in the Russian and Ukrainian press in the Soviet Union attacking the Congress and the Americans of Ukrainian descent in the usual vulgar manner. It was an internal Communist balalaika concert.

2. The second phase began with the appearance of the first of the Washington Post editorials in October 1963 precipitating, in turn, an internal American discussion.

3. In the third phase the Washington Post broadened its action against the Shevchenko monument by inviting foreign intervention into this internal American discussion. The Washington Post asked the head of the

Ukrainian delegation to the United Nations (that means in fact the Soviet Union), L. Y. Kizya, for his opinion on this purely American matter and he readily obliged. Kizya's letter is an ideological Communist intervention into American interior affairs and it represents a kind of diplomatic missile in the same sense as the real missiles did during the Cuban intervention.

4. Finally, in *Literaturna Gazeta* from Kiev, November 29, 1963, there appeared—by order of the Russian Communist Party—an open letter addressed to the Ukrainians, to the Ukrainian Community in America, and to the "Shevchenko Memorial Committee." Here, indeed, was a second missile of intervention into American affairs with formulated propositions.

The Washington Post is fully responsible for this new Kizya twist in the action against the Shevchenko monument, and I will try to explain to you, Mr. Editor, the implications of your invitation to L. Y. Kizya to participate in the row and of his intervention.

5. Of course, in between these phases there surely were diplomatic interventions with oral or written missiles by the Soviet Embassy at our State Department, but their content is still top secret.

Against the presented background of Shevchenko's universal significance for mankind and America, against the background of the Russian Communist "up-side-down" language and the Russian Communist "up-side-down" image of Shevchenko, including the plight of liberal arts and sciences, of fine arts and literature under Communist dictatorship, I now evaluate your last base news story of November 29, "UN Official Joins Shevchenko Row."

That an American journalist would debase himself and his human dignity as well as the dignity of the free press to this nadir of nadirs by writing to the representative of Soviet Ukraine in the U.N., the representative of the Russian Communist terror and police state, requesting his opinion about the Shevchenko statue in the Capital of free America—Washington, D.C.—I would have never believed, but it happened.

Has the newspress of the United States, amid its constant clamor for freedom and pledges of responsible journalism, reached that point of moral and professional disintegration where it begins to hold the opinion of a Communist henchman in diplomatic clothing in greater respect than it does statements from the President of the United States? In this connection allow me to quote the text of a letter addressed to me on March 25, 1961, in New York as president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society from the late President John F. Kennedy:

"I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

Has the great American newspress also reached that point of intellectual paralysis where it no longer has respect for the American principle of due process of law as demonstrated by the U.S. Congress in its public hearings on the erection of the Shevchenko monument? Out of these hearings came unanimous acceptance of the resolution together with House Document No. 445, titled "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko, 1814-61," which summed up the paramount reasons why the statue should be erected and the highlights of Shevchenko's universal significance as reflected in his works and tragic life.

The democratic process of discussion in the hearings, statements of American scholars and university professors, the unanimous resolutions of the Congress, the statement of our late President—none of these are suffi-

cient. You, a free American journalist, a representative of the free press of America's Capital, you asked for the expert opinion (and I suspect also for a provocative approval for the Shevchenko statue) from a U.N. official who as head of Communist Ukraine's Delegation represents a regime which has for decades abolished all freedom of the press, of thought, of liberal arts and sciences, of fine arts and literature. In Kizya you found a "really qualified authority" for the Shevchenko monument to be built by American citizens in the American Capital.

The Washington Post-Kizya affair has two aspects and they require full clarification:

(1) the evaluation of your appeal to Kizya as a political act, (2) the political and moral evaluation of Kizya's answer to the Washington Post.

1. Your letter to comrade Kizya has very deep implications and disturbing significance for all Americans of captive nations origin. And I am sure you did not think about these implications. Allow me, therefore, to pose some questions which might set you to thinking:

(a) Do you think, Mr. Editor, that given a similar situation involving Moscow, a Russian Communist journalist from a leading Moscow paper would ask "expert opinions" about an American statue in Moscow from an American representative in the U.N.? From a nation whose government and leaders until recently were called capitalist bloodsuckers, gangsters, slavedrivers, fascists, colonialists, etc.? From a nation regarded as the No. 1 enemy of communism?

I am an outspoken enemy of communism, but I know that Communist journalists have, according to their Marxist-Leninist value system, their own idea of national and professional honor. Therefore, a Russian Communist journalist would have never, never done it.

I am asking you publicly where is your honor as a free American journalist and an American citizen? Where is your human dignity?

(b) Do you not think that by your letter to Comrade Kizya (whose full text and Kizya's full reply you still keep secret), you acted unloyally to our Congress, the late slain President, and even to us, the American citizens of Ukrainian descent, by discriminating against our rights as American citizens to act freely here in the United States, without the supervision and control of the Russian Communists and their agents in the U.N.? Has it come to the point where we American citizens and our Congress need the advice and consent of Russian Communist dictatorship for our actions in the Capital of free America—advice and consent which a representative of the free American press in our Capital is only too eager to obtain from a member of the U.N. Russian Communist spy nest?

(c) By your letter to Kizya did you not place in Communist hands an excellent weapon which they can use in their cold war battle against our Government? Did you not do this in the sense that this act will be evaluated even in the free world as a demonstration of your contempt for the President, the Congress, and the rights of all American citizens of captive nations origin?

(d) Is it not a disgrace that we, free American scholars in free America, are disregarded by an American free journalist as authorities about Shevchenko and our old country for a representative of the Russian Communist police and terror state in the United Nations?

Thus does the Washington Post and you, Mr. Editor, fail to recognize even the existence of free American scholarship and the free scholarship of the free world as the source of expert information about Shevchenko. Instead, you regard as a qualified expert L. Y. Kizya, the representative of a regime which has abolished academic freedom, all human rights, and has the most

bloody and criminal record in the whole world's history. You, a free American, asked for the "expert" opinion of a representative of the Russian Communists, the butchers of Budapest, the murderers of Katyn, of Nagy, and Malypetr, of the Americans Juliet Stuart Poyntz, Walter Kriwitsky, Maning Johnson, Lawrence Duggan, Abraham Feller, of Leon Trotsky, and on and on. The Washington Post asked for an expert opinion on Shevchenko, the bard of Ukraine, a representative of the Russian Communist Party and government which murdered the Ukrainians: Petlura, Oskilko, Konowalets, and recently in Germany Dr. Rebet and Bandera.

You asked for an opinion from a representative of the government and party whose responsibility, by due process of law, was by a free court in Germany established on the basis of a confession of the killer of Rebet and Bandera, who acted on orders of the Soviet Government and was decorated by the Soviet Government for the murder.

You asked for an "expert" opinion on Shevchenko, a representative of the Russian Communist Party and government which in the 1930's committed an act of genocide against 5 million Ukrainians and the Ukrainian nation by a manmade famine to break the resistance of the Ukrainian peasants. From a government and a party which during World War II was responsible for the Ukrainian Katyn's of Winnitza, Stanislaviv, Lvov. From a government and a party which liquidated in the 1930's more than 200 Ukrainian poets, writers, and scholars. From a government and a party whose criminal leader Stalin (according to the secret speech of Khrushchev) himself planned the "resettlement" of the Ukrainian nation behind the Urals, from a government and a party which committed genocide on the Chen-Inglish, Volga Germans, Crimean Tartars, Kalmyks, Kabardino-Balkars, and Karachai? From a government and a party which has such a record of anti-Semitism and of persecution of all religions? (See Dr. Joseph Lichten, director of the Foreign Affairs Department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. "The Jews in the Soviet Union," paper No. 13, Slavic Institute, Marquette University, 1962.)

(e) Is it not a disgrace that free American scholars are not regarded as experts on Shevchenko by the Washington Post in place of an opportunistic Ukrainian flunky of bloody Russian communism, of this communism which is the very antithesis to Christianity, freedom, truth, justice, and peace for which Shevchenko stood?

In summary: your inclusion into our discussion in this free American society of a Russian Communist agent as an "expert"—representing as he does such a record of infamy, atrocity, and barbarianism—is from the moral point of view a scandal, and from the political point a crime.

The Russian absolute czar gained from the disintegrating Turkish Ottoman Empire through aggressive wars the right to "protect as 'experts' all the Orthodox, especially Slavic Orthodox peoples," and thus to mix themselves in all Turkish interior affairs. The Washington Post granted the representative of Red Russian absolutism a similar right to appear as an "expert" on Ukrainian matters and to mix himself into American interior affairs in the very Capital of the United States of America. In fact, this "expert big brother protection" is granted for all captive nations matters because through him, is speaking in fact, the Soviet Union and its Russian Communist Party ruling them.

Is the United States, according to the Washington Post, still a sovereign nation in which American citizens of Ukrainian captive nations origin can remain free of the "expert-protection" and jurisdiction of the Soviet Union and its Russian Communist Party? Or does the "big brother" already enjoy some "expert" privileges granted him

by a free paper of the American free press of our Capital? Quo Vadis Washington Post?

2. And now I present an evaluation of Kizya's answer to your Washington Post, an answer which is an admirable piece of communistic psychological warfare which took into consideration all the editorials:

(a) In publishing this answer of a Communist official of the U.N., a beloved and traditional spy center of the Russian Communists, you, Mr. Editor, committed a significant spelling error in the headline of the term "Ukrainian" which proves that somebody in your office is even ignorant about that. Your headline read: "Ukrainian Pleads for Statue." At least this mistake separated us, Americans of Ukrainian origin, from the "Ukrainian" Comrade Kizya, your expert.

(b) Kizya completely ignored all the malicious, vulgar, and imprudent insults of the Ukrainian nationhood and nationality contained in your editorials; he, the Communist, enjoyed them as excellent ammunition for the future against "ugly America."

(c) The Communist was pleased and happy to assume the role of the supreme "expert" on Shevchenko, his monument, and the actions of the American citizens and scholars who are sponsoring it in the Capital of free America. He did so at the invitation of the Washington Post.

(d) Kizya simply passed with the silence of a sovereign the accusations of your editorials that Shevchenko is anti-Russian, anti-Polish, anti-German, and all the other anti's. He did so simply because they were too stupid for him to discuss.

(e) Kizya passed with silence any ideological connection of Shevchenko with George Washington and his "new righteous law," as an indirect kick in the teeth for our Founding Fathers.

(f) Kizya, the Communist, enlightens the illiterate but free American journalist of a leading paper in our Capital (which has three universities and the Library of Congress) who Shevchenko is; and the free American journalist printed it again completely unaware of the semantic "up-side-down" language of the Communists: a language so well understood by our Communist-slain President J. F. Kennedy:

"He (Kizya) showed a reverence for Shevchenko equal to that displayed by the poet's American admirers. Terming him 'a great son of Ukraine, an uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression,' Kizya said Shevchenko 'deserves to have his statue decorating one of the squares of the U.S. Capital.'"

The Washington Post still has not made public the full text of both letters.

(g) Kizya's letter implies that, of course, these ideals of "the great son of Ukraine" Shevchenko, have long been realized in Ukraine and the Soviet Union through the efforts of Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev: freedom, justice, social and national self-determination, a happy working class, a happy farmer class which produces, for example, grain in abundance. Anyone who doubts it is a liar whether he be an American scholar, plain citizen, Congressman or Senator, even including journalists, and the Secretary of State and even our late President.

(h) It also implies that the great ideals of Shevchenko realized in the Soviet Union, are still not realized in our "retarded and backward" nation, as D. Ostrianyn in attacking the monument (Komunist Ukrainy, Feb. 2, 1961) so eloquently described the case while officially interpreting Shevchenko's appeal about the "just and new law of Washington":

"Today all the righteous laws (of George Washington) in the United States have been

buried; there exists a reign of the most highhanded reactionary social forces, a ruthless enslavement of workers, and racial and national discrimination."

(i) Therefore, Kizya, with a feeling of proud superiority, says that Shevchenko's and Washington's ideals have been fulfilled in the Soviet Union, fears that we, Americans of Ukrainian descent, will doubt the truth of his assertion and, therefore, he protests the efforts of the American sponsors of the statue to use it to fan up animosity toward Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggravate the cold war.

But Kizya has great plans for the United States with the Communist "up-side-down" Shevchenko ideology and states: "Nowadays in the age of radio, movies, and television, (Shevchenko) can play an important role in the enrichment of the culture of the American people"—apparently in the first line of the Washington Post Slavic concerns. But as today, according to D. Ostrianyn (Komunist Ukrainy, Feb. 2, 1961), "All the righteous laws (of George Washington) in the United States have been buried" and they are realized and preserved only in Soviet Ukraine and the Soviet Union, Kizya apparently feels that the Russian Communists have a mission to restore them, like in Cuba.

(j) Summing up: Kizya protests that American citizens of free America claim, first, the right to defend the true image and ideological heritage of Shevchenko, the champion of George Washington, and secondly, he demands the establishment of full thought control over American citizens of Ukrainian descent, according to the objectives of the Russian Communist Party, and lastly, what is contained in the meaning of Shevchenko's words about the "new and righteous law of Washington" has to be decided in Moscow by the Russian Communist Party and not in Washington, D.C., where the American Declaration of Independence was and is realized, and especially not by free American citizens. Thus, Kizya attempts to construct a new ideological Berlin wall around Americans of Ukrainian descent in the United States and all this is perpetrated with the blessing of the Washington Post.

L. Y. Kizya, brought now officially into the discussion the existence of the cold war in support of your opinion (October 13) that "the Ukrainian-American sponsors conceive the statue to be a blunt weapon in a fierce cold war propaganda against the Soviet Union," an editorial which you surely submitted to him.

Let us now analyze this cold war accusation of the Washington Post and Kizya against the sponsors of the Washington monument.

Before pointing the finger of blame at Americans of Ukrainian descent for allegedly fanning up animosity against the Soviet Union through this Shevchenko affair and for participating in the cold war, let us first establish a clarification of this basic problem: What is the cold war? As a background, I quote from the speech of our late President John F. Kennedy which was delivered in Kizya's presence in the U.N. on September 21, 1963:

"Our conflicts, to be sure, are real. Our concepts of the world are different. No service is performed by failing to make clear our disagreements. A central difference is the belief of the American people in self-determination for all peoples.

"We believe that the people of Germany and Berlin must be free to reunite their capital and their country. We believe that the people of Cuba must be free to secure the fruits of the revolution that has been so falsely betrayed from within and exploited from without.

"In short, we believe that in all the world—in eastern Europe as well as western, in southern Africa as well as northern, in old

nations as well as new—people must be free to choose their own future, without discriminations or dictations, and without coercion and subversion."

Again, may I quote from the deceased President's speech in Baltimore on September 16, 1960:

"To rail against colonialism while holding in strictest bondage a great empire stretching from East Berlin to Vietnam is to achieve new heights of hypocrisy."

And again may I quote from the commencement address at American University in Washington, D.C., on June 9, 1963:

"As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements. So let us not be blind to our differences. And if we cannot end our differences now, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."

"Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other people not merely because they are our partners, but also because their interests and ours converge."

Is it a crime in the opinion of the Washington Post for us as American citizens to be inspired by these pronouncements of our late slain President?

A second basic question that requires an answer in this debate is: Who was and still is the aggressor in the cold war which has been going on since 1949? Just who is it that has deprived all the captive nations of their liberty, who has violated the Atlantic Charter and the U.N. statutes, and who has placed missiles in Cuba? And who is it that has undermined the whole of Latin America?

I call your attention to the statement of our Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Averell Harriman (New York Times, Oct. 26, 1963) who cautioned the American people against being misled by the treaty for a partial ban on nuclear testing, or the euphoria which has followed it.

He (Harriman) said that Premier Khrushchev had made it very clear to him that the ideological conflict continues, and that no coexistence was possible in this field. Both the Soviet Union and Communist China, Mr. Harriman said, are determined to achieve their objective of world communism. (His views were expressed in a speech prepared for delivery at a dinner meeting at Columbia University's 24th American Assembly at Arden House.)

Consequently, taking into consideration the words of our slain President, of our distinguished Under Secretary of State, and of the Muscovite Dictator Khrushchev himself, we see (1) the ideological cold war of the Russian Communist dictatorship against the United States and the free world is a fact which we have to face; (2) the Russian Communists are the aggressors, according to Khrushchev himself.

Therefore, it is not the Americans of Ukrainian descent with their Shevchenko monument who are provoking the cold war against Russian Communist dictatorship; indeed the very opposite is true: it is the Russian Communists who are employing their aggressive, perfidious, cold war methods even against the Shevchenko monument and, in effect, against the existence of free America.

It is a fact that the cold war and all its phases was originated and continues to be masterminded by the Russian Communist Party against the United States and the entire free world. Kizya's letter to you is convincing proof of what gigantic importance the originators of the cold war in Moscow have attributed to the monument of Taras Shevchenko in Washington. They cannot permit the true, unfalsified ideology

of this champion of George Washington to radiate from Washington, D.C., to all captive nations, so through Kizya, they now openly intervene by using the Washington Post.

Do you honestly believe that the Communists want peace and that they will give up the cold war? If so, it is very simple to achieve and the formula is rather old: "Peace on earth to men of good will"—only to them. And they can have it immediately by granting to all captive nations the supreme human value of freedom proclaimed by George Washington and his champion, Taras Shevchenko, by granting them the same status as the former colonies have in Africa. Then the cold war would be immediately banished.

The third basic problem to be clarified is, What is the final aim of the Russian Communist aggression in the cold war? In short, it is the annihilation of the United States and the free world. And therefore the Russian Communists realize that the true and unfalsified Shevchenko cannot be allowed to speak as a symbol from Washington, D.C.; instead they promote their up-side-down version of Shevchenko, pretending, as Kizya implies, that in the Soviet Union his ideals of freedom and brotherhood have already been realized.

The joint attack and argument of the Allies, the Washington Post and Kizya, that the Shevchenko monument can be used for the cold war "to fan up animosity" and "aggravate the cold war" demanded this lengthy explanation of the whole cold war complex.

But the Washington Post is still unaware how logically absurd are the excerpts from Kizya's letter that were published. First, he lectured you, Mr. Editor, that Shevchenko was "an uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression" and that he "deserves to have his statue decorating one of the squares of the U.S. Capital."

Second, he lectured you about the "nationwide Shevchenko festivities" in the Soviet Union, including the erection of a monument in Moscow, for his 150th birthday anniversary. Besides you know (November 12) that Shevchenko's name is memorialized in Ukraine in literally hundreds of place names.

How can the monument in Moscow of Shevchenko, "the uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression," with many monuments all over Ukraine—how can the same Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., be interpreted or directed against these ideals of Shevchenko—the fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression? All Americans adore these ideals, the more so as they are written in "Washington's new and righteous law," the American Declaration of Independence.

Therefore, how can Shevchenko's statue be used "to fan up animosity toward Soviet Ukraine and all the more to aggravate the cold war"? Because the monument of Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., will also be dedicated to the same "uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression." Therefore, the protests of Kizya simply make no sense and are insulting to the intelligence of the readers of the Washington Post. Does Kizya really believe that Americans are for slavery and injustice, for social and national oppression the world over, including Ukraine and the Soviet Union? Does he believe that we Americans of Ukrainian descent want by this monument in Washington to challenge the ideals of Shevchenko which Kizya would have us believe are already realized in the Soviet Union—the ideals of freedom, justice, social and national self-determination?

Kizya's argumentation makes no sense, and every reader becomes aware of an either-or dilemma. Either: the aims of the "un-

compromising fighter against slavery, injustice, and social and national self-determination" are already realized in Soviet Ukraine and the Soviet Union—and in this case the Shevchenko monument in Washington cannot logically be used as a weapon in the cold war at all; on the contrary it will be a tribute not only to Shevchenko but to the Soviet Union as well. And in this case all scholars, journalists, Congressmen, and Senators, even our President are misinformed or else they are deliberate liars about the realities of the Soviet regime.

Or the opposite is true. In Soviet Ukraine the ideals of Shevchenko are not realized; there is slavery, injustice, social and national oppression, violation of the statutes of the U.N. and of the Human Rights Charter. Here, indeed, is a situation in which a monument in Washington, D.C., dedicated to this "uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression" can "fan up animosity" because it will disturb the conscience of the world and even of the Russian Communist imperialists in the Kremlin. In this case the Shevchenko monument will also be a monument to the fact that Kizya and his Russian Communist dictators are imposters, liars, and ideological crooks who wish to deceive the United States and the free world.

But in this case the "animosity" is not the business of us American citizens. We know who originated and who is continuously conducting the cold war, which has most recently reached Cuba. Our country gave the world Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson. Our slain President also proclaimed self-determination and freedom for all peoples of the world. Did his pronouncement also "fan up animosity" against the Russian Communist dictatorship and was he therefore murdered by a Moscow-trained Communist?

For the "peace of mind" of the Russian Communist dictatorship are we now to permit them to assassinate the ideological heritage of Shevchenko in the free world, by blowing up with the dynamite of lies, malicious smear, suspicion, and provocations the realization of Shevchenko's monument which has been presented to the Capital of America and the American nation by American citizens of Ukrainian descent?

May I assure you, Mr. Editor, the very existence of free America with or without the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., is an "animosity" for the Russian Communists and therefore Khrushchev "wishes to bury us."

The intervention of Kizya through the Washington Post is a masterful example of the cold war techniques of Communist dictatorship. So, Mr. Editor, you should not complain about waiting 4 weeks for an answer from Kizya. In Moscow the cold war is conducted not by illiterates and liberal amateurs but by Communist experts and specialists. (See "Soviet Speciality: Political Warfare," Communist Affairs, vol. I, No. 8, 1963, pp. 3-7 and with a good bibliography. Research Institute on Communist Strategy and Propaganda, School of International Relations, University of California.)

The Agitprop (the Department of Propaganda and Agitation), operating under the Presidium and the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, works closely with the Soviet Foreign Office which has a large psychological warfare department using for this purpose all the radio broadcasting facilities. In foreign countries the Soviet ambassador himself or an Agitprop expert directs all the activities, assisted by the press attachés as well as leading Communists of the country. Any and all "international organizations" serve as propaganda platforms for the Communists, but their current favorite is the United Nations. (See "The Soviet Record in the United Nations," Communist Affairs, vol. I, No. 3.)

Surely all this Communist Agitprop apparatus was immediately alarmed by the project of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., and its symbolism was fundamentally discussed (a) for Soviet Ukraine, (b) for the captive nations, and (c) for the free world, especially America.

As a lifelong student of Agitprop, I present you Agitprop's whole scheme. Agitprop has past experience in evaluating Shevchenko's symbolism because Soviet Ukraine has already had the impertinence to present a Shevchenko monument to Canada at Palermo for Communist propaganda.

(a) Shevchenko shaped modern Ukrainian nationalism under the inspiration of George Washington, the Father of America. (b) Shevchenko struggled not only for the freedom of Ukraine, but for all victims of Russian imperialism from Finland to Rumania, from Poland to the Caucasus and Turkestan.

(c) Consequently, there is for the Communist world revolution an eminent danger that this Shevchenko monument in Washington can become the "monument to freedom of all captive nations," which will continuously by its very existence in Washington embarrass the Russian Soviet Government and Communist Party in its "mission to liberate colonial peoples from Yankee imperialism," especially in Latin America. In another respect the monument will have deep repercussions among all the captive nations which are friendly to America and outside the Soviet Union.

It is for these reasons that the Shevchenko monument in Washington must be either killed or annexed by the Russians. Otherwise the Shevchenko monument in Moscow and the dozens in Ukraine can get a completely different and "un-Soviet" meaning and be regarded, in fact, as a tribute to George Washington and to American freedom, and as a challenge to Communist dictatorship.

There can be no doubt that all Agitprop offices conducted special meetings on this matter at which was elaborated a similar plan of gigantic counteraction both inside the Soviet Union, by presenting Shevchenko as a forerunner of Russian communism, and in the United States and throughout the free world. And the counteraction is and will be directed on all levels and by all means with the following aims in the United States:

1. Either still make the construction of the Shevchenko monument impossible or, at least delay it, by the big lie and Pavlovian methods of smear techniques against which native Americans are helpless because they are completely illiterate in Slavic and Communist matters.

Agitprop's instructions to its agents were to collect all printed material against the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C. At the proper time it will be used as ammunition for propaganda against America in Soviet Ukraine and in all the captive nations not for fanning up "animosity" but rather revolutionary hate and contempt toward Americans, for their illiteracy and lack of culture.

In due time, too, out of this material will be constructed all the arguments against the Shevchenko monument as an insult not only to the Ukrainian nation, but to the whole of Slavdom. The next effort will be to demonstrate to Ukrainian and all Slavic nations of what little value to present-day Americans is Shevchenko and Washington's "new and righteous law." Another likely move will be to prove by the material that Shevchenko misinterpreted Washington's "new and righteous law," and that true freedom and justice were realized by Lenin in the Soviet Union. Above all, they will use the press material planted by proper transmission belt operators into the American press to undermine any sympathy in the Soviet Union and

the Socialist camp for America and its ideology.

2. Or eliminate from the Shevchenko monument project all symbolism which can be used against the Communist world revolution and its mission to liberate colonial peoples by doing the following:

(a) Officially supporting the idea of the monument, welcoming it and integrating it into the great program of Shevchenko festivities in the Soviet Union and thus assuring that it will not be directed against Marxism-Leninism or the Soviet Government. Therefore, publicly oppose and rectify the planted anti-Shevchenko material in the American press in order to ridicule it and in order to achieve for the Soviet Union Government and the Communist Party as a matter of record the merit of having saved the monument from American ignorance and arrogant attacks.

(b) In order to completely eliminate any possibility that Shevchenko might become an anti-Soviet symbol, attempt to propagate among Americans of Ukrainian descent the invitation of a Ukrainian Soviet delegation to the unveiling of the monument—a delegation which would appear with a bag of soil from Shevchenko's grave and ceremoniously deliver it on behalf of the "Ukrainian Soviet People," thus demonstrating the realization of Shevchenko's ideals in the Soviet Union before all of official Washington and American public opinion.

For every specialist in and student of Russian dialectical communism it is obvious that the psychological warfare with its Pavlovian methods so confusing to Americans was an elaborate part of this "Operation Shevchenko." Whichever of these two plans is used, Soviet Moscow and the Communist Russian Party is and will continue to be the winner and America the loser. The reason is because Moscow convincingly demonstrates before the whole world the illiteracy in Slavic and Soviet matters, and the complete naivete of the United States as the leader of the free world.

We had already witnessed the enumerated phases of the operation and therefore there came to us not as a surprise, excellently harmonized with your editorials and Kizya's letters to the Washington Post, the open letter in the Literaturna Ukraina to the Shevchenko Memorial Committee in New York formulated according to the Kizya scheme: (a) eulogy on Shevchenko, (b) protest the use of Shevchenko against the Communist hypocritical peace movement, and finally (c) the proposition to send some soil from Shevchenko's grave (from which the Russian Communists removed the huge iron cross) for the monument in Washington, D.C., and even to participate in the unveiling ceremony by sending a delegation. Naturally, the test ban treaty is also mentioned by the signers of the open letter, but they do so without knowing about the pamphlet of our Department of State which lists the many treaties the Soviet Union has already broken with the United States. Nor do the signers of this letter know that Lenin's government also once recognized the independence and sovereignty of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic.

This Kievan letter is actually an extension of the Kizya letter to you at the Washington Post, and it had definite political aims. We Americans citizens are here tempted with the sentimental value of the soil from Shevchenko's grave and even by a delegation to the unveiling of the monument in Washington, D.C., to insure to Shevchenko the honor he deserves. In the name of peace they preached to us a kind of coexistence—this in spite of Khrushchev's frank statement about the impossibility of ideological coexistence. The fact is that he is completely right; successful coexistence with Russian communism's atheistic materialism is as absolutely

impossible as coexistence of an individual with cancer.

We have the deepest sympathy with the signers of this letter, with these unhappy human beings, the survivors of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, whom Russian Communist dictatorship degraded to obedient serfs, to instruments of the Party's Agitprop and who are pushed around and exploited for Communist purposes by this Russian tyranny. This Communist despotism broke their backbones into rubber; they still remain silent against the falsification of Ukrainian classicists among them: Shevchenko, Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, Fedikovich, Kobylanska, and Oles. They fail to protest the new party program of 1961 which calls for the Russification of all non-Russian languages and the effacement of national distinctions, including especially of language distinctions. Their lips remain silent over cancellation by Moscow of the announced publication in 1963 by the Ukrainian Soviet Academy of Sciences in Kiev of "The Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language," the language of Shevchenko.

Now, however, in the matter of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Shevchenko, the patron of our First Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, preserved in the free world—the signers speak to us for the first time as they were ordered to take the floor.

But we know that they are speaking to us, free American citizens, by order of Kizya and the Agitprop; we understand also that the Russian Communist dictatorship wants to use the soil only as bait for emotional people; we know, too, that this whole soil plan as well as the proposed delegation is nothing more than the usual Russian Communist semantic trick. To accept this proposal would mean the desecration and profanation of this soil and the ideals it stands for by demanding that we, free American citizens, publicly agree before the whole world during the unveiling of the Shevchenko monument that the political regime which ordered the signers to speak and to act, has also fulfilled in Ukraine and the Soviet Union Shevchenko's ideals of freedom, justice, social, and national self-determination.

And this regime will even expect gratitude from us for this soil—a soil saturated with the blood of millions of Ukrainian victims and freedom fighters who died faithful to Shevchenko while struggling against Russian imperialism. By accepting this soil and delegation, behind which is contemporary Russian imperialism and colonialism, we American free citizens, would become false witnesses of Kizya, Russian communism, and its Agitprop—by our acceptance we would propagate a monstrous lie to the free world, a crime against truth, freedom, justice, and against the very memory of Shevchenko and Washington; in fact by such an act we would profane the free soil of George Washington in the United States.

We American citizens of Ukrainian descent know that the political regime behind Kizya and the Russian Communist Party is a crossing of Ivan the Terrible's Oprichniki terror-police-tyranny and the Russian Black Hundreds program.

To speak with the language of the Washington Post the new Kizya intervention is a clearcut plan "to kidnap" the true Shevchenko symbolism of the planned monument in Washington, D.C. for the Russian Communist dictatorship, for Russian imperialism, and colonialism over all captive nations.

We are citizens of a free and open society and wish to remain such, dedicated to the ideals of George Washington and his Ukrainian champion Shevchenko. We cannot permit Kizya, the Russian Communist Party, and its Agitprop to publicly transform the unveiling of the Shevchenko monument in

Washington, D.C., a tribute to Washington and Shevchenko, into a Communist glorification of barbarian Russian dictatorship.

We know there is no substitute for freedom, and that the philosophy upon which our country has become great is freedom.

We know, too, that a vile, a godless, and conscienceless foe is intent upon using our freedom to destroy our freedom.

We refuse to help this foe; we are dedicated to the defense of America's ideological heritage and we mean it, so help us God.

Kizya must finally realize that we American citizens of Ukrainian descent are not suckers. He must also realize that we are determined to stop his ideological intervention in Washington, D.C., regarding the Shevchenko monument.

VII

Let me also frankly correct you regarding the symbolism of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., as conceived by its sponsors.

I explain and underscore the fact that the monument is first and foremost not directed against something but for something.

1. This monument of Shevchenko in Washington will be, in fact, the expression of our reverence for the Father of the American Nation, George Washington, and the immortalization of Shevchenko's prophetic appeal and assurance, "When will we receive our Washington, with a new and righteous law? And receive him we will some day in spite of all the obstacles." For us, Shevchenko and Washington are inseparable.

2. This unshakable monument will be the symbol of our faith and hope in the universal validity of George Washington's law (the ideas of the American Declaration of Independence).

3. This monument will be the expression of our deep gratitude to the American Nation, which in the era of Stalinist barbarism, opened its gates wide for us exiles and conferred upon us its citizenship and all liberties of this new and just law.

4. This monument will be the symbol of the innate longing for liberty not only of Ukraine, but of all oppressed nations and their struggle against contemporary tyrants and hangmen—which, we believe firmly, soon will lead to a just peace and true brotherhood of all nations. This monument is being built for this purpose.

5. The monument to Shevchenko is meant to symbolize the poet's prophetic words about universal human happiness that "on the rejuvenated earth, there will be no foe and enemy, but there will be a son and a mother and together all will be." And for this Shevchenko prayed with these words: "Together all on earth bless God by spiritual unanimity and brotherly love."

The fact that the projected monument in Washington, D.C., has already generated repercussions in the whole Soviet empire proves only Shevchenko's gigantic stature as a champion of Washington. But repercussions are not the fault of us American citizens. Those responsible are the originators and continuators of the cold war, those who regard the very existence of the United States as the greatest animosity for their Communist world revolution—with or without the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C.

VIII

Mr. Editor, I have now submitted to you with factual accuracy the proper material for every argument you raised against the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C. I have shown that your reckless, deliberate, blatant, and irresponsible distortion of truth was an insult to the intelligence of every civilized reader and that it showed no respect for the basic American conception of fairplay.

Do you believe that the Washington Post has a responsibility to its readers and the public at large? Do you not agree that the essence of freedom of the press requires respect for truth, the careful maintenance of open communications, of ideas, and responsibility to the public? Does the American public have a right to know the truth about Shevchenko?

In spite of all this I still remain an optimist. It is obvious that some "masters of deceit" by submitting to you through transmission belts material against Shevchenko's monument "took you for a ride." I still believe you will apologize to us, your fellow American citizens, for publishing the gross distortions which you have made in this matter.

You honored me by not publishing my first letter, by closing your paper to all protests and rectifications. Thus I do not expect you will publish this one. You preach democracy and freedom of the press but you do not practice it in this case. You suppress the truth. Can it be that you made up your mind in advance and you do not wish to be confused by facts?

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI,

President.

THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY
OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
IN THE UNITED STATES, INC.,

New York, N.Y., December 17, 1963.

The Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Editorials in the Washington Post of October 18 and 25, and of November 1 and 12, disclaimed the universal significance of the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, and stated that in his writings are elements offensive to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background. It was also indicated that Shevchenko is officially hailed in the U.S.S.R. Among the arguments your newspaper employed against Shevchenko and the proposed memorial to him was the statement that Shevchenko is not known in this country.

A few facts concerning Shevchenko and his place in the history of world literature may help to resolve some misunderstandings. First of all, Shevchenko has been known in the United States of America for almost 100 years. The first known publication about him was entitled "Curious Ideas of the Poet Taras Shevchenko." It appeared in the Alaska Herald, San Francisco, March 1, 1868, page 3. The Alaska Herald was the first American newspaper published in Russian and Ukrainian in the first American printing house equipped with Cyrillic type; it published Shevchenko's poetry and articles on the poet. Since then numerous writings on Shevchenko have appeared in this country. The "Library of the World's Best Literature" (New York, 1898, vol. 29, p. 493) states that Shevchenko's poetry enjoys wide popularity and that he is the author of one of the greatest epics. Several American encyclopedias and dictionaries characterize Shevchenko as one of the greatest poets of the Slavic world, and as an inspired prophet of a new social and political system. They state that Shevchenko, both as a poet and as one of the founders of the political organization known as Sts. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, furthered the realization of ideals of social justice. He contributed to the destruction of serfdom.

It is inaccurate to say that Shevchenko had no connection with America. In his time (mid-19th century) fighters for freedom within the Russian Empire were greatly interested in America and its political system. Shevchenko in a poem expressed a longing for a Washington with a new and just law. Numerous American sources con-

tain material on Shevchenko's friendship with the American tragedian, Ira Aldridge, a Negro born in New York City. Aldridge's picture, sketched by Shevchenko, was reproduced in several American publications. In recent years the prominent American sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, made several statues of Shevchenko.

A bibliography of writings published in the United States on Shevchenko would fill a volume; however, the attention paid to him by Russian, Polish, and Western European scholars has been even greater. When the Russian Government forbade the commemoration of Shevchenko's anniversary in 1911 and again in 1914, the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg arranged a special session devoted to Shevchenko at which prominent Russian scholars spoke on secrets of genius. At the same time a celebration led by Fedor Korsh, a leading Russian Slavist who published several papers on Shevchenko, was carried out in Moscow. The Imperial Academy of Arts in St. Petersburg, from which Shevchenko was graduated, also solemnly commemorated the 50th anniversary of his death.

Of Western European scholars, Alfred Jensen, a professor of Stockholm University, wrote a monograph on Shevchenko (1916) in which he spoke of him as a universal spirit and a beacon for humanity. Shevchenko became better known to the West at the time of the czarist ukaz of 1876 which prohibited the use of the Ukrainian language in publications. The World Congress of Writers, convened in Paris in 1878, protested against this ukaz; it specifically mentioned Shevchenko, whose works were banned. Shevchenko was praised in French, Italian, and German periodicals, in addition to being lauded by Czechs and Poles. In 1877 Charles Dickens introduced him to the English reader.

Shevchenko's poems were translated into at least 52 languages, most completely into Russian, German, Polish, and Yiddish. Russian translations were made by prominent writers such as Herzen, Turgenev, Nekrasov, Leskov, Sologub; the best Russian Shevchenko translator was Boris Pasternak. Shevchenko maintained friendly ties with the Poles. His funeral in St. Petersburg in 1861 was the first in the history of Eastern Europe to manifest an international desire for liberty. In eulogies at his grave, the thoughts and feelings of three nations who had fought each other for ages—Poland, Russia, and Ukraine—were blended.

Not only were Jews prominent students and translators of Shevchenko's writings, they also have been defenders of his heritage and memory. M. Hekhter, a prominent Jewish journalist and public figure, is the author of a vivid description of the persecutions and prohibitions connected with the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Shevchenko's death and the erection of a memorial to him in Kiev. The memorial was forbidden by the police regime with the support of the ultrareactionary Russian chauvinists (the so-called "Black Hundred") known as organizers of Jewish pogroms. It is a well-known fact that Shevchenko openly denounced anti-Semitism.

An international literary lexicon states that Shevchenko's Kobzar became a gospel for the Ukrainian people. But Shevchenko also was recognized by the world as one of its most prominent poets, fighters for freedom, and humanitarians. The UNESCO-Courier in the issue of July-August 1961, states:

"This apostle of liberty, enemy of all oppression, Taras Shevchenko, goes beyond the narrow limits of one country. He is a poet of humanity; his message of brotherhood and love, truth and justice, and above all, of freedom, is worldwide in scope, universal in significance. Other poets have sung his

song, other poets are perhaps better known, but none by the pure identification of his life with his inspiration deserves greater homage or recognition."

Such great classics as Shevchenko, Pushkin, and Mickiewicz are not forbidden in the U.S.S.R. since this would antagonize their peoples. Works of these writers, however, are falsified, writings on their creative works are one-sided, and unbiased scholarly research is possible only outside the boundaries of the U.S.S.R. Thus the United States became a center of research on Shevchenko. His complete works were recently published here. Last year a collection of papers by members of our Academy, Taras Shevchenko, 1841-1861, A Symposium, was published by Mouton & Co., the Hague.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER ARCHIMOVICH,
President, the Ukrainian Academy of
Arts and Sciences in the U.S.

JURI J. LAWRYNENKO,
Shevchenko Institute.

REFERENCES

"Curious Ideas of the Poet Taras Shevchenko," Alaska Herald, San Francisco, March 1, 1868, page 3.

Yaroslav Chyz, "Pershi zhadyky pro Tarasa Shevchenka v Amerytsi, Shevchenko, annual 3, New York Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 1954, pages 33-35.

Library of the World's Best Literature, New York, 1898, volume 29, page 493.

Semen Demydchuk, "Shevchenko v amerykans'kykh entsyklopediyakh," Shevchenko annual 4, New York, Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 1955, pages 12-17.

Yaroslav Chyz, "Ayra Oldridzh i Shevchenko," Shevchenko, annual 4, pages 18-24.

Alexander Archipenko, 50 Creative Years, 1908-1958, New York, 1960, page 225.

D. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, "National'nye i obshchechelovecheskie elementy v poezii T. G. Shevchenka," Nemoy Yubiley, Kiev, 1914.

Na spomyn 50-kh rokovyn smerty T. Shevchenka, Moscow, 1912, also newspaper Rech, 1911, No. 57, February 28.

V. Shchurat, Shevchenko i polyaki, Lviv, 1917.

T. Zin'kivsky, "T. H. Shevchenko v svitli evropeys'koy krytyky," Pysannya, volume II, Lviv, 1896.

Alfred Jensen, Taras Schewtchenko. Ein ukrainisches Dichterleben. Literarische Studio. Wien, 1916.

M. Dragomanov, "Voyna s pam'yat'yu o Shevchenko," Vol'noe slovo, Geneva, No. 46, 1882.

M. Dragomanov, La Literature Oukrainienne proserite par le Gouvernement Russe. Rapport presente au congress litteraire de Paris (1878) par Michel Dragomanov. Geneva, 1878, 42 pages.

Ivan Korovytsky, "Uchast' polyakiv u pokhoroni Shevchenka," Shevchenko, annual 3, 1954, pages 26-31.

L. Zhemchuzhnikov, "Vospominanie o Shevchenko, Ego smert' i pogrebenie," Osnova, St. Petersburg, No. 3, pages 1-21.

M. Hekhter, "Shevchenkivski dni," Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk, No. 4, 1914; also his articles in Ukrayins'ke zhyttia, 1911, and in Literaturno-Naukovyi Vistnyk, Nos. 1, 3, and 4, 1911.

Shevchenko's signature under the protest against anti-Semitism, Russkiy Vestnik, St. Petersburg, 1858, No. 2, pages 245-247.

Pauline Bentley, "Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's Poet of Freedom," The UNESCO Courier, July-August 1961, pages 53-56.

Taras Sevcenko 1841-61. A Symposium. Edited by Volodymyr Mijakovskiy and George Y. Shevelov on behalf of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the

United States. Mouton & Co., 1962. 'S-Gravennage, 304 pages.

DECEMBER 24, 1963.

Mrs. JAMES H. ROWE,

Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ROWE: We have learned with sorrow and regret that Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, a member of your Commission, has made a public statement to the effect that he will propose that your Commission rescind the approval of the Shevchenko site in Washington. The project is scheduled to be brought to conclusion in May 1964. It is also our understanding that Mr. Louchheim is motivated by the campaign of the Washington Post, which recently began such campaign of smear, trying to denigrate the significance of Taras Shevchenko and his contribution toward the advancement of freedom not only in Ukraine but in the whole of Eastern Europe.

In the name of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, which encompasses 92 parishes and 8 missionary stations, with 120 priests and over 75,000 communicants, we sincerely urge you not to succumb to this un-American campaign against the great humanitarian and freedom fighter, which Shevchenko was, but allow that the monument in his honor be erected in our Nation's Capital.

Our entire congregation, whether born in this country or Ukraine, honors Shevchenko as one of the most outstanding humanitarians and advocates of freedom not only for Ukraine, but for all other countries and nations, and for all people regardless of creed, color or nationality. His works have been translated into many world languages. He was against no group as such, and among his best friends were many Russian intellectuals who secured his freedom from czarist imprisonment, as well as many Polish, German and French believers in freedom. He denounced the persecution of Jews in czarist Russia and deplored deeply the slaughter of the Caucasian and Moslem peoples by the Russian czars in the early part of the 19th century.

Recently John Steinbeck, our great American writer, on visiting the Shevchenko Museum in Kiev, and upon learning about his life and his contribution to the cause of freedom, stated: "Now I understand the greatness of the Ukrainian poet. He died a death of dignity. That is why I was so moved * * *"

We sincerely urge to abandon Mr. Louchheim's proposal which calls for rescinding the approval of the Shevchenko site in Washington, for should such an event occur it would constitute a great act of injustice and prejudice on the part of a Federal agency, and it would be both contrary to our tradition of honoring the outstanding freedom fighters of other nations and of counteracting our own Congress and our own Government.

Respectfully yours,

MSTYSLAV S. SKRYPNYK,
Archbishop of New York and President
of the Consistory.

DECEMBER 24, 1963.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was reported in the December 6, 1963, issue of the Washington Post that you had recommended to restudy the approval of the Shevchenko monument site in our Nation's Capital, and consequently the work on the completion of the statue to this great humanitarian and advocate of universal freedom has been suspended on your order.

In the name of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, which has 92 parishes and 8 missionary stations, with 120 priests and over 75,000 communicants, I urge you not to succumb to the campaign of smear and distortions recently undertaken by a Washington newspaper, and ask you to allow the work on the site to be continued and the statue to be erected next May, in accordance with Public Law 86-749.

As Americans of Ukrainian origin and of the Orthodox faith we are disturbed that Shevchenko, one of the greatest poets in Eastern Europe, has become the object of an anti-Ukrainian campaign which certainly is not in our national interest. Taras Shevchenko is revered not only by the 45-million Ukrainian nation now in Communist slavery, but by the entire freedom-loving world. His works have been translated into 52 world languages. He was a man dedicated to the freedom of all nations regardless of creed, color, or race, and for his love of freedom and human dignity he had paid with a 10-year exile and imprisonment. As a poet and great humanitarian Shevchenko had many friends among the Russian, Polish, German, and French intellectuals, and he befriended an American Negro actor, Ira Aldrich; he denounced the persecution of Jews in Czarist Russia and deplored the slaughter of the Caucasian peoples, and above all he dreamed of a free Ukraine established on the same principles as the United States was established by George Washington.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States, as well as other Government agencies have properly understood and appreciated the value and international significance of Taras Shevchenko and accordingly approved the project for erecting a monument in his honor in our Nation's Capital. To impede this work now would be both inconsistent with our national traditions of honoring the great leaders of other nations, and counteracting the decision of the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Government, which have approved the entire project and voted an appropriate site in Washington, D.C.

We sincerely hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will recommend that the work on the completion of the Shevchenko monument be resumed forthwith, and that hundreds of thousands of our citizenry of Ukrainian descent be informed that their efforts on behalf of this project will come to a fruitful and successful termination.

Thank you for your kind attention in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

MSTYSLAV S. SKRYPNYK,
Archbishop of New York and President
of the Consistory of the Ukrainian
Orthodox Church in the United
States.

CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF
CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN
DESCENT,

December 13, 1963.

Mr. JAMES WIGGINS,
Editor and Executive Vice President of the
Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Attention of the Executive Committee of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED) has been drawn to editorials published in the Washington Post on October 18, 25, and November 1, 1963, in the matter of the proposed Shevchenko memorial. We regret to find that these editorials express opinions which seem to be based upon incorrect information and a number of misunderstandings.

Our organization represents American citizens of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Ukrainian descent. All of our members are well aware of the significance of the 19th century Ukrainian

poet, Taras Shevchenko, whose passionate love of freedom, equality and human dignity for all men regardless of race, nationality or color inspired not only the Ukrainians but all other peoples of Central and Eastern Europe to struggle for their national and human rights more than 100 years ago. His works have been translated into some 52 languages.

Shevchenko, the poet and champion of freedom who paid for his temerity to attack oppression by a 10-year sentence of exile and imprisonment, was an implacable enemy of tyranny and a devoted friend of the enslaved and persecuted. He counted among his friends many Russians, Polish, German, and French intellectuals, as well as the American Negro actor, Ira Aldrich. He denounced the persecution of Jews in czarist Russia and deplored the slaughter of the Moslems. He advocated the establishment in Ukraine of a political system similar to the American one.

The fact that Soviet propagandists claim for themselves the heritage of this Ukrainian freedom fighter who died over 100 years ago cannot convert him into a Communist hero any more than Hitler or Mussolini could give a posthumous political coloring to Beethoven or Michelangelo.

We should like to go on record as being fully in support of Public Law 86-749 for the erection of a Shevchenko memorial in Washington, D.C.

Very truly yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN BALKUNAS,
President.

Dr. JOHN G. LEXA,

Secretary.

Cc.: Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF CENTRAL
AND EASTERN EUROPEAN DESCENT,
December 13, 1963.

Mrs. JAMES H. ROWE,
National Capital Planning Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mrs. ROWE: The attention of the executive Committee of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent has been directed to newspaper reports indicating that a member of your Commission, Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, has been quoted to the effect that plans for the erection of a statue commemorating the 19th century poet laureate, Taras Shevchenko, should be shelved and restudied with a view to a possible repeal of Public Law 86-749 authorizing the memorial.

These statements followed a campaign against the Shevchenko memorial in a series of editorials in the Washington Post.

It is hardly necessary to underline further the point made by the Evening Star of December 4, 1963, that we are all immigrants except for the American Indians and that many other foreign or foreign born heroes have been commemorated in monuments in the Nation's Capital. As an organization of American citizens of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Ukrainian descent we are familiar with the life and works of Shevchenko and his fight for freedom and equality of all peoples. It is no coincidence that his works have been translated into 52 foreign languages.

We are perturbed to see that an organized campaign seems to have been initiated against the Shevchenko memorial despite the granting of congressional authorization. Such a campaign, if successful, would certainly create the impression among American citizens whose forefathers happened to come from Eastern Europe that their contributions to this country and the cultural heritage of their ancestors are considered inferior to others.

We hope that our appeal in this matter will be taken into consideration and the National Capital Planning Commission will proceed promptly with the plans for the erection of the statue of the Ukrainian poet.

Very truly yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN BALKUNAS,
President.

Dr. JOHN G. LEXA,

Secretary.

Cc.: Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, November-December 1963]

IS THIS THE VOICE OF THE WASHINGTON POST?

In a year of shocking events the Washington Post, which is considered one of our finest liberal newspapers, has made its own shocking contribution. It has engaged in a wholly uncharacteristic campaign for the past 2 months. Its target: the Ukrainian minority in this country. Ugly and heavily biased, this campaign is so flagrantly unliberal and so indiscriminating in its arguments and choice of allegedly true facts that one refuses to believe that this is the true Washington Post. Instead, one sees a "Charlie McCarthy" dangling before him, biting, venomous, and fraudulent.

What precipitated the ill-advised campaign of the Washington Post was the groundbreaking ceremonies held on September 21, 1963, in Washington, D.C., for a statue of the outstanding Ukrainian freedom fighter and poet laureate, Taras Shevchenko. Since 1959 the entire Ukrainian-American community has been engaged in a proud and praiseworthy undertaking: the erection of a monument in honor of a world-recognized champion of liberty, not only of Ukrainians but of oppressed people everywhere.

The U.S. Congress took favorable action, voting a special law (Public Law 86-749) authorizing the erection of such a memorial. President Eisenhower signed it in 1960, thereby making it a law of the land. Subsequently, several U.S. Government agencies gave their final approval and endorsement, while the Ukrainian-American community collected about \$300,000 for the project. The statue itself is now being executed by an outstanding Canadian sculptor and its unveiling is scheduled for the end of May 1964.

What is especially strange is that the Post itself wrote an informative article on the statue some 3 years ago.

But after the groundbreaking ceremonies this past September the editors of the Washington Post suddenly discovered that Shevchenko was not worthy of a commemorative monument in Washington, a veritable city of statues. Why? Because he has no universal significance for Americans but is the pet of a small minority, which is using the statue to advance their own peculiar notion of how to fight communism and their own implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood.

No Pulitzer Prize here, for this is journalism approaching the scurrilous. The phrase "small minority" appeals to the worst instincts of our American way of life: if a group is small, the implication is that it is unimportant.

Reducing Shevchenko to a "pet" defames both an acknowledged artist and his people, a people who in this century alone have lost millions as a result of deliberate and wanton genocide.

Freedom for this oppressed people may be indeed implausible. But freedom for the small American Colonies only 200 years ago seemed at least as implausible, a circumstance which did not daunt the freedom fighters of the time. If Shevchenko has no significance for Americans, then freedom itself seems to have been lost in a garble of

cheap paper, cheap ink, and meretricious thinking.

But the Washington Post goes on to state bluntly that some of the elements of Shevchenko's writings are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background.

WHO WAS SHEVCHENKO?

Such an onslaught as this can, at best, be explained on the grounds of ignorance. It is an ignorance, we admit, with which Ukrainians have long been familiar. On one side of the coin is the West's lack of knowledge of East European history in general and of the Ukrainians in particular. On the other side is the genocide perpetrated on this people by its rapacious neighbors, particularly the Russians. The Ukrainians, we suggest, have survived too long between the Scylla of ignorance and the Charybdis of invasion and killing to be dismissed.

Is it really too much for a responsible newspaper to check on such a figure as Shevchenko? It is easily verifiable, for example, that Shevchenko's poetry has been translated into some 52 different languages. These include the Chinese, Japanese, and Mongolian languages; there is a series of Shevchenko's works translated into Hebrew, as well as into Russian, Polish, and German. Evidently, his poetry must have some appeal for the Jews, Poles, Russians, and Germans. Just how Americans of such descent find his work offensive may indeed be revealing.

The editors of the Washington Post should also check on the fact that Shevchenko translations in the Russian language appeared during the lifetime of the poet himself: between 1856 and 1936, some 30 editions of Shevchenko's works have appeared in Russian, translated by some 70 Russian poets and writers, some of world fame. Up to 1939 some 97 volumes of his works had appeared in the Polish language, and several dozens of editions of his works have been published in the German language.

This is the Ukrainian pet.

THE CRUX OF THE MATTER

It will be no comfort to the Washington Post to find out that the only opponents of the Shevchenko commemoration are the Russian Communists in the Kremlin and their subservient puppets in Ukraine.

As long ago as March 7, 1961, Literaturnaya Gazeta of Moscow denounced the proposed Shevchenko statue in Washington. The Communist mouthpiece wrote:

"Moreover, they Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists have gone so far as to try to represent Shevchenko as a propagator of the ill-famed 'American way of life.' Taking out of context a few lines about George Washington from the poem 'The Feeble-Minded,' the nationalist 'experts on Shevchenko' are trying to prove that the poet 'dreamt about Ukraine as a replica of the democratic United States.'"

Another Communist organ, Komunist Ukrainy (February 2, 1961, Kiev), amplified the reference of Shevchenko to George Washington as follows:

"In these words Shevchenko contrasted the reactionary autocratic order of serfdom with the political order defended by George Washington. Today all the 'righteous laws' in the United States have been buried. There exists a reign of the most highhanded reactionary social forces, a ruthless enslavement of the workers, and racial and national discrimination. The American reactionaries and their hirelings, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, will never succeed in turning the poet-revolutionary (Shevchenko) into a partisan of the American bourgeois order."

The Communist enslavers of Ukraine have apparently found a mighty ally in the world capital of freedom to prevent a group of

Americans of Ukrainian descent from erecting a statue to a poet whose whole life was dedicated to the freedom of all men, regardless of creed, color, or nationality. What might be underscored here is that these Ukrainians fled persecution and death in their homeland. They and their descendants make up a valuable if small portion of American citizenry. It is a sad commentary on the times that their most valuable contribution—an intimate knowledge of the enemy—should be endangered through an irresponsible attack on their symbol of freedom.

We might direct the attention of the Post to another minority, one even smaller—the Chinese in our country. In addition to lack of size, these are even of different color. Moreover, their hopes for a free China border on the impossible. And what of the moneys we send to Taiwan to prop up a fantasy?

What is the price of freedom, Washington Post?

WHO GETS THE \$1,700,000 IN THE COMMUNIST WHEAT DEAL?

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I asked the president of Continental Grain Co., of New York, to disclose who gets the \$1,700,000 bonus which was apparent in the deal Continental made last week with the Department of Agriculture for Russia-bound Durum wheat.

Text of my telegram to Mr. Fribourg:

Your firm's recent purchase of Durum wheat from U.S. Department of Agriculture for export to the Soviet Union at the subsidy rate of 72 and 73 cents a bushel, was approximately \$1,700,000 more favorable than the next previous sale of Durum for another export transaction 2 weeks earlier. Secretary Freeman denies that this bonus to your firm was to cover the premium cost of shipping part of the grain in U.S. bottoms. Secretary Freeman's denial puts your firm in a bad light, and makes it appear you received an unconscionable profit. This I have difficulty believing, and offer you this opportunity to clarify the facts. If the \$1,700,000 bonus does not go to help hire U.S. bottoms, who gets it? If it does go to hire U.S. bottoms, and thus, in effect, subsidizes ocean transportation to the Communist destination, who originated the idea of hiding the shipping subsidy as a part of an abnormally high export subsidy on Durum wheat? Did the idea originate in Continental Grain Co. or the U.S. Department of Agriculture? In any event, with whom in the Department of Agriculture did your firm discuss the Durum wheat subsidy bid problem before you made the 72- and 73-cent bid? As a member of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, I would appreciate having answers to these questions.

THE SOURCE OF FEDERAL AID

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial policy recently enunciated by one Michigan newspaper, and applauded by another, deserves some notice by Congress. Hereafter, whenever the term "Federal aid" or "Federal grant" appears in any news story, the editor of the Port Huron Times-Herald will automatically substitute the phrase "Federal tax funds."

Such an editorial policy, if it were widely applied, would do much to clear up a great deal of misunderstanding about the real source of "aid" from Washington. Indeed, I would suggest a revision of the announced policy which would make the true situation even clearer. Whenever the term "Federal aid" is used, it would be even more accurate to substitute the words "tax funds or funds borrowed from our children."

An editorial which appeared on December 31, 1963, in the Cadillac (Mich.) Evening News is reprinted below:

IT ALL COMES FROM TAX FUNDS

Taxpayers in Cadillac and around the country should halt a step taken recently by F. Granger Weil, president and editor of the Port Huron Times-Herald.

Mr. Weil stated editorially that his newspaper will hereafter replace the terms "Federal grants" and "Federal aid" with the words "Federal tax funds."

Mr. Weil said further that: "There is no such thing as 'Federal funds.' The money spent by the Federal Government is your money: Whatever Government spends it must first get from the people."

The Port Huron paper will be going to some expense to change each predated news wire stories to conform with this new policy. However, it should help set the record straight in that city and might help in getting across to people in general that Government can only give what it first takes from the people—or plans to take later.

This has special application for Albonites at this time, as we contemplate more Federal housing and also urban renewal projects.

Aside from the projects themselves, and our own likes and dislikes for the projects; this matter of 'tax funds' is an important one. For with the entry of Government into the housing picture it makes it more and more difficult for persons who own rental property to pay the taxes which help support these Federal programs.

Certainly we would not quarrel with the use of Federal tax funds in areas where emergencies exist for this is the function of Government. But we do feel that the city council might well ponder the aspect of the use of Federal tax funds for the presently proposed projects along with their thoughtful deliberations over the concerns of the people involved, along with where the city share of urban renewal funds for required utilities and streets will come from during 1964, 1965, and 1966.

And these things should be considered before binding contracts are signed—rather than confronting the city with "emergency demands" for funds as the projects get into full swing, if they are fully approved.

As we understand it, the city water fund is almost on a "hand to mouth" basis after bond issue requirements are met. In fact, it has had to borrow from the sewage utility fund, which is better off for the moment at least, but not in a position to

build perhaps soon-to-be needed industrial park sewers.

However, the real point we want to make today is that the Federal funds are not "Santa Claus" gifts to any community. Living in a comparatively high income State, Michiganders collectively are paying much more into the Federal Treasury than we get back through various Federal expenditures, we are also told. But we're not going into that point today as many of the figures on that subject seem oversimplified.

CALL TO EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Ripon Society, a group of outstanding young men in the Cambridge-Boston, Mass., area addressed a call to excellence in leadership to Republican leaders throughout the country. It is a thoughtful statement of our political situation—idealistic yet practical in its approach to the vast number of problems facing us today. It calls upon us to provide an effective moderate point of view in developing a strategy for an assault on the domestic and global issues at stake today. I commend it to my colleagues and urge them to read it carefully.

This statement is the product of the thoughtful discussion and study by the Ripon Society for many months. It is offered in the spirit of constructive effort to build a Republican Party which will be equipped to lead the Nation in the years ahead and reflect credit upon our two-party system.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the statement for printing in the body of the RECORD:

A CALL TO EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NEW GENERATION OF REPUBLICANS

(From the members of the Ripon Society, Cambridge, Mass.)

For a moment a great Republic stood still. Everywhere men reacted first in disbelief and horror, then in anger and shame, and then in more measured thought and silence. The President is dead. A nation is in mourning.

History provides us with few such occasions to pause and reflect upon the state of our society and the course of its politics. While we yet sorrow, so must we seize this moment before our thoughts slip away to be lost in the noise of life as usual.

It is in this context that we have chosen to speak. We speak as a group of young Republicans to that generation which must bear the responsibility for guiding our party and our country over the coming decades. We speak for a point of view in the Republican Party that has too long been silent.

The Republican Party in 1964 faces not only an election but a decision. Shall it become an effective instrument to lead this Nation in the remainder of the 20th century? Shall it emerge from the current flux of American politics as the new majority party? Or shall it leave the Government of the Nation to a party born in the 1930's and

without a leader capable of transforming its disparate elements to meet the challenge of a radically new environment? We are convinced that the choices the Republican Party makes this year will have an incalculable effect on the destiny of our Nation.

We should like to approach this decision from three aspects—the strategy for achieving a new Republican consensus, the nature of a Republican philosophy appropriate to our times, and the qualities of excellence required in our leadership.

TOWARD A NEW REPUBLICAN CONSENSUS

Election results in 1960 and 1962 indicate that there is no clear political consensus in the country. We are perhaps at one of those points in our political history when a new majority is about to emerge.

American politics has been by and large one-party politics. A single party has been dominant for considerable periods in our past history—the party of Thomas Jefferson, the party of Abraham Lincoln, and most recently the party of Franklin Roosevelt. Each of these great parties emerged during a period of revolution in political ideas and was based upon a new majority consensus.

The Roosevelt coalition of the 1930's is still the majority party in this country. It continues to control both Houses of Congress and the majority of State Governorships. Yet its loyalties are fading, its base is eroding, and its dynamism has been exhausted. F.D.R. forged his great coalition of the urban minorities, trade unions, liberal intellectuals, farmers, and the Democratic South on a program to meet the economic distress of the depression years. Accordingly, the Democratic Party of today looks back to 1932 and 1936 and has never quite been able to escape the dialog of domestic politics from that period. In a real sense the Democratic coalition of the 1930's, dedicated to the preservation of its economic and social gains since the great depression has become the standpat conservative party of today.

John F. Kennedy was attempting to rebuild the Roosevelt coalition—to infuse it with the idealism of a new generation that found the political issues of the depression years increasingly irrelevant. He was seeking to lift the Democratic Party to a broader international concern. If, as appeared likely, he had faced the exponent of a virulent Republican conservatism in 1964, he might well have built a majority that would have assured the renewed dominance of the Democratic Party.

But fate deprived him of that opportunity—and fate also delivered control of his party to a leader far closer to the era of Roosevelt than to his own. Lyndon Johnson, it can safely be predicted, will try to put Roosevelt's coalition back together once again. But if he succeeds, will he be able to educate and transform his party and Nation to the tasks of the future? Trained as an apprentice of the New Deal; representing the southern wing of his party with its decidedly regional orientation; inclined by temperament to national rather than international concerns; will he not be a "prisoner of the past?" While the Nation may admire his knowledge of and ability to manipulate political power, Lyndon Johnson is not likely to fire the hearts and minds of Americans. His, at best, would be an administration of continuity.

If the Democratic Party, bound to the clichés and fears of past history, is incapable of providing the forward-looking leadership this country needs, the Republican Party must. There are at least two courses open to the party—the strategy of the right and the strategy of the center. We feel strongly that the center strategy is the only responsible choice the party can take.

The strategy of the right is a strategy for consolidating a minority position. It is per-

haps best described as an effort to build a coalition of all who are opposed to something. As an "anti" movement it is not surprising that it has been singularly devoid of positive programs for political action. The size and enthusiasm of the conservative movement should not be discounted, however. It represents a major discontent with the current state of our politics, and, properly channeled, it could serve as a powerful constructive force. But the fact remains that the strategy of the right, based as it is on a platform of negativism, can provide neither the Republican party an effective majority nor the American people responsible leadership.

The strategy of the right should be rejected for another basic reason. It is potentially divisive. Just as Disraeli warned the British Conservative party a century ago of the dangers of the two Englands, so would we speak out against a party realignment of the small States of the West and South against the urban centers of America—or any similar realignment that would pit American against American on the basis of distrust or suspicion. We must purge our politics of that rancor, violence, and extremism that would divide us. In the spirit of Lincoln, we must emphasize those goals and ideals which we hold in common as a people:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

We believe that the future of our party lies not in extremism, but in moderation. We believe that a moderate course of progressive Republicanism can be justified both in terms of strategy and philosophy. The moderate course offers the Republican Party the best chance to build a durable majority position in American politics. This is the direction the party must take if it is to win the confidence of the "new Americans" who are not at home in the politics of another generation: the new middle classes of the suburbs of the North and West—who have left the Democratic cities but have not yet found a home in the Republican Party; the young college graduates and professional men and women of our great university centers—more concerned with opportunity than security; the moderates of the new South—who represent the hope for peaceful racial adjustment and who are insulted by a racist appeal more fitting another generation. These and others like them hold the key to the future of our politics.

Since 1960 John F. Kennedy had moved with shrewd political understanding to preempt the political center. Republican moderates for the most part remained silent. By 1964 the Republican Party, perhaps with a Presidential nominee from the conservative right, would have had great difficulty in reclaiming the center. Now the very transfer of power means that the center is once again contestable. We believe that the Republican Party should accept the challenge to fight for the middle ground of American politics. The future lies here. The party that will not acknowledge this political fact of life and courageously enter the contest for power does not merit and cannot possibly win the majority support of the American people.

Must the Republican Party then adopt Kennedy-new frontier programs to compete for the center? No. Such a course would be wrong and it would smack so obviously of "political opportunism" as to insure its defeat. The Republican appeal should be rooted in a moderate Republican philosophy and should call forth the best leadership and vision the party can produce from its rich

history and current strengths. As Republicans, we must prove to the American people that our party, un beholden to the hostages of a faded past, is a more flexible instrument for the governing of this great Nation and for the realization of the noble American aspirations of human dignity and peace with honor. What then are the dimensions of a moderate yet dynamic Republican approach that can galvanize the elements of a new Republican consensus?

TOWARDS A MATURE REPUBLICAN PHILOSOPHY

A Republican philosophy capable of capturing the imagination of the American people must have at least three attributes. It must be oriented toward the solution of the major problems of our era—it must be pragmatic in emphasis. It must also be moderate in its methods—concerned more with the complexities of the means toward a solution than with a simplistic view of the ends. And finally, it must marry these attributes of pragmatism and moderation with a passion to get on with the tasks at hand.

Our philosophy must be oriented toward the solution of problems. The image of negativism that has too frequently been attached to our party must be dispelled. The new generation in American politics is looking for a party that is able to grasp the realities of its world, that exhibits a sensitivity to the problems that are its concern. This means that the first task of the Republican Party is to recognize and to begin devising approaches to the problems of the last half of the 20th century. We note only the most salient of domestic problems: the legitimate aspirations of the Negro in the northern cities, as well as in the South; the human adjustments to the process of automation in industry and in business; the phenomenon of the megalopolis with the attendant problems in housing, transportation, and community services; the emphasis of quality in our educational system, our health services, and our cultural services in general.

The Democratic Party will have solutions or purported solutions to all these domestic problems. But does it have the imagination demanded by the new world we face? Or will its answers merely be reiterations of the New Deal, more of the same, more indiscriminate massive Federal spending, more Government participation in the economic and social life of the Nation and individual?

The greatest mistake would be for the Republican Party to turn its back on these problems. Without this beginning we cannot utilize the strengths of our free enterprise system, of the individual initiative that has characterized our citizenry, of the infinite variety of our private institutions, the potential strengths of our several levels of government. If we fall here, just as if we fail to contest the center, the battle will go to the Democrats by default.

If our times demand new vision and new solutions on the domestic scene, how much greater is the need on the international front. The greatest challenge this Nation will face in 1965, 1970, and 1975, will most likely be decisions in its foreign policy. Merely to continue our foreign policy will not be enough. The American President must now serve as the first statesman of the world. America must assume the responsibilities commensurate with its power.

We must have the creative imagination and political sophistication to shape our policies to meet constantly changing distributions of power. At the same time we must have the perspective to give our foreign policy a direction that will meet the test of decades. We must get on with the paramount task of forging a new relationship with Europe. This will involve a new and more realistic approach to the question of nuclear sharing. The problems of the alliance—political, military, and economic—will

demand the finest qualities of statesmanship, of political engineering, of shrewd bargaining and compromise of which we are capable as a people. In our relationships with the Communist nations we must be sensitive to the diffusion of power within the bloc and the opportunities and dangers this affords. We must recognize and develop those areas of common interest such as arms control measures to reduce the chances of war by miscalculation or accident. At the same time we must check Communist aggression in whatever form it takes. We must develop a strategy for economic, technical, and military assistance that both merits the support of the American people and fulfills our commitments and responsibilities as leader of the free world.

Vision is a recognition of problems; it is a function of leadership. The Republican Party has produced a proud lineage of pragmatic statesmen since Lincoln. It is our hope that once again it will provide the leadership to meet the occasion.

While our philosophy and our program must be pragmatic, so must it be moderate. Simply to define the problems is not to solve them. The moderate recognizes that there are a variety of means available to him, but that there are no simple unambiguous ends. He recognizes hundreds of desirable social goals where the extremist may see only a few. The moderate realizes that ends not only compete with one another, but that they are inextricably related to the means adopted for their pursuit. Thus he will most likely set a proximate goal. While working for limited realizable objectives he will be especially concerned with the means, the environment in which the goals are achieved. The moderate chooses the center—the middle road—not because it is halfway between left and right. He is more than a nonextremist. He takes this course since it offers him the greatest possibility for constructive achievement.

In contrast, the extremist rejects the complexity of the moderate's world. His is a state of mind that insists on dividing reality into two antithetical halves. The gray is resolved into black and white. Men are either good or evil. Policies are either Communist or anti-Communist. It is understandable that the incredible complexity and mounting frustrations of our world will cause men to seek one right answer—the simple solution. The moderate cries out that such solutions do not exist, but his would appear to be a thankless task. Who will reward him for telling them their dreams can never be? It is not surprising that the doctrinaire has always reserved his greatest scorn for the pragmatist and not for his opposite number. The moderate poses the greatest danger to the extremist because he holds the truth that there is no truth.

Moderation is not a full-blown philosophy proclaiming the answers to all our problems. It is, rather, a point of view, a plea for political sophistication, for a certain skepticism to total solutions. The moderate has the audacity to be adaptable, to seek the limited solution most appropriate to the needs of his nation, its institutions, and its people. The Republican moderate approaches these problems from a more conservative perspective, the Democratic moderate from a more liberal one. The fact that we may meet on common ground is not "metoism." It is time to put away the tired old notion that to be real Republicans we must be as different as possible from our opponents. There is no more sense in that view than in the idea that we must be for isolationism, prohibition, or free love because our opponents are not. It is time we examined the merits of a solution in itself rather than set our policy simply in terms of the position the Democratic Party may have taken. We would do well to hear Paul's injunction to the Philipians: "Finally, brethren, whatso-

ever things are true, whatsoever things are just * * * if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Today we feel that the Republican Party must once again affirm its great tradition of pragmatism blended with political responsibility. But can the moderate produce the image of conviction and dedication that has been so much a part of the attraction of extremists throughout history? Is the flaming moderate just a joke, or is he a viable political actor? Can we be emotional about a politics so pluralistic, so relative, so limited in its range of available maneuver? Perhaps we share the too abundant enthusiasm of youth but we feel that we not only can—we must. We must show our world that our emotion can be aroused by a purpose more noble and a challenge more universal than the cries of an irresponsible extremism. Tempered with an honest uncertainty we must be ever willing to enter upon yet another crusade. We must learn to be as excited about openmindedness as we once were about final answers, as dedicated to partial solutions as we have been to panaceas. We must engage life as we find it, boldly and courageously, with the conviction that if we and reason endure we shall surely succeed—and with the knowledge that the greatest sin is not to have fought at all.

TOWARD EXCELLENCE IN REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

The assassination of John F. Kennedy has put the Republican Party in the position of fighting the election of 1968 in 1964. It has required that the party define not only a new strategy and a positive program but that it choose the men who are to lead it in these great tasks. The party must now find these men; men who can forge a new national party; men who can renew the great progressive Republican tradition; men who possess the qualities of excellence that we should be the first to see as the Kennedy legacy.

It is still too early to take the full measure of our late President. As Republicans we have disagreed and still disagree with many of the programs of his New Frontier. As members of the responsible opposition we have been critical of his administration's performance. But as Americans and as members of a generation still younger than his, there was something in John F. Kennedy that we admired. It would be petty indeed to deny this, dishonest to deny that we look for no lesser qualities in the future leadership of our own party.

John F. Kennedy brought to the Presidency a perspective of the years ahead. His vision of America and its role in the world was not simply the product of youth, of that "new generation of Americans" to whom the torch had been passed. It was derived from those qualities of mind and spirit that comprise his legacy to us: his sense of imagination and inquisitiveness, his subtle and keen intelligence, his awareness of the ultimate judgment of history, his courage to affirm life, his love for the art of politics, his respect for excellence. Robert Frost had spoken of his era as an age of poetry and power. He brought to the Presidency a style and a zest that challenged the idealism and won the enthusiasm of our generation.

Republicans protested with candor that there was too much style and not enough substance to his policies. Now, fate has denied us a full answer. The merits of the man and his leadership will be debated long beyond the coming campaign; but there are lessons in his life and death that we cannot completely escape. We have witnessed a change in the mood of American politics. After Kennedy there can be no turning back to the old conceptions of America. There can be no turning away from the expectations of greatness that he succeeded in imparting to our vision.

To all thinking Republicans the meaning of November 22 should be clear. The Re-

publican Party now has a challenge to seek in its future leadership those qualities of vision, intellectual force, humaneness and courage that Americans saw and admired in John F. Kennedy, not in a specious effort to fall heir to his mantle, but because our times demand no lesser greatness. Our party should make the call to excellence in leadership virtually the center of its campaign platform for 1964. The Republican Party should call America's finest young leaders into the political arena. It should advance its talented younger leadership now to positions of responsibility within the national Republican Party and the Congress. Great government requires great men in government. In a complex age, when truth is relative and total solutions elusive we can do no more than pledge the very best qualities of mind and soul to the endless battle for human dignity. And we dare to no less at every level of social activity, from the Presidency to the town selectman. As Republicans, we feel confident that Americans everywhere will join such an appeal.

We issue this call to excellence in leadership with the full realization that there is much essential work yet to be done before the November elections: the selection of the candidates, the building of a record in the 88th Congress, the shaping of the party platform, the planning of strategy for the campaign. We have not nor do we pretend to spell out a specific course of action. We fear, however, that these efforts will fail unless the party is motivated and directed by the broader and deeper concerns we have voiced. Without this vision and sense of purpose, the Republican Party will most certainly fail in the broadest sense of providing America the responsible leadership it needs.

The moderates of the Republican Party have too long been silent. None of us can shirk the responsibility for our past lethargy. All of us must now respond to the need for forceful leadership. The moderate progressive elements of the Republican Party must strive to change the tone and the content of American political debate. The continued silence of those who should now seek to lead deserves our party and Nation alike. The question has often been asked, "Where does one find fiery moderates?" Recent events show only too clearly how much we need such men. If we cannot find them, let us become them.

LUTHER AND ORVILLE SHOULD GET TOGETHER

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, press reports clearly indicate the U.S. Department of Agriculture has refused to grant export subsidies on Durum wheat sales to friendly free world countries comparable with the subsidy approved for the big Russian wheat deal.

While many Americans may approve the sale of surplus U.S. wheat and other agricultural commodities to Russia on the same terms we give our allies, they would most certainly oppose the granting of preferential trade concessions to Communist Russia and its satellites.

The Department of Agriculture should reveal every detail concerning the announced Durum wheat transaction. The

public is entitled to know why taxpayers will pay an "ocean freight subsidy" of 14 cents per bushel on the reported 13 million bushels of Durum made available to Russia, and the public is entitled to know if Commodity Credit Corporation received the market value for the Durum sale to Continental Grain Co. or if preferential treatment was accorded.

Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, who stated on Tuesday, January 7, we were not paying an "ocean freight" subsidy and Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, who on the same date said we were paying such a subsidy, should get together and agree on their statements.

EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter, tables, and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 30, 1963, in a memorandum for the heads of the departments and agencies of the executive branch, President Lyndon B. Johnson laid out a plan by which the departments and agencies were to administer their operations with utmost thrift and frugality. Included in President Johnson's plan was his request that top officials assume personally the day-to-day responsibility for good management and economical administration, press ahead vigorously in the manpower control and utilization program that had been earlier started by President Kennedy, and seek the advice of the committees of Congress as well as other groups to find better and more effective ways to operate the Government. I strongly commend President Johnson for this stand.

In keeping with the President's suggestion to the heads of the departments and agencies to work with congressional committees, I am today advising these officials of this subcommittee's interest and our willingness to be of assistance in President Johnson's program.

The Manpower Utilization Subcommittee is interested in eliminating outmoded and duplicate operations, improving work methods, raising employee morale, increasing employee productivity, and improving the services of Government to the people. The history of this subcommittee for the past 8 years has been that of working closely with the departments and agencies in attempts to achieve these goals. Often the response has been heartening but likewise there have been instances of so-called foot dragging or even worse mere lipservice.

By and large, we feel that currently there is a greater manifestation of interest in manpower management in the Federal Government, with an indication of action, than the Members have witnessed in some time. Undoubtedly much of this interest stems from the vigorous program launched by President Kennedy,

The subcommittee has also received excellent cooperation from employee organizations across the Nation. Without the support of these people many of our accomplishments would not have been possible.

The Manpower Utilization Subcommittee does not operate on the theory that all problems will come to our desks on the Hill or that we will get all the facts by staying in Washington. During the past year the subcommittee has been in contact with over 70 different activities of the executive branch. Our contacts related to a variety of subjects, including the problems of military and civilian staffing patterns, alleged forced retirements of career employees, use of contractor personnel to perform work historically and successfully performed by Government employees, the buddy system in the employment and promotion of personnel, and alleged preferential treatment in personnel administrative matters.

The subcommittee's investigative staff was sent to 15 field activities scattered across the country to study actual manpower and related problems at the sites. These staff visits were followed through by consultation with top management officials at the Washington level in the particular bureaus and offices. We have a record of accomplishments based on this procedure testifying to the values of both a cooperative approach between a congressional committee and the executive branch and on-the-site evaluations.

The members met in public hearings during 1963 over a period of several weeks with manpower officials of 15 departments and agencies. A variety of subjects were raised representing many different aspects of the overall problems of manpower control and manpower utilization.

Informal briefings were provided the members by department and agency heads on a number of specific issues. Included in these issues were questions relating to quality control, use of contract technicians, and the comparative cost of various projects as between in-house capability and contractor operations.

As the result of these many different activities the subcommittee will issue this month formal reports on a number of subjects, including the fiscal management function in the Department of Defense, the use of contract technicians, preferential personnel practices, and a summary of manpower control and utilization techniques.

During 1963, resulting from the numerous contracts by the subcommittee members and staff with management and employee groups, several manpower management problem areas in the Federal Government were detected. Some were not new, other areas were. However, many of these personnel management issues reflect potential savings to our Nation, directly or indirectly.

Every year we hear rumors of too many employees on the Federal payroll. There is always a rebuttal that the Federal Government is not growing as rapidly as our economy or the population, much less as rapidly as State and local governments. These are indeed moot questions

to be answered properly by close inspection of the mission, functional priorities, and workload of a particular department or agency.

Our subcommittee has found areas where reductions in personnel would be quite profitable and even lead to more effective management. In turn, there are other areas that are now conceivably understaffed. This reflects a current basic weakness in our Federal manpower program; namely, the lack of a sound and realistic technique to determine employee requirements. Too often we in the Government must resort to historical trends as the best or sole procedure for determining the number of personnel required.

I recognize that civilian employment in the Federal Government since 1958 was on an upward trend until this past October. But, I am happy to note that in November there were 5,000 fewer Government employees than in November 1962.

The subcommittee members recognize the increasing demands on the departments and agencies for more services and for new and expanded functions. There is no question but that the economic growth of the country plus our population explosion are strong contributory factors for more Federal employees. Even so, the subcommittee members continue to look to top management in the Federal Government to improve personnel controls and utilization to offset a higher percentage of these increasing requirements.

The subcommittee has been quite interested for years in inflationary trends in the Classification Act grade structure. Comparing June 30, 1963, employees by pay grade with June 30, 8 years previously; namely, 1955, one finds indeed some interesting statistics. In 1955 some 33.3 percent of all employees in the Federal Government were in grade GS-1, GS-2, and GS-3. Today 16.5 percent are in the three lowest pay grades. The reverse has taken place in the top pay brackets.

In 1955 there were 38,615 employees in pay grades GS-13 and above. This represented 4.2 percent of all the Classification Act employees. This year, as of June 30, there were 100,046 in these top pay grades, representing almost 10 percent of all the employees under the Classification Act.

On several occasions the subcommittee members have raised this issue with officials in the departments and agencies. Many reasons have been given for the upward grade spiral, including increased use of engineers and scientists, automation, more complex operations in some phases of Government and new functions to be managed. All of these points are, to some degree, well taken. But, the subcommittee also is asking if this continued upward trend may not be in part the end result of inadequacies in personnel administration.

Civilian personnel ceilings have undoubtedly been of benefit but also in some instances have been a factor for increased labor costs to the Government.

Our staff inspections have revealed that when civilian personnel ceilings are reduced and military personnel are available, as so often is the case, operating officials resort to contract furnished services or combat-qualified military. The training of the military personnel is drastically reduced in order to make them available for support—namely civilian-type—work. Based on inspections in several Defense Department field activities this year, the staff noted, as a result of reduced civilian personnel ceilings, the use of active-duty military men or contractor personnel in such jobs as: repair and overhaul of aircraft, automotive vehicles and office equipment; custodial and janitorial services, and particularly in the Air Force, maintenance of buildings and grounds. In several Army field activities, the transportation function and even quality inspection work was put on contract.

In most of these instances the contractor merely furnished people and, in my opinion, at a greater cost than if the services had been performed by Government direct-hire personnel.

The subcommittee has, over the years, received more complaints concerning the increased use of military personnel in civilian-type jobs than on any other subject. Investigations by the subcommittee have indicated work being performed by able-bodied military men that has historically and successfully been handled by career civilian employees. Our staff has observed time and again able-bodied military at bases in the United States serving as chauffeurs, typists, receptionists, office machine operators, painters, carpenters, ground maintenance men and the like. The Members recognize that there must be an adequate number of jobs here at home for rotating combat military people from ships and foreign stations. However, this rotation base in the States has in many instances become "fat." We have noted, for example, an Air Force installation on the east coast where management officials on their initiative found in excess of 700 military jobs, out of a total of 5,000 that they felt should be civilianized. May I add, these management officials were military officers. Our experiences have indicated that this is not an exception. In fact, 18 months ago, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, on the urging of this subcommittee, found 15,000 military personnel in the four services engaged in nonmilitary work that could be accomplished by 13,000 civilians. Our subcommittee strongly endorsed the idea with the proviso that the 15,000 military personnel would return to civilian life. An international crisis at the time, the Cuban Affairs of 1962, temporarily put this plan in the "deep freeze."

The Manpower Utilization Subcommittee has frequently gone on record as favoring a strong combat force; however, we are not in favor of calling up, involuntarily, to the services young men to perform tasks common to our civilian economy. The morale of both the military man as well as the displaced civilian employee may be adversely affected.

Since labor today in the Defense Establishment may be from direct civilian

employees, military personnel, or contractors, it is the considered opinion of this subcommittee that the mere reductions of career civilian employees does not necessarily reduce labor costs in the Department of Defense. The other two labor sources, both regarded as more expensive than career civilians, must likewise be controlled. Otherwise, the cut in career civilian employment merely becomes a gesture.

Too often we have noted throughout the departments and agencies dependence on consultants and other per diem experts for making decisions that should be made by Government's management officials. Frequently it was noted that there was already available in an agency the talent being bought on a consulting basis.

Our staff has also witnessed in its inspection trips, and we have learned in public hearings from top management, of the extensive use of overtime. Extensive use of overtime frequently becomes a moot management question as to the net overall efficiency and economy as related to an increased staff. However, our subcommittee has frequently noted overtime running as high as 15 to 25 percent of the total pay of the same employees month after month over an extended period of time. These facts have been brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Department as an indication that there might be inadequate planning and/or the need to reappraise personnel requirements.

The subcommittee has noted this year numerous other manpower problem areas. For example, the impact of automation on paper work operations in the departments and agencies has been gaining in momentum in the past 5 to 10 years. The Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, has recently shown us a dramatic example of the impact of automation on labor needs. To handle a certain phase of the 1960 census, the Census Bureau used 86 employees and five electronic computers. For the same phase of the 1950 census, without the computers, 3,400 employees were required to do the job. In the next several years automation will mean in the Government the reassignment and possible retraining of thousands of people. Automation will continue to have numerous indirect effects on personnel administration. Our subcommittee has profited from the excellent cooperation of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, chaired by the gentleman from Montana, Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN. That subcommittee has held several public hearings on the overall impact of automation on statistical operations in the Federal Government.

The role of the older worker in the Government is becoming more noticeable. We have reviewed numerous allegations that older persons were being discriminated against, in initial hirings, in promotional opportunities and recently by one of the agencies in its redeployment of career employees.

Closely related to alleged discriminations of older employees has been the issue of forced retirements. Our subcommittee has learned of many allega-

tions, whereby the career employee was forced by management to retire—the reasons vary considerably.

Both of the above manpower items are of sufficient volume as to warrant more detailed examination by the subcommittee this year.

The Manpower Utilization Subcommittee has made a detailed study of the current and growing practice in the military departments of recently retired military personnel being rehired as career Government civilian employees. In 1960 the military services hired some 2,000 military people who had retired that year. Included in that group were 70 personnel actions which the subcommittee members felt should be reviewed by top management in the Defense Department. Many of these personnel actions reflected a buddy system personnel procedure. Included in this procedure were such actions as: holding a job open until a particular man retired from the military service, writing up a job to fit the qualification of a certain individual, and the so-called quickie appointment. The name "quickie appointment" arose as a result of situations whereby a military man retired one day and the next day returned to the same job, same desk, as a career civilian employee.

These kinds of personnel actions have been called to the attention of the Secretary of Defense. Some corrections have been made with a policy statement that has dampened somewhat the ardor of this buddy system aspect of personnel administration. Subcommittee interest and study have revealed need for a more comprehensive policy and a tighter monitoring of the total personnel management system. Over 450,000 military personnel will retire from active duty between now and 1970. To protect the career civilian employee and to guarantee an equal opportunity for the retiring military man to work for the Government as a civilian, additional and more positive action, in several ways, must be exercised by the Congress and by the executive branch.

Our subcommittee in 1963 recorded accomplishments in several other areas of endeavor. A staff appraisal of wage board pay procedures in one Government field activity has saved the Government over \$65,000 a year. The cooperation of management in the agency's headquarters was especially notable.

Subcommittee interest in specific contracts for the overhaul and repair of aircraft, in two of the services, resulted in the dropping of a cost-plus contract to be replaced by a competitive bid approach. The Government has saved several thousands of dollars as a result. In another instance, our interest resulted in a contractor cutting a unit price for overhaul of engine parts from \$240 to \$175. In both of these cases local Government employees worked closely with the subcommittee.

On the recommendation of our subcommittee, based on a staff review of another Government field activity, contracts for a number of technicians were terminated. The personnel were placed on a direct-hire basis or the jobs were abolished. This reflects, according to

management officials in the agency, an annual savings in excess of \$900,000.

The attention of management in the military departments was called to duplicate recordkeeping and ineffective, in fact often impractical, operating statistics. In several instances, especially at naval shipyards, naval air stations, and Air Force bases, local management is revamping and/or changing the collection and analysis techniques relating to administrative data. Headquarters officials have noted our subcommittee comments and have made numerous changes.

Our subcommittee last year received hundreds of personnel-action complaints from across the Nation. We have neither the staff nor the funds to go into all these individual cases. However, last year we reviewed many of these cases with the departments and agencies and/or the Civil Service Commission.

Out of these personnel cases our subcommittee has been able to develop more realistic background material for future courses of action. These cases have pointed up weaknesses and/or needs to revise: retirement practices, wage-board pay procedures, the buddy system of employment, the scheduling of vacations, the redeployment of employees, and appeals procedures.

President Johnson in his memorandum of November 30 to agency and department heads, indicated that progress had been made in the management of manpower in the Federal Government. The President is quite right, and I would like at this time to note some of the improvements that have been reported to the subcommittee. For example, during the year the Department of Agriculture through reorganization and coordination of major functions saved 400 man-years; the Department of the Army and the Navy underwent extensive reorganizations to reflect new concepts of warfare with attending changes in hardware and in its support; and the Marine Corps by consolidating activities in the Philadelphia area saved 70 positions.

By revising its payroll operations the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will realize savings in labor costs of \$350,000 annually.

During the year automation was carried a step further in many paper-processing operations in the Federal Government. This was especially noted in the Departments of Agriculture, Navy, Treasury, and the Veterans' Administration. In fact, the Veterans' Administration in one operation alone, veterans' insurance payments, has cut 400 jobs as a result of automation.

The Department of State, last month in a report to the subcommittee, indicated substantial savings as a result of management surveys—13 consulate posts will be closed at a savings of more than \$500,000 annually. In the same report, AID revealed that revised staffing patterns, with a critical eye toward requirements, has meant the abolishment of 15 technician positions in various parts of the world.

The Air Force, in its most recent manpower report to the subcommittee, indicated that as a result of its review of air

traffic personnel needs a savings of 400 jobs can be realized.

Possibly the most dramatic incident cited to our subcommittee during 1963 was by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. Out in California, by use of helicopters, drilling equipment is now being relocated in a matter of 4 hours. In the past, over similar terrain, this operation normally would have required a six-man crew 2 weeks to do the job.

These are but a few examples of many instances reported to the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the effectiveness in manpower control and utilization by management in the Federal Government. Quarterly the subcommittee reviews the reports by departments and agencies and as a result prepares a summary for the members and for manpower officials throughout the Government.

Despite these many fine accomplishments employment in the Federal Government is above the same month in 1958. However, I am happy to note that during a 12-month period, October 1962–November 1963, civilian employment in the Federal Government dropped. Even so, for the same 12 months, October 1962 through November 1963, the Federal civilian payroll was \$16 billion. Need I say, that is a lot of money.

Congressmen, agency heads, supervisors, rank-and-file employees throughout the Federal Government, we all face a great challenge now, today, to reduce the costs of the Federal Government by exercising more effective controls and utilization of Government employees. President Johnson has placed the challenge before us. The next few months will separate the lipservice managers from the results managers.

I pledge to Lyndon B. Johnson the fullest cooperation of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee in this noble effort.

THE NATION'S TRAGEDY—1963

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today in order to call to the attention of my colleagues a magnificent special memorial section published by the Chicago Sun-Times on December 29, 1963, in memory of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Students of history for centuries to come will seek information about this tragic chapter of American history when President Kennedy was murdered.

It is my hope that by including in the body of the RECORD today the complete text of this special memorial section published by the Sun-Times, we may leave for posterity a permanent record of how one American publication interpreted and reported this tragic event of 1963.

The men and women who prepared this special memorial section are among America's most highly respected writers. Their words describing this entire tragedy graphically record the full impact of the tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which in my judgment mirrors, through the Members of Congress, the chronicle of contemporary American history as it unfolds from day to day, should include this magnificent memorial section which so skillfully describes one of the great tragedies of our civilization.

It is with a sense of deep pride that I include in my remarks today the work of these outstanding men and women of American journalism.

The Chicago Sun-Times has performed a classic public service in compiling into a few pages the full scope of those tragic days in November which took from America one great President and gave to America another great President.

The Sun-Times Kennedy memorial section follows:

A BLACK FRIDAY IN DALLAS

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—It was a balmy sunny noon as we motored through downtown Dallas behind President Kennedy.

The procession cleared the center of the business district and turned into a handsome highway that wound through what appeared to be a park.

I was riding in the so-called White House press pool car, a telephone company vehicle equipped with a mobile radiotelephone. I was in the front seat between a driver from the telephone company and Malcolm Kilduff, acting White House Press Secretary for the President's Texas tour. Three other pool reporters were wedged in the back seat.

Suddenly we heard three loud, almost painfully loud cracks. The first sounded as if it might have been a large firecracker. But the second and third blasts were unmistakable—gunfire.

The President's car, possibly as much as 150 or 200 yards ahead, seemed to falter briefly. We saw a flurry of activity in the Secret Service followup car behind the Chief Executive's bubbletop limousine.

Next in line was the car bearing Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. Behind that, another followup car bearing agents assigned to the Vice President's protection. We were behind that car.

Our car stood still for probably only a few seconds, but it seemed like a lifetime. One sees history explode before one's eyes and for even the most trained observer, there is a limit to what one can comprehend.

I looked ahead at the President's car but could not see him or his companion, Gov. John B. Connally, of Texas. Both men had been riding on the right side of the bubbletop limousine from Washington. I thought I saw a flash of pink which would have been Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

Everybody in our car began shouting at the driver to pull up closer to the President's car. But at this moment we saw the big bubbletop and a motorcycle escort roar away at high speed.

We screamed at our driver, "Get going, get going." We careened around the Johnson car and its escort and set out down the highway, barely able to keep in sight of the President's car and the accompanying Secret Service followup car.

They vanished around a curve. When we cleared the same curve we could see where we were heading—Parkland Hospital, a large brick structure to the left of the arterial highway. We skidded around a sharp left turn and spilled out of the pool car as it entered the hospital driveway.

I ran to the side of the bubbletop.

The President was face down on the back seat. Mrs. Kennedy made a cradle of her

arms around the President's head and bent over him as if she were whispering to him.

Governor Connally was on his back on the floor of the car, his head and shoulders resting in the arms of his wife, Nellie, who kept shaking her head and shaking with dry sobs. Blood oozed from the front of the Governor's suit. I could not see the President's wound. But I could see blood spattered around the interior of the rear seat and a dark stain spreading down the right side of the President's dark gray suit.

From the telephone car, I had radioed the Dallas bureau of UPI that three shots had been fired at the Kennedy motorcade. Seeing the bloody scene in the rear of the car at the hospital entrance, I knew I had to get to a telephone immediately.

Clint Hill, the Secret Service agent in charge of the detail assigned to Mrs. Kennedy, was leaning over into the rear of the car.

"How badly was he hit, Clint?" I asked.

"He's dead," Hill replied curtly.

I have no further clear memory of the scene in the driveway. I recall a babble of anxious voices, tense voices—"Where in hell are the stretchers * * *. Get a doctor out here * * *. He's on the way * * *. Come on, easy there." And from somewhere, nervous sobbing.

I raced down a short stretch of sidewalk into a hospital corridor. The first thing I spotted was a small clerical office, more of a booth than an office. Inside, a bespectacled man stood shuffling what appeared to be hospital forms. At a wicket much like a bank teller's cage, I spotted a telephone on the shelf.

"How do you get outside?" I gasped. "The President has been hurt and this is an emergency call."

"Dial 9," he said, shoving the phone toward me.

It took two tries before I successfully dialed the Dallas UPI number. Quickly I dictated a bulletin saying the President had been seriously, perhaps fatally, injured by an assassin's bullets while driving through the streets of Dallas.

Litters bearing the President and the Governor rolled by me as I dictated, but my back was to the hallway and I didn't see them until they were at the entrance of the emergency room about 75 or 100 feet away.

I knew they had passed, however, from the horrified expression that suddenly spread over the face of the man behind the wicket.

As I stood in the drab buff hallway leading into the emergency ward trying to reconstruct the shooting for the UPI man on the other end of the telephone and still keep track of what was happening outside the door of the emergency room, I watched a swift and confused panorama sweep before me.

Kilduff, of the White House press staff, raced up and down the hall. Police captains barked at each other, "Clear this area." Two priests hurried in behind a Secret Service agent, their narrow purple stoles rolled up tightly in their hands. A police lieutenant ran down the hall with a large carton of blood for transfusions. A doctor came in and said he was responding to a call for "all neurosurgeons."

The priests came out and said the President had received the last sacrament of the Roman Catholic Church. They said he was still alive, but not conscious. Members of the Kennedy staff began arriving. They had been behind us in the motorcade, but hopelessly bogged for a time in confused traffic.

Telephones were at a premium in the hospital and I clung to mine for dear life. I was afraid to stray from the wicket lest I lose contact with the outside world.

My decision was made for me, however, when Kilduff and Wayne Hawks of the White House staff ran by me, shouting that Kilduff would make a statement shortly in the so-

called nurses room a floor above and at the far end of the hospital.

I threw down the phone and sped after them. We reached the door of the conference room and there were loud cries of "Quiet." Fighting to keep his emotions under control, Kilduff said "President John Fitzgerald Kennedy died at approximately 1 o'clock."

I raced into a nearby office. The telephone switchboard at the hospital was hopelessly jammed. I spotted Virginia Payette, wife of UPI's southwestern division manager and a veteran reporter in her own right. I told her to try getting through on pay telephones on the floor above.

Frustrated by the inability to get through the hospital switchboard, I appealed to a nurse. She led me through a maze of corridors and back stairways to another floor and a lone pay booth. I got the Dallas office. Virginia had gotten through before me.

Whereupon I ran back through the hospital to the conference room. There Jiggs Fauver, of the White House transportation staff grabbed me and said Kilduff wanted a pool of three men immediately to fly back to Washington on *Air Force 1*, the presidential aircraft.

"He wants you downstairs, and he wants you right now," Fauver said.

Down the stairs I ran and into the driveway, only to discover Kilduff had just pulled out in our telephone car.

Charles Roberts of Newsweek magazine, Sid Davis of Westinghouse Broadcasting and I implored a police officer to take us to the airport in his squad car. The Secret Service had requested that no sirens be used in the vicinity of the airport, but the Dallas officer did a masterful job of getting us through some of the worst traffic I've ever seen.

As we piled out of the car on the edge of the runway about 200 yards from the presidential aircraft, Kilduff spotted us and motioned for us to hurry. We trotted to him and he said the plane could take two pool men to Washington; that Johnson was about to take the oath of office aboard the plane and would take off immediately thereafter.

I saw a bank of telephone booths beside the runway and asked if I had time to advise my news service. He said, "But for God's sake, hurry."

Then began another telephone nightmare. The Dallas office rang busy. I tried calling Washington. All circuits were busy. Then I called the New York bureau of UPI and told them about the impending installation of a new President aboard the airplane.

Kilduff came out to the plane and motioned wildly toward my booth. I slammed down the phone and jogged across the runway. A detective stopped me and said, "You dropped your pocket comb."

Aboard *Air Force 1* on which I had made so many trips as a press association reporter covering President Kennedy, all of the shades of the larger main cabin were drawn and the interior was hot and dimly lighted.

Kilduff propelled us to the President's suite two-thirds of the way back in the plane. The room is used normally as a combination conference and sitting room and could accommodate 8 to 10 people seated.

I wedged inside the door and began counting. There were 27 people in this compartment. Johnson stood in the center with his wife, Lady Bird. U.S. District Court Judge Sarah T. Hughes, 67, a kindly faced woman stood with a small black Bible in her hands, waiting to give the oath.

The compartment became hotter and hotter, Johnson was worried that some of the Kennedy staff might not be able to get inside. He urged people to press forward, but a Signal Corps photographer, Capt. Cecil Stoughton, standing in the corner on a chair, said if Johnson moved any closer, it would be virtually impossible to make a truly historic photograph.

It developed that Johnson was waiting for Mrs. Kennedy, who was composing herself in a small bedroom in the rear of the plane. She appeared alone, dressed in the same pink wool suit she had worn in the morning when she appeared so happy shaking hands with airport crowds at the side of her husband.

She was white faced but dry eyed. Friendly hands stretched toward her as she stumbled slightly. Johnson took both of her hands in his and motioned her to his left side. Lady Bird stood on his right, a fixed half-smile showing the tension.

Johnson nodded to Judge Hughes, an old friend of his family and a Kennedy appointee.

"Hold up your right hand and repeat after me," the woman jurist said to Johnson.

Outside a jet could be heard droning into a landing.

Judge Hughes held out the Bible and Johnson covered it with his large left hand. His right arm went slowly into the air and the jurist began to intone the constitutional oath, "I do solemnly swear I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States * * *"

The brief ceremony ended when Johnson in a deep, firm voice, repeated after the judge, "and so help me God."

Johnson turned first to his wife, hugged her about the shoulders and kissed her on the cheek. Then he turned to Mr. Kennedy's widow, put his left arm around her and kissed her cheek.

As others in the group—some Texas Democratic House members, members of the Johnson and Kennedy staffs—moved toward the new President, he seemed to back away from any expression of felicitation.

The 2-minute ceremony concluded at 2:38 p.m., and seconds later the President said firmly, "Now, let's get airborne."

Col. James Swindal, pilot of the plane, a big gleaming silver and blue fan-jet, cut on the starboard engines immediately. Several persons, including Sid Davis, of Westinghouse, left the plane at that time. The White House had room for only two pool reporters on the return flight and these posts were filled by Roberts and me, although at the moment we could find no empty seats.

At 3:47 p.m., the wheels of *Air Force 1* cleared the runway. Swindal roared the big ship up to an unusually high cruising altitude of 41,000 feet where, at 625 miles an hour, ground speed, the jet hurtled toward Andrews Air Force Base outside Washington.

When the President's plane reached operating altitude, Mrs. Kennedy left her bedchamber and walked to the rear compartment of the plane. This was the so-called family living room, a private area where she and Mr. Kennedy, family, and friends had spent many happy airborne hours chatting and dining together.

Mr. Kennedy's casket had been placed in this compartment, carried aboard by a group of Secret Service agents.

Mrs. Kennedy went into the rear lounge and took a chair beside the coffin. There she remained throughout the flight. Her vigil was shared at times by four staff members close to the slain Chief Executive—David Powers, his buddy and personal assistant; Kenneth P. O'Donnell, appointments secretary and key political adviser; Lawrence O'Brien, chief Kennedy liaison man with Congress; and Brig. Gen. Godfrey McHugh, Mr. Kennedy's Air Force aide.

Mr. Kennedy's military aide, Maj. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, was busy most of the trip in the forward areas of the plane, sending messages and making arrangements for arrival ceremonies and movement of the body to Bethesda Naval Hospital.

As the flight progressed, Johnson walked back into the main compartment. My portable typewriter was lost somewhere around the hospital and I was writing on an oversized electric typewriter which Mr. Ken-

nedy's personal secretary, Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln, had used to type his speech texts.

Johnson came up to the table where Roberts and I were trying to record the history we had just witnessed.

"I'm going to make a short statement in a few minutes and give you copies of it," he said. "Then when I get on the ground, I'll do it over again."

It was the first public utterance of the new Chief Executive, brief and moving: "This is a sad time for all people. We have suffered a loss that cannot be weighed. For me it is a deep personal tragedy. I know the world shares the sorrow that Mrs. Kennedy and her family bear. I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help—and God's."

When the plane was about 45 minutes from Washington, the new President got on a special radiotelephone and placed a call to Mrs. Rose Kennedy, the late President's mother.

"I wish to God there was something I could do," he told her, "I just wanted you to know that."

Then Mrs. Johnson wanted to talk to the elder Mrs. Kennedy.

"We feel like the heart has been cut out of us," Mrs. Johnson said. She broke down for a moment and began to sob. Recovering in a few seconds, she added, "Our love and our prayers are with you."

Thirty minutes out of Washington, Johnson put in a call for Nellie Connally, wife of the seriously wounded Texas Governor.

The new President said to the Governor's wife: "We are praying for you, darling, and I know that everything is going to be all right, isn't it? Give him a hug and a kiss for me."

It was dark when *Air Force 1* began to skim over the lights of the Washington area, lining up for a landing at Andrews Air Force Base. The plane touched down at 5:59 p.m.

I thanked the stewards for rigging up the typewriter for me, pulled on my raincoat and started down the forward ramp. Roberts and I stood under a wing and watched the casket being lowered from the rear of the plane and borne by a complement of Armed Forces bodybearers into a waiting hearse. We watched Mrs. Kennedy and the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, climb into the hearse beside the coffin.

The new President repeated his first public statement for broadcast and newsreel microphones, shook hands with some of the Government and diplomatic leaders who turned out to meet the plane, and headed for his helicopter.

Roberts and I were given seats on another helicopter bound for the White House lawn. In the compartment next to ours in one of the large chairs beside a window sat Theodore C. Sorensen, one of Mr. Kennedy's closest associates with the title of special counsel to the President. He had not gone to Texas with his Chief but had come to the airbase for his return.

Sorensen sat wilted in the large chair, crying softly. The dignity of his deep grief seemed to sum up all of the tragedy and sadness of the previous 6 hours.

As our helicopter circled in the balmy darkness for a landing on the White House south lawn, it seemed incredible that only 6 hours before, John Fitzgerald Kennedy had been a vibrant, smiling, waving, and active man.

THREE LAST, BRIGHT HOURS—AND THE NIGHTMARE DESCENDS

(By Carleton Kent)

DALLAS.—It had rained in the early morning, but then the sky cleared into the livid blue of the Southwest; the air was cool, and every prospect pleased as John F. Kennedy rode into Dallas.

In neighboring Fort Worth, not notably a hotbed of liberalism; he had been extrava-

gantly praised at a chamber of commerce breakfast meeting by "Mr. Fort Worth," Chamber President Raymond Buck.

"Our great, courageous, and brilliant leader of the world's strongest nation," Buck had called him. "Our hearts and our arms are open to you. May God bless you and cause His light to shine on you and your companions."

Three hours later, in the bright sun of Dallas, 30 miles away, the young President lay dying in the back seat of an open car, struck down by an assassin whose gun couldn't miss his russet-haired target in a slow-moving motorcade.

He had come to Texas the day before for pre-campaign politicking in a State whose 25 electoral votes would be important in 1964, whose Democratic Party was torn by a family feud, and in which conservative Republicans fanatically devoted to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, were boasting of their strength.

Overnight the President had smoothed over the public portions of the fight among Democrats. He had persuaded Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, the liberal Democrats' champion, to ride in the same car with Lyndon B. Johnson, his dearest Democratic foe, and Mrs. Johnson in the Fort Worth and Dallas motorcades.

This was something YARBOROUGH had twice refused to do on Thursday, in San Antonio, and Houston.

Pleased over this demonstration, maybe only a gesture of Democratic unity, the President charged on Dallas, the citadel of right-wing Republicanism.

He had a speech in his pocket, to be delivered at an enormous luncheon meeting sponsored by top business executives of Dallas—almost to a man stanchly conservative—and it minced no words.

It accused his extremist foes of talking nonsense—of assuming that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory, and that peace is a sign of weakness.

The assassin's bullet struck him down a half hour before he was to deliver his challenge, and while he was on his way to the luncheon date in the Dallas trade mart that ended on the grimmest of notes.

The crowd in downtown Dallas had been extra large and appeared extra friendly.

There were a few Goldwater signs. There was one in big capitals in an office building that said merely, "Bah." There was another, longer one: "Because of my respect for the Presidency, I despise you and your brand of socialism."

Reporters riding in a "White House press bus" 200 yards behind the President's car guessed Mr. Kennedy probably laughed at those.

After the sniper's bullet hit him, Mrs. Kennedy cradled his head in the lap of her raspberry-colored wool suit, the one he had kidded her about earlier in the joyous day at Fort Worth.

He had apologized, to a crowd standing in the early morning rain of a parking lot across from the hotel, because his wife hadn't come with him.

"Mrs. Kennedy is organizing herself," he said. "It takes longer. But, of course, she looks better than we do when she does it."

And at the chamber of commerce breakfast later he complained that "nobody wonders what Lyndon and I wear."

Just before the shots rang out that killed him and gravely wounded Texas Governor, John B. Connally, riding in the seat ahead of him, the Kennedys were laughing at something Mrs. Connally turned around to say to them.

"You can't say Dallas wasn't friendly to you today," she said.

Then occurred the kind of nightmare the Secret Service always live with.

And Senator YARBOROUGH riding two cars behind will never forget the sight of the Secret Service man beating his fist on the presidential car in what he knew to be anger, frustration, and despair.

The President died without ever answering Mrs. Connally, or saying another word.

He could have had no intimation of what fate had in store for him. He did know, of course, that his visit to Texas was begging political danger.

But that was the kind of America he preached. He felt it was better to come to Texas, to challenge the Republicans and to risk any damage accruing from the Democratic Party's factional fight, than to turn his back on it and pretend no trouble existed. He chose to go into difficult political terrain, and to face the most vociferous and unyielding foes of his administration in the fiercest citadel of conservatism in the Nation.

Of course, he didn't know one man, instead of arguing politics, would use a sniper's rifle.

A GRAY SATURDAY IN CAPITAL

(By David Wise)

WASHINGTON.—The rain in Washington, cold, gray, and dismal, had begun soon after the dawn.

At each corner of the President's mahogany casket, four white candles cast flickering shadows in the hushed East Room of the White House.

John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, reposed there, in his home, for the last time Saturday, 1 day after an assassin's bullet in Dallas had cut short his Presidency, his hopes, and his life at the age of 46.

A family mourned, a nation mourned, a world mourned, and as the rains came throughout the long, sorrowful day, it seemed as though the heavens mourned, too.

There was shock in Washington Friday when the President was murdered. Saturday there was only sadness.

The dead President's immediate family and the great men of power in Washington filed past the closed casket Saturday.

During the night, residents of the Capital could hear the sirens of the police escort as the casket containing the President's body moved through the dark streets from Bethesda Naval Hospital to the White House.

The blue-gray Navy ambulance left the hospital at 4 a.m. Inside were Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, still wearing the blood-spattered pink suit, stockings, and shoes she wore Friday, and the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

At 4:25 a.m., the ambulance, its window curtains drawn, moved through the northwest gate of the White House. A double line of marines led the way as the ambulance and three limousines moved under the elms, bare of leaves, up the driveway to the north portico of the White House.

Hundreds of persons who had waited in the darkness outside the White House gates watched silently. Men removed their hats. Mrs. Kennedy stepped out of the ambulance, waiting patiently for the flag-draped casket to be removed.

Then, she turned and walked steadily between the double line of marines, on the arm of Robert Kennedy.

Mrs. Kennedy, the Attorney General, and a few members of the President's staff gathered in the East Room before dawn. One of the priests in attendance said a short prayer.

At 10:30 a.m., a private Mass was conducted in the East Room, attended by Mrs. Kennedy, her 2 children, and about 75 close friends and members of the family.

And all day long they came to file silently into the East Room—the leaders of Congress, the military, members of the President's Cabinet, his close friends, the Justices of the Supreme Court, the members of the diplomatic corps, Governors, and mayors.

As the leaders of the Nation filed past the casket, two of President Kennedy's rocking chairs were taken out of the White House by workmen, to be placed in storage.

AMID SORROW, THE STRENGTH TO CARRY ON (By Thomas B. Ross)

WASHINGTON.—"Mrs. Kennedy has asked that this be as distinguished a tribute as we can possibly make it."

With those words of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., began the preparations for the solemn and majestic ceremonies that ended when John Fitzgerald Kennedy was laid to rest Monday afternoon.

This is the story of how Mrs. Kennedy's anguished request was carried out.

It was then midafternoon Friday; Mr. Kennedy had been shot to death 3 hours before. Shriver had just talked by phone with Robert Kennedy, who was waiting for the body to be flown back from Dallas.

Shriver carried the Attorney General's words to a meeting in the White House of the late President's staff, his principal military aides, and the protocol chiefs of the State Department. Shriver was not to go to bed for another 30 hours.

He had been having lunch with his wife, Eunice, at a downtown restaurant when word came that his brother-in-law had been shot. Together, they returned to Shriver's office in the Peace Corps.

Robert Kennedy phoned for the first time a short while later. Shriver suggested the Attorney General stay with Mrs. Kennedy and let him handle the details. The Attorney General agreed and the Shriver set out for the White House.

Mrs. Shriver left almost immediately with Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, to be with their parents in Hyannis Port, Mass.

Shriver went to work on the arrangements. Mrs. Kennedy had now returned to Washington with the President's body. Another call from the Attorney General conveyed her desire to have the East Room in the White House prepared as it was for the body of Abraham Lincoln.

Shriver had 8 hours to carry out the request and no one seemed to know how the East Room had been decorated for Lincoln.

Shriver called Richard Goodwin, a former aide at the Peace Corps who had recently been chosen as the President's special assistant on the fine arts. Within half an hour, Goodwin produced a photograph of Lincoln's body lying in repose in the White House.

Shriver then turned to William Walton, an artist friend of Mrs. Kennedy. Walton took Goodwin's picture and put the White House staff to work.

A furniture upholsterer, brought to the White House from Cape Cod, Mass., by the First Lady, stood on a 20-foot ladder for 9 hours arranging the black window curtains in the proper way.

Carpenters took down the aluminum storm doors to return them to their original form.

Walton removed the gay flower decoration and substituted white lilies. Also during the first night he managed to find the proper yellow candlesticks. Antique oil lights were located to illuminate the White House driveway.

At midnight, Shriver had a crucifix brought in from the bedroom of his home in nearby Maryland.

The military men were having great difficulty locating a ceremonial honor guard to receive the President's body with appropriate dignity and ceremony.

Finally, at 3 a.m., the White House naval aide, Capt. Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr., located two dozen members of a crack drill team at the marine barracks a couple miles from the White House.

They were roused from sleep and volunteered without hesitation. They arrived at

the White House in time for Mrs. Kennedy's arrival from Bethesda Naval Hospital with the body at 4:30 a.m.

By then all was in readiness.

Everything, the First Lady said, had been done exactly as she would have done it.

The First Lady declared her resolve to walk behind the casket to the church and she asked that Mass be held at St. Matthew's.

Mrs. Kennedy, the Attorney General, and Shriver agreed that there should be a "low" spoken Mass rather than a "high" sung Mass with incense and more elaborate ceremony. The late President had not been a man for pomp and circumstance.

Mrs. Kennedy recalled how pleased she had been with the man who sang at her wedding. Within hours he agreed to come to Washington for the Requiem Mass.

The First Lady also remembered how moved she had been by Bizet's "Agnus Dei," which also had been played at the wedding. The piece was promptly included in the music scheduled for the Mass.

Mrs. Kennedy asked that there be no elaborate diplomatic display and so the State Department's chief of protocol, Angier Biddle Duke, sent out a worldwide request that the foreign representation be held down.

But the request was to no avail. By noon Saturday the State Department had been flooded with cables reporting that emperors, princes, queens, and presidents were determined to attend the funeral.

All afternoon Saturday Shriver and Duke worked out the invitation list and the seating arrangement in the cathedral. It was completed by nightfall.

And at 11 p.m., more than 30 hours after he had received his first call from the Attorney General, Shriver went home to bed.

A MOURNFUL SUNDAY PROCESSION (By William Braden)

WASHINGTON.—The body of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was carried to the Capitol rotunda to lie in state Sunday in a ceremony that pulsed with the stark horror of a Greek tragedy.

The agony of the procession was made almost unbearable by the shooting in Dallas that ended the life of President Kennedy's accused assassin.

Lee Harvey Oswald, 24, was gunned down while the first elements of the cortege were forming around the north portico of the White House.

The news that Oswald had been shot spread quickly at the White House and along the cortege route, where it was picked up by spectators with transistor radios.

And then, as if events had been following some ironic script, word of Oswald's death electrified the mourners in the rotunda just as Mrs. Kennedy turned and left the casket of her husband.

There were no tears for Oswald. But it was plain that everyone in this stricken city had already had his fill of hate and violence. And even the supposedly hardened newsmen here were physically sickened by the new bloodshed, holding their stomachs as they turned away from White House radios and television sets.

With this added anguish, the cortege left the White House slightly behind schedule at 1:10 p.m.

The body of the murdered President was carried on the same black artillery caisson that bore Franklin Delano Roosevelt on a similar journey in 1945.

The four-wheeled caisson, draped in black, was pulled by six white horses. It was preceded by a mounted soldier on a seventh white horse. The caisson was followed by a soldier carrying a flag and by a riderless dark gray horse named Black Jack.

The gelding was fully saddled and a sword in a scabbard hung on the right side of the

saddle. The silver stirrups were reversed and held a pair of black riding boots.

The casket, covered by the Stars and Stripes, was carried from the East Room of the White House by servicemen and placed on the caisson at the crepe-hung north portico.

To the beat of muffled drums, the procession left the White House by the northeast gate, the driveway lined by sailors who presented the flags of the 50 States.

Following an historic route, the cortege moved along Pennsylvania Avenue to 15th Street, and then turned right, taking 15th south until it rejoined Pennsylvania. Then, with the Capitol dome visible in the distance, it proceeded down Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues to Delaware Avenue, where it turned right again to arrive at the East Plaza of the Capitol. The cortege covered the 1.8-mile route at a constant pace of 100 steps to the minute, the cadence set by the throb of the drums.

No one who was there is likely to forget those drums that thudded like a broken heart the entire length of the march.

An estimated 300,000 persons jammed the route, standing 10 to 20 deep at the curbs, leaning from windows, perched on walls and rooftops and wedged in trees.

The crowd was the largest he had ever seen in Washington, said Police Capt. Joseph V. Osterman.

It seemed that almost all of those along the way, adults and children, were wearing their Sunday best, in respect for the dead leader. And aside from the drums—always the drums—the silence seemed nearly perfect as the cortege moved down the broad eight lanes of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The skies were cloudless and painfully bright. A crisp wind blew from the west, whirling brown and yellow leaves from near-barren trees, bracing the flags that hung at half-staff all along the way.

To some, the procession sometimes seemed like a little lost ship making its way down the black river of pavement. It was not a small procession, but it looked diminutive on the vast, empty boulevard.

The cortege was headed by a police honor guard. This was followed by the escort commander, Maj. Gen. Philip C. Wehle; by the 20 drummers from the 5 services; by a company of Navy personnel, symbolizing Mr. Kennedy's service in that branch during World War II; by a special honor guard consisting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and, just ahead of the caisson, a color detail and clergymen.

Behind the caisson came a serviceman with the Presidential flag and then the horse and cars carrying dignitaries and members of Mr. Kennedy's family—among them President Johnson and Mrs. Kennedy with the two children, Caroline and John, Junior.

The rear was brought up by another police honor guard and by the White House press corps.

Their repressed emotions finally proved too much for the well-behaved spectators. And when the procession had passed, they suddenly broke from the curbs and moved into the street to join the reporters who brought up the rear of the cortege.

It was a startling and poignant sight. Looking back, the reporters abruptly found themselves joined by hundreds and then thousands of men, women, and children.

Running and trotting, the spectators swept after the cortege, following their fallen President.

But at Ninth Street, police threw a cordon across the avenue—holding spectators and reporters alike.

The reporters were finally allowed through. But minutes later they had been joined by a second wave of spectators.

Another police cordon was encountered at Seventh Street. Once again, the reporters

eventually talked their way through. But at Fourth Street, the reporters and others came up against a line of Marines with fixed bayonets. And this time the newsmen were stopped cold, despite the protests of a White House press aid who pointed out they were a part of the official procession.

The cortege continued along Constitution Avenue and then swung around to the East Plaza.

Again the crowds broke, and they moved like a wave toward the Capitol—thousands and thousands of them, literally engulfing the building and rushing up the stairs of the West Plaza.

Arriving at the East Plaza, the cortege was honored by a 21-gun salute. Drums sounded four ruffles and flourishes, and the Air Force band played "Hail to the Chief" and a naval hymn, "Eternal Father, Strong To Save."

The casket was then carried into the rotunda, under the great dome, where it was placed upon the black-draped catafalque that once supported the coffin of Abraham Lincoln.

John, Junior, was taken outside, but Caroline stood at her mother's right side in the rotunda as brief tributes were paid to Mr. Kennedy by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate Democratic leader; Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, and Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House.

"There was the sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands," said MANSFIELD.

He eulogized Mr. Kennedy as a leader, as a patriot, as a father and as a husband.

"He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn—might give," said MANSFIELD. "He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down."

"We are saddened," said Warren. "We are stunned. We are perplexed."

"What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today, which are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

"What a price we pay for this fanaticism."

"It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn."

"But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event."

"If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us and the bitterness that begets violence."

"Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?"

"At each great crisis in our history," said MCCORMACK, "we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it."

Mr. Kennedy was such a man, said MCCORMACK, and he added:

"Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural."

"But as the first bitter pang of our incredulous grief begins to pass, we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place

among the great figures of our world history."

"While this is an occasion of deep sorrow, it should also be one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and for a future world of peace."

The acoustics were bad, and most of the speeches went unheard by the small group of mourners who had crowded into the rotunda. Former President Harry S. Truman stood behind the speakers with bowed head, his hands clasped in front of him.

Mrs. Kennedy was dressed in black, her head covered with black lace. Caroline wore a blue coat, red shoes, white gloves, and a ribbon in her hair. And those who do not have children her age wondered whether she understood what was happening there.

Her uncle, Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, stood next to her.

It was warm in the rotunda. Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia was led out at the beginning of the ceremony. A physician said VINSON was overheated. And after being given a fluid, the Representative, who has been in Congress for more years than Mr. Kennedy lived, returned to hear the proceedings from a chair.

At 2:17 p.m., a serviceman and President Johnson carried a mounted floral tribute to the casket in the center of the rotunda. Mr. Johnson bowed his head briefly and then turned and walked back.

Then Mrs. Kennedy and Caroline walked hand in hand to the catafalque, knelt and Mrs. Kennedy kissed the flag which covered her husband's casket.

The time—2:19 p.m.

The mother and daughter turned and walked from the bier, and then led the mourners out of the rotunda.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times,
Dec. 29, 1963]

A MONDAY WALK IN GOTHIC GLOOM (By William Braden)

WASHINGTON.—The casket moved through the streets followed by presidents and princes, dukes and prime ministers—even a king and an emperor.

But the eyes of thousands were on a woman in black.

She strode briskly to the cadence of the funeral drums, her head erect, her widow's veil tossed by the wind.

The passage of years may some day blur the memories of those who lined the curbs of the Nation's Capital Monday. Even the clatter of hooves and the beat of the drums may someday be forgotten.

But for those who stood and watched it, Mrs. John F. Kennedy's last walk with her husband can never be forgotten.

She strode with strength and purpose behind the caisson that bore the murdered President, the veil fluttering like a proud and terrible flag of honor. And those who watched shared both her sorrow, which was a nation's sorrow, and her strength, which was her own.

Surely it was her finest hour.

Many of the world's most powerful leaders, all on foot, kept step behind Mrs. Kennedy as her husband's casket was carried from the White House to the Requiem Mass in St. Matthew's Cathedral.

A separate procession a short time earlier had taken the casket to the White House from the Capitol rotunda, where Mr. Kennedy had lain in state since Sunday afternoon.

A final procession, following the mass, bore the casket to its resting place in Arlington National Cemetery.

The widow's unprecedented march to the cathedral followed a route of about a half mile.

The procession first moved west on Pennsylvania Avenue, turning north at 17th Street. Then it continued to the cathedral on 17th, Connecticut Avenue and Rhode Island Avenue.

The day was crisp and bright—very much as it was on Sunday when Mr. Kennedy was carried to the rotunda. The temperature was in the forties, the sky was cloudless, and the buildings along the way formed deep canyons of alternate sunlight and shadow.

Mourners jammed the sidewalks. Others stood on high ledges of office buildings and many more appeared to risk their lives by sitting on the edges of roofs, their feet hanging down.

The crowds waited silently, as they did Sunday. Then, in the distance, came the sound of the muffled drums.

Then the sound of pipes and then the dread music of military bands playing Chopin's funeral march.

And finally the long procession, far grander than Sunday's, headed by a police honor guard.

Close behind the police came the red-jacketed Marine Band, its snare drums covered with crepe.

Spectators in the rear stood on boxes to see, and a well-dressed man hurried up carrying a newly purchased garbage can to use for a platform.

A phalanx of West Pointers marched by, followed by cadets and midshipmen from the Air Force, Navy, and Coast Guard Academies.

Next came contingents of enlisted men and a mixed contingent of servicewomen.

Above the unwavering rhythm of the drums, the chords of the funeral march echoed again and again.

The Navy Band passed, moving from the shadows into the sunlight that glistened on its instruments.

More contingents of servicemen, and then the Air Force Band.

From time to time the bands played "America" or "Onward, Christian Soldiers." But always they returned to Chopin's dirge.

Paratroopers swung past wearing jaunty berets, followed by marines in dress uniform.

Then the sound of pipes and the Black Watch marchers in kilts and busbies, the ribbons of their instruments flying in the breeze.

And then the black artillery caisson drawn by six white horses.

The three horses on the left side were ridden by soldiers in dress blues, and an outrider kept pace on a seventh white horse.

The casket was still covered by the U.S. flag that would not be removed until the burial ceremony, and it was secured to the lumbering four-wheeled caisson by two black bands.

Behind it marched a solitary bluejacket in white puttees, carrying the Presidential flag. And then once more the awesome sight of the riderless dark horse with two black boots placed in its reversed stirrups.

So far the stillness of the crowd had been almost unbroken.

But now, as the widow passed, a very faint sound rose, lost almost at once on the wind, like a low, collective moan.

Mrs. Kennedy was flanked on the right and left by her husband's brothers, Robert and Edward—the Attorney General and the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

She walked past at steady pace, her arms swinging free, her face hidden by the black veil.

Men, women, and children turned their heads to stare after her. And they continued to stare after her until she was far up the street.

They seemed hardly to notice those who came behind her—Harry S. Truman, Dwight

D. Eisenhower, Prince Philip, President Charles de Gaulle, President Johnson.

After the mass, Mrs. Kennedy and the dignitaries entered limousines for the hour-long procession through downtown Washington and across the Potomac River to Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

News men here have remarked on the muteness and tearlessness of the spectators during Sunday's and Monday's processions.

But the reason for that is not hard to find. Tears spring from grief. And the grief here is deep.

But there is horror here, too. A horror that numbs and dumfounds and at times prevents the outward manifestations of sorrow.

It is a gothic gloom that pervades this city.

The black bunting. The drums. The ringing of the bells at night and the shuddering of organs. The pomp and circumstance, out of another age.

And more than that, the memories. The constant reminders here, at every hand, of a happier time.

For it is here that he lived and worked and was seen. It is here that one walks past the White House at night and sees the crepe above the door in the lighted north portico.

The White House, with Caroline's swings and John, Junior's, sandbox back behind.

It is as if Poe's raven perched on every marble bust in this city of marble busts, calling "Nevermore."

The natural shock at the death of a President is multiplied beyond measure by the circumstances of that death—sudden and violent, unexpected and senseless. Not the natural death of a beloved and elder statesman but the murder of a young pioneer who promised a New Frontier.

This is more than grief. This is deeper than grief.

"It's going to happen to the whole world," said an old woman who stood watching the final procession from cathedral to cemetery, her eyes glazed with unreasoning fear. "And it's going to happen overnight. It happened to him. And if it happened to him, it can happen to all of us."

In the passing procession, the limousine carrying the new President was escorted by a score of Secret Service men.

The men who walked beside the car seemed to be staring up at every window of every building along the way.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times,
Dec. 29, 1963]

"THE TRUMPET SUMMONS US"—HIS BUOYANT WORDS ECHO

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—The soul of John F. Kennedy, martyred 35th President of the United States, was commended to God Monday in a simple Roman Catholic low mass in St. Matthew's Cathedral.

The hour-long ceremony, attended by 1,200 persons from all over the world, some of the highest and others of the most ordinary estate, was dominated in one sense by the heavy, harsh voice of Richard Cardinal Cushing, who performed the last rite.

But overriding Cardinal Cushing, the music and the ancient Catholic ritual were some of Mr. Kennedy's own words—and particularly those of his inaugural address of January 20, 1961.

They were delivered by the Most Reverend Philip Hannon, auxiliary bishop of Washington, along with a recollection of some of the slain President's favorite Bible quotations, from the pulpit.

Bishop Hannon read the inaugural address, and the words sounded as brave and buoyant as they had on that freezing winter's day less

than 3 years ago when Mr. Kennedy took the oath as President:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation'—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

"I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation.

"And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

In the congregation were Ethiopia's Emperor, the Queen of the Hellenes, the King of the Belgians, the Prime Minister and the Prince consort of the United Kingdom, the proud soldier-President of France, and the governmental rank—and the file—from America and all over the world.

White House office secretaries and petty-detail handlers were there, too, all joined together in a moving display of affection and grief.

At 11:45 a.m. the congregation, all but those who had walked behind Mrs. Kennedy in the sad procession from the White House, could hear through the open main doors a military band playing the hymn "Pray for Dead." Its strains clashed with those of the organ, playing softly inside.

Five minutes later came a mournful skirl from the famed Black Watch bagpipers, who only 2 weeks ago had staged a brave marching show on the south lawn of the White House for a grandstand full of Washington children, at the Kennedy's request.

And at noon Cardinal Cushing, followed by purple-garbed prelates, walked down the center aisle to the massive main doors.

He greeted Mrs. Kennedy, who had just been joined by her children, Caroline, 5, and John, Junior, 3, who had arrived by car. John cried a moment, but stopped when his mother comforted him. Later he was given a religious pamphlet to occupy his attention.

In turn, Mrs. Kennedy, dressed in black and wearing a long diaphanous veil, was comforted by the richly garbed and mitred Cardinal Cushing, who had officiated at her wedding and the baptism of the children.

He put his arm around her shoulders, as she genuflected before him. Then he leaned down and gently patted the children.

Mrs. Kennedy, giving a hand to each child, walked down the aisle, closely followed by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, the late President's mother, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, and other members of the family.

The sounds of military protocol outside—the mournful muffled drum beats, the orders cracked out to honor guards and other military units, continued to mingle with the liturgical music inside the cathedral.

Cardinal Cushing stood aside, his hands clasped in the attitude of prayer, as President Charles de Gaulle, of France, in his beige general's uniform, led the foreign dignitaries into the church. He was accompanied by Queen Frederika of Greece, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia also was in the front row.

De Gaulle's face was stern and solemn as he walked down the aisle, guided by ushers in the full-dress uniforms of the U.S. armed services.

Many of those who followed—the chiefs of state and heads of foreign delegations, the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, the diplomats, the congressional leaders of both parties—walked with downcast eyes.

The band outside played the traditional ruffles and flourishes, followed by "Hail to

the Chief" that always greets the President on formal occasions—and President and Mrs. Johnson entered the church.

Then, after Cardinal Cushing had blessed the casket, the pallbearers bore it inside and walked slowly down the center aisle, behind altar boys carrying the crucifix and candles, their flames guttering in the cold wind blowing through the open door.

De Gaulle knelt during the entire service, his body erect, his face somber and seemingly frozen. Near him sat West Germany's Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, following the mass with absorption.

Toward the end, Cardinal Cushing doffed the vestments of the mass, resumed the scarlet cape and capella, and blessed the body in the simple wooden coffin and uttered the final prayer:

"I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in Me, even if he die, shall live; and whoever lives and believes in Me shall never die."

The honor guard slowly carried the casket out of the cathedral. Tears coursed down the strong, angular face of the cardinal as he stood in the doorway, his raiment brilliant in the afternoon sun.

He wiped his eyes with a handkerchief while the Army band ranked outside played a dirge.

The young widow walked erect with her children. But under her black veil her eyes shone with tears. Mrs. Rose Kennedy lost her composure as she left the cathedral and wept. So did Senator KENNEDY.

President Johnson's face was set in a grim, tragic mask as he reached the door—again to the sound of "Hail to the Chief."

Caroline, sobbing at her mother's side, and John, Junior, were turned over to the family nurse, Maud Shaw, and three Secret Service agents.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his wife walked out of the cathedral a few paces ahead of former President Harry S. Truman.

The Eisenhowers and Mr. Truman paused at the door to say a few words of comfort to Mrs. Kennedy. Then General Eisenhower and Mr. Truman, political feuding forgotten, conversed on the cathedral steps as they waited their cars.

And the sad journey to Arlington National Cemetery and Mr. Kennedy's final resting place resumed.

JOURNEY'S END ON HILLSIDE

(By Thomas B. Ross)

ARLINGTON CEMETERY.—John Fitzgerald Kennedy was buried Monday at a modest graveside overlooking the majestic memorial to Abraham Lincoln.

It was a grand but simple ceremony in the eloquently understated manner of the 35th President of the United States who was killed by an assassin's bullets last Friday.

The burial place at the Arlington National Cemetery was close by the spot where the late President had paused on a quiet stroll early last spring and commented: "Imagine living out here. Wouldn't this be a wonderful place for the White House?"

At that time, accompanied by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his close friend, Charles L. Bartlett of the Sun-Times Washington Bureau, President Kennedy had just completed an unpublished tour of the cemetery and the Custis Lee mansion, once the home of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Monday afternoon, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was laid to rest in the hillside sloping down from the mansion to the Potomac River.

At the grave was his widow, Jacqueline, but his children, Caroline and John, Jr., who had attended the requiem mass at St.

Matthew's Cathedral, were not taken to the cemetery.

With the exception of the late President's ailing father, Joseph P. Kennedy, the rest of the large family was there—mother Rose, brothers Robert and Edward, sisters Eunice, Patricia and Jean.

Mrs. Kennedy, a black veil covering her beautiful face, stood a few paces from the grave as Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston read the committal prayers of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Kennedy's burial place is located in an open stretch of land more than 100 yards from the other closely ordered graves of this military cemetery.

The only other President buried here is William Howard Taft.

The late President's body was borne to the cemetery across the Lincoln Memorial Bridge. Mrs. Kennedy followed the black, horse-drawn caisson in a limousine. The Marine Band and a special military honor guard preceded the casket in slow cadence.

The cortege came to a halt 100 yards from the grave. Mrs. Kennedy stepped out of the limousine and the band sounded "Ruffles and Flourishes." Then the National Anthem was played.

Mrs. Kennedy approached the grave along a straw mat in company with Attorney General Robert Kennedy. The rest of the family followed immediately behind them, taking up positions to the right of the grave on a long grass-colored matting.

President Johnson stood inconspicuously behind the family, off to the side, and it was difficult to pick him out of the crowd of mourners.

Former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, alighting from the same car, assumed an equally inconspicuous vantage point in the throng of lofty national and international dignitaries.

The mourners made their way to the graveside between two columns of the Army's Special Forces, advanced by the late President to strengthen the fight against Communist guerrillas in such places as Vietnam.

Autumn leaves, dropped from planes at a high altitude, fell on the burial site as the mourners approached their places.

President Charles de Gaulle, of France, resplendent in a light brown general's uniform, took up a position at the foot of the grave. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, on De Gaulle's left, was also in uniform, a bright kelly green sash across his chest.

Prior to the religious ceremony, the Irish guard, here on personal request of Mrs. Kennedy, performed a special manual at the foot of the grave.

De Gaulle removed his hat and glasses and made the sign of the cross as Cardinal Cushing began the prayers. The cardinal's vivid red robes stood in sharp contrast to the black lectern.

The prayers, alternately in Latin and English, included the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary. Twice the cardinal sprinkled holy water on the casket. Midway through the religious rites, Cardinal Cushing paused, the troops came to present arms, and a 21-gun salute was sounded.

Overhead 50 jet fighter planes zoomed by at low altitude. They were followed by Air Force 1, the plane which carried the late President to Dallas and brought his body back last Friday. The exhaust and the contrails of the jets left a gray smudge on the cloudless sky.

At the conclusion of the prayers, Mrs. Kennedy and the Attorney General moved closer to the grave beside Cardinal Cushing. The late President's brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., of Chicago, took up the spot left by the Attorney General next to Mrs. Rose Kennedy.

Three volleys of musketry rang out, and taps were sounded. The band struck up a hymn, and the eight body bearers began to fold the American flag which they had been holding over the casket.

Mrs. Kennedy lit an "eternal flame," akin to the light that burns under the Arc d'Triomphe in Paris. Then she took the folded flag, paused momentarily as Cardinal Cushing offered a few words of comfort to her, and walked to her limousine.

At that point, for the first time in her 3-day ordeal, Mrs. Kennedy's public composure began to dissolve. Those close to the grave said she began to weep, and she approached Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Taylor put his arm about her and attempted to console her. Mrs. Kennedy, although still weeping, seemed to regain much of her composure as she departed for her limousine.

Cardinal Cushing moved to the side of the late President's mother, who had been leaning heavily on Shriver's arm. The cardinal raised his arm, as if to put it about Rose Kennedy's shoulder. But she straightened herself up, grasped his hands, and kissed the episcopal ring.

Then she rested her head on his shoulder for a brief moment, before leading the rest of the family to the waiting cars.

MRS. KENNEDY—A WOMAN EQUAL TO HER TASK

(NOTE.—This tribute to Mrs. John F. Kennedy was written on the 10th anniversary of her wedding to the late President by Charles Bartlett, a close personal friend. It is being reprinted because it reveals the qualities of character and personality that were so clearly revealed in her conduct during the tragic days of late November.)

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—It would be impossible to imagine any state of life in which the companionship of marriage was more essential or any wife more ideally suited to this particular President.

An observer living among politicians is struck by the fact that the complexities which confront all wives are compounded for the wives of politicians and doubly compounded for the wife of a politician who manages to reach the White House. The difference is that the compartmentalization between home and office which is possible in private life becomes exceedingly difficult in public life. No private pursuit, however ambitious, carries an involvement for a wife that equals the demands placed upon a woman whose husband is seeking or holding high political office.

It is possible to love a politician without loving politics but it is impossible to marry one without becoming part of his career.

Jacqueline Kennedy's struggle to attain this compartmentalization has been the measure of her firmness and resourcefulness. A President lives as much in controversy as in the White House and his private life is a seclusion from the tempest and a respite from the pressures.

Mrs. Kennedy's greatest accomplishment has been to maintain this refuge and embellish it with the variety, warmth, and wit of her own personality.

As a young woman entering the White House, Mrs. Kennedy had many choices and much advice, but she chose a firm course of following her own best instincts. She set out to do the things she could do well for her family and the White House and to do them in her own style and with people she selected herself.

The zest and thoroughness with which she plunged into the task of refurbishing the White House were the mark of this spirit.

Starting almost on the first day of her residency, she sought out the people who

could give her the knowledge that she needed, then the people who could find the things that she needed, and finally the people who would pay for them.

When the drive faltered, she swallowed her shyness and went before the television cameras in an appearance that will long stand as a classic in the medium. When donors faltered, she prodded them with charm and persistence that narrowed their avenues of escape.

Her effort developed a momentum that swiftly transformed the White House from simulated and meaningless elegance to gracious and authentic dignity. She created in less than 3 years a priceless museum of American treasures.

This same determination—to make the White House reflect the best in American life—was applied to a dogged and detailed assault on the pomposity of official functions. The effort did not spring from any desire to win fame as a hostess. It was simply a matter of doing something that had to be done in a fashion that would please her husband and enhance the country in the eyes of foreigners.

The cause of her public impact in an era when masses of women are struggling to be more beautiful and interesting is not difficult to discern. But the imitators of Mrs. Kennedy have missed the essence of her personality and success, which is an insistence on being herself.

Women are using their emancipation to go in many directions, but the most common fallacy of the sex is a tendency to watch each other and to do what the other is doing.

Mrs. Kennedy did not make the mistake of trying to be Eleanor Roosevelt or Dolly Madison. But by fidelity to her own individuality, she has become a unique figure in the White House and an enormous asset to the President.

THE MAN THE NATION LOST

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—John F. Kennedy was an intensely realistic man and he talked occasionally of assassination in the same analytical fashion in which he discussed the other hazards and opportunities of his Presidency. On the morning of the day it happened, he referred to the ease with which a President could be shot.

This may or may not have been a premonition, but it was certainly not a fear or any form of negative emotion. His mind dwelled constantly on the forces which could obstruct his purposes and this was simply one that had to be considered.

He was impelled into politics by a sense of the things that could be done for the country. He ran for President with a confidence that he could be a constructive force. His days in the White House were marked above all by a driving desire to do his best in the time that he had.

He could not have regretted, if the assassin's bullet left him any moments of reflection before death, any wasted time or missed opportunities. He could only have felt a deep sadness that he would not live to achieve his high hopes for his term of office.

It is ironic that a man so dedicated to tangible deeds is destined now to be remembered less for his accomplishments than for the intangible qualities of his spirit and character. He disciplined himself to be great in order to do great things and the waste of his death is that his greatness so far exceeded his time for achievement.

Discipline was a prime ingredient of his greatness. He rarely talked in abstract terms but he displayed over the years a firm determination to define for himself the strong

and weak characteristics of man and to expand the strengths and reject the flaws that he found in himself. It was as if he had assessed the qualities that he would need for the challenges he saw ahead and determined to possess them through an exercise of will.

In this pursuit he had much to work with from the beginning. His mind was lightning fast from youth, his intuition was quick and precise, and his curiosity was limitless. His temperament was innately balanced between action and reflection, between gravity and humor, and between cold reason and human warmth.

He did not change as a personality. His burdens never eclipsed his broad streak of gaiety, his adversities did not encroach upon his optimism, and his honors and offices never managed to swell his solid assurance into anything that could be called conceit.

He inspired loyalty because he was loyal and because his personal qualities made associates and friends strive to show him their best. He projected an electricity that sought a spark of wisdom or wit and his presence, even as a young man, was always a challenge.

The zest and enthusiasm that he brought into the White House never flickered. He arrived with a burning sense of the good things that could be done and as he faced the difficulties of doing them, his determination deepened and his pace quickened.

Death caught him at a time when he was stimulated beyond all the past periods of his intense life by the varied challenges on the domestic and foreign fronts. He went off to Texas in a high spirit of confidence that he could meet these challenges despite all the disappointments of the past year.

His force stemmed from his belief that a great nation should not tolerate remediable shortcomings and no one who had the privilege of knowing him can ever accept the virtue of a passive attitude. To at least this one friend, his epitaph will be: "He was a gentle and fine man who possessed the will to meet the problems as he saw them."

AMERICA WEEPS

President Kennedy lies dead, a martyr in the cause of democratic government.

His countrymen weep in sorrow and in anger.

The immensity of the crime can hardly be grasped in these hours of confusion that inevitably have followed the assassination of the Chief of the most powerful Nation in the world.

The Nation goes ahead with a new leader. Vice President Johnson has assumed the heavy burden of the Presidency and the policies of the Nation will undergo no imminent change. But inevitably the assassination will change the course of history, not only in the Nation but in the world.

And it should change the temper of our times. At the moment the motive that lurked in the twisted mind of the killer is not, of course, known.

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as the bombing of houses of worship, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

All of these acts of violence are the work of persons who, fundamentally, do not believe in a democratic government operating under a rule of law.

The whisperers and preachers of hate and disunity, who undermine confidence in our Government and our public officials by irresponsible attacks on their sanity and loyalty, plant the motives in the heads of those who pull the triggers and toss the bombs.

Those who impugn the motives of our national leaders, who defy the courts, distort the operations of the United Nations, or advocate a change in our form of government,

might not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the eyes that lined up Mr. Kennedy's head in the crosshairs of a rifle sight yesterday.

The awful loss that hate visited upon the Nation and the world should inspire all Americans to join together in this hour of shock and mourning in a reexamination of the national conscience.

The right of dissent, the exercise of free speech, the criticism of the President and other public officials, high and low, must not corrode into sullen rebellion that breeds violence. All Americans, those who agree with their Government's policies and those who disagree, must stand together on this fundamental and demonstrate this unity by action as well as words. The purveyors of hate must acknowledge the danger they create.

When we speak of the purveyors of hate we obviously are not speaking of the President's regular political opposition, those persons in his own party and in the Republican Party who had disagreed with many of his views and policies and who also grieve for Mr. Kennedy. We are speaking of the extremists, left and right, who go beyond the pale in their opposition and criticism.

The Nation owes a great debt to Mr. Kennedy who gave his life in the service of his country as surely as a soldier on the front line. And to Mrs. Kennedy and the President's family, the American people offer their hearts. The personal tragedy of an assassination seldom has been as heartbreakingly evident as in the scene that followed the shooting: Mrs. Kennedy holding the President's head in her lap and weeping "Oh, no."

No, it should never have happened in America. That it did must weigh heavily on America's conscience. And if it brings a reawakening and a real change in the temper of our times, Mr. Kennedy will not have died in vain. This is a prayer in which all Americans can join.

THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(Gwendolyn Brooks, Chicago's Pulitzer Prize-winning poet, wrote these words upon the assassination of President Kennedy and sent them to the Sun-Times. "I was so very much upset, as everyone else is, I wanted to express what I felt," she said. "I started making notes during the first 2 hours after I heard of the President's death. 'Late Friday, after the house was quiet, I sat down and completed the poem.'")

(By Gwendolyn Brooks)

"* * * this good, this decent, this kindly man."—SENATOR MANSFIELD.

I hear things crying in the world.
A nightmare congress of obscure
Delirium uttering overbreath
The tilt and jangle of this death.

Who had a sense of world and man,
Who had an apt and antic grace
Lies lenient, lapsed, and large beneath
The tilt and jangle of this death.

The world goes on with what it has.
Its reasoned, right and only code.
Coaxing, with military faith,
The tilt and jangle of this death.

THE DEED THAT FREEDOM BRED

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad that demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit that we have first to realize and then to resolve.

The American future depends on it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we

have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, as outside the laws and the community of their fellowmen.

What happened in Dallas, to be sure, could have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city, but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation, Lee Harvey Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who assaulted Mr. Johnson and Adlai E. Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him, the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred that feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination.

In Dallas today there is much searching of conscience, and well there should be. Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting to read Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said, "Each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. It is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality, but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom that lie so close to the surface of our national life.

We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that leads men, in differing, say, about taxes or civil rights or Russia, to feel that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive.

Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business.

The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought

has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing arts of Lyndon B. Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence.

His great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

HIS LEGACY TO THE NATION (By Milburn P. Akers)

President Kennedy's place in history will be established only in the perspective of the passing years. But his place in the hearts of his countrymen and freemen everywhere has been manifest ever since word of the tragic happenings in Dallas was flashed throughout the world.

A nation deeply divided on many issues recoiled in shock and horror at his assassination; a nation which had long prided itself on determining divisive issues at the polls or in the courts was stunned by the realization that a gallant young President had been felled by an assassin. That nation, instantly united in its grief, paid tribute to John F. Kennedy in a manner such as has seldom, if ever, been accorded mortal man.

And then, following obsequies attended by the great and the near great from all over the world, they buried him at Arlington; not another unknown soldier but an American President who, in a relatively short span, had come to symbolize many of free men's aspirations. John F. Kennedy continues to live in the hearts of his countrymen.

What of the future—the future to which Mr. Kennedy so frequently alluded?

Many of its problems remain unresolved, the time allotted the stricken President having been too short to determine them.

President Johnson has a heritage of unsolved problems, even as did Mr. Kennedy and as have had most Presidents. For the great problems of the Nation and of the world are not speedily solved. Most Presidents can do little more than point in the direction of those solutions.

Mr. Kennedy did so in the nuclear test ban treaty. He was pointing toward an end to the cold war, to disarmament, and to a normalization of trade between the free world and the Soviet bloc. These things were seen by him as possibilities after he had boldly and successfully met Soviet Russia's missile challenge in Cuba.

President Johnson, whose methods are apt to differ vastly from those of his predecessor, will, no doubt, continue these efforts. For the world cannot afford to live dangerously in the atomic age.

Mr. Johnson is in general agreement with his predecessor's foreign policies. The difference will be largely in methods.

On the domestic front, Mr. Johnson, long experienced in the wiles of legislative leadership, is likely to settle for the possible in contrast to Mr. Kennedy's constant pressing for the desirable. Mr. Kennedy put the emphasis on the future. Mr. Johnson, more pragmatic than ideological, will doubtless put the emphasis on the present. In so doing, he may press for the adoption of quite a few of those measures which Mr. Kennedy advocated and, in advocating, brought enactment closer.

The race problem remains. Mr. Kennedy's solutions, northern and metropolitan in outlook, will now give way, insofar as White House leadership is concerned, to ones which,

while southern and rural in origin, have been tempered and shaped in the national arena. This isn't to say that one view is superior to the other. It is merely to note that a new approach to this still unresolved problem is likely.

In John F. Kennedy the Nation had a youthful, gallant President to whom history beckoned; a President intent on reshaping the Nation's structure in many ways. He championed the cause of the aged and the infirm, of youth in need of educational opportunities, and of peace. He sought a nation in which opportunity was the right of all, irrespective of race. He established objectives with which few disagreed. Disagreement came largely in the methods he proposed to accomplish them.

Mr. Johnson agrees with many of those objectives. But his background, training, and experience are such that he will, while seeking the objectives to his utmost, settle for the possible, when he has satisfied himself what is possible and what is not possible.

Mr. Kennedy was the architect. Mr. Johnson's role, given time, will be that of the builder.

THE PRESIDENT: HOW HE'LL BE REMEMBERED (By Eric Sevareid)

What was John F. Kennedy? How will he stand in history? As this is written, just after his death, it is hard even to assemble thoughts, easy to misjudge such a complicated human being.

The first thing about him was his driving intelligence. His mind was always on fire; his reading was prodigious; his memory almost total recall of facts and quotations. A friend of mine crossed the Atlantic on a liner with the Kennedy family, years ago. She remembered the day Jack was ill in the stateroom; there lay the thin, freckled little boy—12 years old, and reading Churchill's early life, other books scattered about his bed. His was a directed intelligence; he did not waste his energies; he always seemed to know where he was going and he put first things first.

John Kennedy's intellectuality was perhaps the hallmark of his nature, even more than his youth; the thing that made him different from so many Presidents. But few thought of him as an intellectual in the sense of one seeking truth for its own sake; he sought it, in order to act upon it. He was that rare and precious combination, the man of contemplation as well as the man of action. He had a sharp sense of history from his immense reading, and was acutely conscious of what his own place in history might be. In a sense, he lived for that; much of his personal correspondence as President suggested his awareness that those letters would be part of the American archives and story for all time.

He brought a new style into Government; he surrounded himself with intellectuals, as did Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first years; but in his personal style he was more like President Theodore Roosevelt. Like the first Roosevelt, President Kennedy believed in action; he had no patience with those who were tired or skeptical or cynical; no patience with those who could not keep up, mentally or physically.

He became, with his young and beautiful wife, the symbol of America as he and most of us like to think of America: itself young, itself always hopeful, believing, and believing that Government could change the face of our land and our lives and that America could do more than any country in the world to change the face and the nature of the world itself.

He showed no signs, even after 3 years in office, of growing tired, either in body or spirit . . . but the built-in obstacles to practical achievement were—and remain—prodigious and complex. He began some new practical courses of Government action—as

with the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress; these, perhaps, were more imaginative than his domestic conceptions; in any case, it is in the domestic field that his difficulties were the greatest and progress the slowest.

Early on, he showed that his way would be to try to conciliate and persuade the Congress, and to compromise with it where he had to, rather than to try bulldozer tactics. Of his bold actions, his nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union over Cuba was the boldest, one of the boldest and most successful acts of statesmanship the history books will ever tell the future about.

But at bottom, President Kennedy was a cautious, prudent man. He liked to have all his ducks in a row before he fired. However vibrant in his political behavior, he was, in his deepest emotional nature, a conservative human being. Rarely did the people become aware of his deep feelings about anything. When he spoke to the country by radio or television, his head usually ruled his heart. Only in very special circumstances, as on the day of brutal events in Mississippi, did passion rise in his voice as he spoke. This is why some professional observers said that President Kennedy had opened his mind to us, but not his heart . . . that therefore, politically, he had not captured the heart of the people.

If that was so, it is so no longer; the heart of the people is with the young President in death; with all of his family.

WHERE THE ETERNAL FLAME BURNS (By James Hoge)

WASHINGTON.—Every 15 minutes, a city bus stops in front of the White House, picks up a load of passengers and wends its way through the Capital and across the river to the gentle slope where John F. Kennedy lies.

The buses, marked by wreaths of artificial flowers, half-staffed miniature American flags and signs reading "John F. Kennedy, Eternal Flame," have been carrying passengers free of charge to Arlington National Cemetery every day since the late President was buried there 3 weeks ago Monday.

The service has been taxed to its fullest. But that has also been the case with police who direct auto traffic to the cemetery and attendants who keep the throngs moving at the grave site.

Few officials expected such an outpouring and now few expect it to cease when the state period of mourning ends December 22.

The crowds are full of the kind of people John F. Kennedy knew well.

There are Roman Catholic nuns, once affectionately praised by the late President for being good Democrats while the church's hierarchy leaned toward the Republicans.

There are teen-aged girls, the jumpers who hopped with excitement along parade routes during Mr. Kennedy's 1960 campaign, now giving in to tears as easily as they once gave in to joy.

There are Negroes who looked to the wealthy son of Massachusetts as their greatest Presidential friend since Abraham Lincoln.

There are ministers and diplomats of foreign countries who still come an average of one a day to lay wreaths.

And, as statistics confirm, there are the hundreds of thousands of Americans who were moved by John F. Kennedy's idealism, grace, and good cheer far more than anyone suspected while he was alive.

Those who take the 15-minute bus ride from the White House to Arlington pass many points in this historic city which bring to mind the late President and his family.

The sad trip begins in front of the main entrance to the Executive Mansion, now draped in black. It continues past the White House south lawn, where, last Christmas season, Mrs. Kennedy took her children for a

sleigh ride in a horse-drawn buggy. Now there stands a darkened half-decorated Christmas tree.

The bus turns into Constitution Avenue just in front of the Washington Monument, its tip shrouded in mist these wintry days and its base ringed with flags at half staff.

It passes the marble headquarters of the Organization of American States, where many of Mr. Kennedy's ambitious plans for Latin America were enthusiastically received and at times ardently opposed. Off to the right looms the State Department, once home of the fast-paced, wit-infused Kennedy press conferences.

The bus turns into Lincoln Memorial Drive and then onto the bridge, which now begins at either end with a memorial to a martyred President.

Passengers strain to catch a view of the Kennedy grave site, which lies on the hillside directly above the bridge and immediately below the Custis Lee Mansion. Mrs. Kennedy picked the location and stipulated that it be on a direct line with the Lincoln Memorial.

From the bridge the white picket fence, up as a temporary barrier around the grave, is visible through the mist.

"I'm not sure I want to go any further," an elderly lady said out loud to no one in particular. The lines around her eyes seemed to crease with sorrow. "I cried so much that weekend. I don't want that again."

"But I promised myself I would come," she continued to a new-found listener. "He was always so good about getting out to see us. I feel I owe him this trip."

Another passenger asked the driver what it cost to run buses to the cemetery every 15 minutes for 9 hours each day. "About \$500," he answered. "There are four buses. That takes six busdrivers, about \$500 a day," he repeated.

Among the passengers was an agricultural expert from India, who for the last 5 months has been teaching at a Texas college. "I leave soon for home," he said in strained English. "I never see Mr. Kennedy. But I know he was a great man. I come to see how you bury great men. They will ask me in India if I have been here. They respected your President more than most."

It was a short uphill walk from the bus stop to the grave. As they walked, several people fidgeted with cameras, rolling in film and setting dials. But most just looked ahead.

A young naval officer shouldered a child and began the grade upward. "This is where the caisson came," he recalled for his son. "You remember Mrs. Kennedy lighting the flame? Well, that's it up ahead. It is supposed to remind you of him and what he did for all of us." The child was silent, lost for a little while in a world where questions do not come easily.

Groups of people seemed to converge on the grave from many directions. They filed along temporary, matted walkways, laid over the cemetery grass, in the hope of minimizing the damage done by the feet of 1,200,000 mourners.

Recent rainy weather turned the walkway immediately around the picket fence into a pool of mud and forced the cemetery attendants to lay thick, black gravel.

The slopes on all sides still bear the marks of the crush of people who came immediately after the state funeral. But within the picket fence, the grass is deep green and the brilliant colors of floral wreaths abound.

"I want there to be flowers forever," said a young nun of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. She and some 20 other Sisters, dressed in their quiet habits, journeyed to Arlington from Norfolk, Va., to place a single rose on the grave.

The grouping around the picket fence never seemed to be without a contingent of nuns, almost as if, like the four-man honor guard which stood at attention, the Sisters meant to watch over John F. Kennedy.

There were nuns in blue garb, black and even red. They came from many places around the country. As one said, "We all sent representatives. This was not only a good man. He was a believing son of God."

Within the picket fence, the eternal flame, ordered by Mrs. Kennedy as a fitting remembrance of her husband, flickered brightly under the gray-clouded sky.

Many studied the flame, as if trying to decide if they liked it. "You know, I didn't think it was a very good idea when I heard about it," a middle-aged man mused.

"But now that I see it * * * well * * * you know it's really appropriate," he went on. "The guy was a light himself. And you see this thing flickering here, moving from side to side and it's like he's not all dead. Something right here has life."

The flame is presently produced by butane gas, stored in tanks under a nearby street. The city's gas and light company has begun engineering work on laying a pipe for natural gas that will be used in the permanent monument, now being designed under Mrs. Kennedy's direction.

Around the eternal flame have been tossed the hats of soldiers from several of the armed services. There is a green beret of the special guerrilla forces, greatly expanded during Mr. Kennedy's administration. There is an airman's cap, one from the Navy and an MP armband, a buffing strap from 3d Infantry and a light blue arm marking from the Marines.

The military mementos hark back to an ancient Grecian custom of paying tribute to a fallen warrior.

Most breathtaking sight at the grave is the view from behind the eternal flame over the Potomac to the Lincoln Memorial and beyond in a straight line all the way to the Capitol Building.

The view seems to catch everyone. People stop taking pictures, and just gaze or whisper about the panoramic vista. What they see is the view that John Kennedy, himself, once saw on a Sunday afternoon stroll and he reacted like them, awed, and pleased at the beauty and the majesty. "Imagine living out here!" he commented to his companions.

He is there now along with two of his four children. On either side of the eternal flame are stone markers, reading simply: "Patrick Bouvier Kennedy, August 7, 1963-August 9, 1963," and "Baby Girl Kennedy, August 23, 1956."

The shades of late afternoon began to deepen and a group of Mennonite college girls realized they must leave to catch the last bus back to Washington. They looked the part of mourners with their faces bare of cosmetics, and their long, uncut hair rolled in buns.

"It is important that we not forget," said a 19-year-old member of the group. "We must, must learn something from what this man gave up for us."

The bus was subdued. It started down the hill, through the cemetery gates and across the bridge to Washington. The time: 4:45 p.m. Shortly, the sun would be down and the commuters heading the other way across the bridge would see above them the bright, flickering light meant to remind them of John F. Kennedy today, tomorrow, and forever.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Dec. 29, 1963]

DEATH'S ENCORE IN DALLAS: VENGEANCE—A GROTESQUE SEQUEL

DALLAS.—Lee Harvey Oswald is dead, slain by a self-appointed executioner who under-

took swift, savage reprisal for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Oswald's killer, Jack Ruby, 52, stepped out of a crowd of 200 in the basement of the Dallas city hall Sunday and put a single pistol bullet into Oswald's side.

"It's too good for him," someone shouted after the 24-year-old, self-styled Marxist dropped in his tracks, a single cry of anguish escaping his lips. Policemen quickly overwhelmed and disarmed Ruby.

It was an incredible climax to the wildest weekend in Dallas history—a savage, sudden moment of raw drama that was caught by national television networks and broadcast with shocking impact into American living rooms.

"He took Kennedy's death much harder than that of our 88-year-old father 5 years ago," said Ruby's older sister, Mrs. Eva L. Grant. "He couldn't eat Friday. He kept talking about Jackie and the Kennedy kids."

Oswald had been formally accused of the sniper assassination of Mr. Kennedy last Friday as the President rode beaming beside his wife Jacqueline in a triumphal motorcade.

Also wounded in the shooting was Texas Gov. John Connally, who is recovering. Later, authorities said, Oswald shot to death a Dallas policeman, J. D. Tippit, who—wittingly or otherwise—interrupted his getaway flight.

The first reaction of the police to Oswald's murder was to mark the assassination case closed, and concentrate on trying to convict Ruby. (He is a Chicago native and his real name is Rubinstein.)

A tumult broke out immediately after the shooting in the basement of city hall. But it was nothing compared to the public uproar over the slaying.

Americans disagreed over the shooting of the cold-eyed Oswald. Some thought he got what he deserved. Others noted that no matter the enormity of the crime charged against him, he still was entitled by law to his day in court.

Amid the furor, Ruby was booked on a murder charge and District Attorney Henry Wade announced that he would press for his conviction and execution in the electric chair with the same vigor that he had proposed to apply toward Oswald.

Oswald was arrested Friday, shortly after Mr. Kennedy's assassination and after the slaying of Patrolman Tippit. He insisted from the outset:

"I did not kill President Kennedy. I did not kill anyone."

He stuck to the story during 48 hours of intensive questioning in temporary detention quarters in city hall. Wade, however, said of his case against Oswald:

"I have sent men to the electric chair with less evidence. The gun was here, his prints were on the gun, the gun was the gun that killed Kennedy, his palm prints were on the box on which the killer sat, and witnesses put him on the sixth floor at the time of the shooting."

Finally, the police decided they would get no information from Oswald. They announced that he would be transferred by armored car from city hall to a permanent maximum-security cell in the Dallas County Jail, about a mile away.

Some 200 newsmen and officials gathered in a basement ramp leading from a city hall elevator to a driveway outside. Other curious spectators stood in bright sunshine outside to await Oswald's emergence.

Oswald, handcuffed, with detectives on either arm, came out of the elevator and took a few steps in the direction of the armored car parked halfway up the inclined ramp.

At that moment, the stocky, conservatively dressed Ruby lunged forward, stuck his pistol flush against Oswald's side and fired a single shot. The roar of the gun was some-

what muffled by its proximity to the victim's body.

The bullet tore through Oswald's vital midsection organs, although it missed his heart. He was rushed to Parkland Hospital and into an emergency room only a few feet from the room where President Kennedy died.

Some of the same doctors who worked on the President tried just as desperately to save Oswald's life. Blood was administered. His chest was opened and his heart massaged by hand. But Oswald never regained consciousness and died at 1:07 p.m. The shooting occurred at 11:20 a.m.

Ruby owns a strip-tease joint, the Carousel, in downtown Dallas about four blocks from police headquarters, and dance hall, the Vegas, farther out.

Wade said Ruby, who came here from Chicago 10 years ago, will be prosecuted for murder in an attempt to send him to the electric chair, just as Oswald would have been. The night club operator was held for a court hearing Monday.

Like many a citizen of Dallas, Ruby was known to be heartless since the assassination of Mr. Kennedy. He closed his club immediately upon word of the Chief Executive's death and did not reopen it. But a close associate said Ruby's grief was more for what he felt would be lost holiday business as a result of the assassination than for the President's death.

Word had reached police headquarters, where Ruby had many acquaintances, that he felt a "sense of shame for Dallas."

And a business associate of Ruby told newsmen:

"He felt very badly about the Kennedy assassination and had been saying, 'Oh, that poor family.'"

Ruby, a stocky man of medium height, had earned a reputation as a good friend, but a quick-tempered foe, ready to use his fists at the slightest provocation.

Ruby went to the scene of Oswald's slaying in businessman's attire. He was neat in a dark suit with jacket, and had a dark felt hat set firmly on his balding head.

It was the first time Oswald had emerged from behind prison walls since his arrest. He wore a dark sweater, gray pants, and a white, open-collared shirt. He came out of city hall a few steps behind Captain Fritz, his hands handcuffed in front of him, with detectives holding him by either arm.

A bright November sun shone as inexorable fate overtook Oswald.

There had been reports of death threats circulating in Dallas against Oswald. The decision to go ahead with his transfer in daylight was explained by Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry, a tall, distinguished official. He told newsmen afterward:

"If I hadn't promised you people I would not take Oswald until this morning, we would have taken him during the night. I told you I wouldn't back down on my pledge."

Wade said Ruby had ready access to city hall, and had approached the district attorney during a Friday night press conference, saying:

"I'm Jack Ruby. I own the Carousel Club here."

Wade said he replied that he thought a press conference was just for newsmen but that Ruby said:

"Oh, I know all the policemen and all the newsmen, too. I just came down to listen in."

Moments after he was shot, Oswald was carried inside city hall to await an ambulance. The sounds and confusion of the shooting triggered pandemonium in downtown Dallas.

Curious spectators raced toward the scene. One man carried a baby's bottle full of milk. Another tried to focus a small camera as he ran madly in the direction of the shooting.

An ambulance sped Oswald to Parkland Hospital. Among doctors who set to work on him were Dr. Malcolm Perry and Dr. M. T. Jenkins, both of whom had watched President Kennedy die.

Oswald was given massive transfusions, and his chest was opened for heart massage. But it was all in vain. The bullet had torn through his vital organs from one side of the body to the other.

One of the more articulate observers of the shooting was Francois Pelou, a reporter for France Press, who said of the slain Oswald: "I'm sure he saw the man. It's my feeling he knew the gun was going to fire because he jerked his hands toward his stomach in sort of a reflex action even before I heard the shot."

HISTORY ON A COLLISION COURSE

(By Sid Moody)

Late in September the President of the United States made known he would be making a flying trip to Texas soon.

About the same time, a muddled, rootless young man drifted into Dallas.

The tragedy had begun.

In classic Greek tragedy the hero is struck down in a raging, bloody finale by an inexorable fate or a deadly, fixed star in his character he cannot see. There was a touch of this in both John F. Kennedy and Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Kennedy was drawn to Texas by a dominant trait of his character, the love of behind-scenes politics with its spoken and unspoken byplay, the irrefutable power of a Presidential backslap, the ultimatums signalled with a smile. Just such a zestful quest brought the President within the gunsight of a man they've said was explosive, dangerous, locked by himself in a room furnished with scorn, hurt, hate, confusion.

Yet much of this momentary, fateful meeting of Lee Oswald and John Kennedy seems, on the basis of what is known, merest chance. Oswald had come to Dallas after he'd sent his wife there to await the birth of their second child at the home of a friend, Mrs. Michael R. Paine.

Through a chance conversation of Mrs. Paine's, he learned of a job opening at a schoolbook warehouse. This, as it turned out, was a perfect spot to fire at the President as his cavalcade sped by. But it wasn't known until 3 days before his visit that the President would travel this route. Oswald had begun work in October.

Perhaps Oswald saw in a brief flash the means to unchain the stern links of repression that bound him.

Whether or not Oswald acted alone or what his motives were may never be known. For if John F. Kennedy now belongs to the ages, so, too, does Lee Harvey Oswald, whether they want him or not.

Yet those facts that are known will be recalled again and again as the Nation explores the crime—and its conscience.

One thing that President Kennedy had on his mind, what had brought him from Washington that November 21, was Texas' 25 electoral votes. A political feud between liberal Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and conservative Gov. John B. Connally was jeopardizing the State's Democratic solidarity.

Mr. Kennedy had made his own peace-making sentiments known on this so-called nonpolitical tour by asking YARBOROUGH to fly down from Washington to San Antonio with him in *Air Force 1*, the President's big fanjet plane.

"All is harmony," said YARBOROUGH after the plane landed. And so, largely, was it with the large crowds that greeted the President.

"Kennedy in '68" proclaimed one banner. But there was another: "We need another ex-President."

Jacqueline Kennedy, along with her husband on a stumping tour for the first time since his nomination in 1960, concealed her distaste for campaigning with smiling waves and even handshakes with the shouting multitudes that pressed in about the President.

"Jackie, baby!" cried a man at Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio.

Leaving San Antonio for Houston that Thursday night, the Kennedy entourage was greeted by an enthusiastic crowd estimated at 300,000.

Meantime, that same evening Oswald had surprised his wife and Mrs. Paine by coming home instead of spending the night as he usually did during the week at his room at a Dallas boarding house. But then there was little predictable about his comings and goings.

Born in 1939, 2 months after a heart attack had claimed his father, he had moved about the Southwest with his mother who struggled to support herself and young son with a succession of jobs. Briefly she had left Lee in a church home in New Orleans. Later, in Fort Worth, his fourth-grade teacher remembered Lee as a "smiley boy with curly hair." He measured 103 on an IQ test, just about average, had some trouble reading, responded gratefully to kindness, liked comic books, and once gave a teacher a puppy, teachers recalled.

There would be more ominous remembrings. As a 13-year-old in New York, where Mrs. Oswald had moved briefly, authorities recalled Lee Oswald as a chronic truant who stayed home watching television while his mother was at work. They said he was potentially dangerous with schizoid and paranoid tendencies, a boy outwardly tranquil but who had deep resentments, particularly against those who had the advantages of a living father. It was advised he be given treatment at a youth home. But Mrs. Oswald moved back to New Orleans and the New York file was closed on her son.

Later, classmates recalled Oswald was a loner, a school yard brawler, a challenger of authority, a constant reader. At 15 he discovered the eloquent outbursts of another angry mind, Karl Marx. Marx's thundering passages that all was wrong with the world burst with brilliant illumination in Oswald's troubled mind and he became a worshipful convert.

Oswald took odd jobs after school turning over his earnings to his mother but at 17 left home to join the Marines. He served in Japan, won a private-first-class stripe and recognition as a marksman but was twice court-martialed for possessing an unregistered gun and for profanity to a noncommissioned officer.

One officer remembered him as a "wise guy" who tried to trip up people in political matters by reading up on them beforehand.

In 1959 he was given a hardship discharge to help support his mother but a month later he was in the Soviet Union saying he was "through" with the United States. "Capitalism has passed its peak," he said, and took a job in a factory in Minsk.

There he married a pharmacy worker, Marina Nicholaeva, and had a daughter by her. But the Communist reality did not match his Marxist dreams and Oswald in May 1962 was granted a passport by the State Department to come home.

He moved to New Orleans where he offered to train anti-Castro guerrillas one day and handed out pro-Castro leaflets the next. He kept on reading—books on Mr. Kennedy, communism, thrillers by Ian Fleming, and a real-life thriller on the assassination of Huey Long.

His neighbors remembered Oswald's Russian wife as pleasant, despite her inability to speak English. But he was glum, silent, withdrawn. Twice he pasted pro-Castro posters on his porch but his landlady made

him take them down. He said later he was an official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee but the group denied it.

Then, last summer, he sent his pregnant wife to live with Mrs. Paine in Irving, just outside Dallas. He went to Mexico late in September and applied for visas for the Soviet Union and Cuba. He stalked out angrily when Soviet officials denied his application. He came back to Dallas and took a \$50-a-week job at the Texas School Book Depository building, visiting his wife, daughter and new baby girl weekends.

"He loved his family, his kids. He was just a father here," said Mrs. Paine.

The morning after Oswald's unexpected arrival at Mrs. Paine's was Friday, November 22. He went to work as usual. What was not usual was the blanket he'd left behind in the garage. Marina remembered later she'd seen a gun butt wrapped inside it. Mrs. Paine noted that morning the blanket was empty.

The President was up early. He talked to a group of Texas Democrats in the parking lot outside his hotel then to a chamber of commerce breakfast. They gave him that Texas trademark, a wide-brimmed hat.

He'd try it on back in the White House, he laughed.

Mrs. Kennedy hadn't made the outdoor appearance. She was busy organizing herself, her husband said with a laugh.

"It takes a little longer but then she looks so much better than we do."

She appeared for the breakfast in a pink wool suit and pillbox hat. The President wore a dark blue suit.

The color matched the Presidential car, a 1961 Lincoln that met the Kennedy party at Love Field in Dallas shortly before noon. The plastic roof was in the trunk. The President thought the public should not be denied a good look at him. If someone really wanted to run the risk of shooting him there wasn't much a plastic top or anything else could do to stop them, he felt.

Nonetheless the Secret Service, as always, had their job to do that day. They weren't happy with the Dallas Trade Mart where the luncheon talk was to be. Too many balconies. They checked through 5,000 yellow roses that were part of the decorations. They ordered that Mr. Kennedy's steak be picked at random from the 2,500 to be served so that if any one wanted to poison the President's he'd have to poison them all.

As customary, a carload of Secret Service agents followed right behind the Presidential limousine. The Vice President, his wife, and Senator YARBOROUGH followed in a third car. For security reasons, Johnson and Mr. Kennedy never traveled together.

The sun smiled, the Kennedys smiled, the enormous crowds hollered and waved.

About 10 minutes past noon that Friday, November 22, a telephone operator at Oxnard, Calif., reported overhearing a woman saying "the President is going to be killed." Surely a crank. But 20 minutes later he was.

Mrs. Kennedy later told Theodore White in Life magazine that she had been thinking of a brief escape from the sun in the shady underpass ahead. Her husband had just agreed with Mrs. Connally, sitting alongside the Governor in the jump seats, that the crowd proved there were those who loved him in Dallas.

Then came the shots that struck the President, the Governor, and the world.

"His head exploded in blood," said Dallas Patrolman James Chaney, who was 6 feet away from the President.

What followed is already history. Mrs. Kennedy cradling her dying husband and crying "Jack, Jack." The crowd scattering. The dash to Parkland Hospital. "Take it easy, take it easy," cautioned one Secret Service man, "if he's not dead we don't want to kill him now." The hats of the wounded Governor and dying President and a red bouquet of roses left hurriedly on the

car floor. The stunned weeping. The doctor turning to his colleague with the cryptic, the irrevocable finality of his profession: "It's too late, Mac."

The sheet was pulled back from the wounded head and the priest read the last rites while the woman, now a widow, held her husband's hand and lay her head on his naked chest and the word sped around the world.

Bobby Kennedy was lunching at home when he heard. He left to answer a call from J. Edgar Hoover, later returned to tell his few luncheon guests: "He died," then went for a walk, alone. His black dog frisked by his side. His brother Ted was presiding over the Senate. He said "My God." So did House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, when told at lunch in the Capitol that he was now second in line to the Presidency. Secret Service agents were quickly assigned to him. The President's mother was told by a niece as she returned from the golf course in Hyannis Port.

The world knew, all the world save the oldest and youngest of those closest to the President, his father and his children. They learned the next day.

"I only cried twice," said Caroline Kennedy.

But in Dallas a hard man with a hard past wept openly.

"He could have been anything, anything he wanted to be and he had to wind up this way," cried Jack Ruby.

Meanwhile, Lee Oswald had gone from the book depository building. Behind a room on the sixth floor was the 6.5-millimeter Mannlicher-Carcano Italian Army rifle Oswald had bought months before from a Chicago mail-order house. There was a box perched by the window. Remains of cold chicken were on the floor. So were three spent shells.

Oswald took a bus and laughed when a woman told the driver the President was dead. He dashed into his roominghouse past the astonished housekeeper who was watching television broadcasts of the assassination. He grabbed a coat and ran out again. Minutes later Patrolman J. D. Tippit, was suspicious of the hurrying Oswald and hailed him. He was shot and killed.

Oswald hurried off, ducked in a doorway when he heard sirens and then into a theater without paying admission. The picture was "War Is Hell." Oswald moved from seat to seat, exciting curiosity of the few others in the theater. A storekeeper, who'd seen Oswald run from the sirens, and the ticket taker were already suspicious. Police were called and cornered Oswald. "This is it," he cried.

After a scuffle he was taken off to jail.

Almost every American of the age of comprehension, alone with their thoughts before the television screens, were drawn together with a strong, uplifting sense of community by the somber events they witnessed. The widow in black kneeling at the catafalque in the Capitol rotunda with the child uncertainly reaching to her mother for guidance as to what she should do. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's eulogy with its moving refrain "and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands." The shadows the riderless gray horses cast as they passed along the streets. Always the reminder of the drums, beating, beating. And the horrible, fascinating moment on Sunday when a man died on television, live.

Jack Ruby, 50, strip-club operator, friend of cops and jailhouse familiar, a sentimental inflammable man fast with his fists, fast with a handout. He slipped through the police guard as two officers turned aside in conversation. Oswald was killed only 48 hours after the President. "I blacked out," Ruby told his lawyer. It was up to a jury to decide. The FBI indicated it didn't think he had anything to do with Oswald other than revulsion for his deed.

THE NEW PRESIDENT: OUT OF TORMENT, A NATION REDEDICATED

(WASHINGTON.—The text of President Johnson's address before a joint session of Congress on November 27.)

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind. He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began.

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic—and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed lands—the dream of education for our youth—the dream of jobs for all who seek them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and dedication.

Now the ideas and ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action.

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and the fortitude to risk war.

We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ; and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age where there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war—we must recognize the obligations to match national strength with national restraint—we must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power—we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest.

This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice.

And let all know we will extend no special privilege and impose no persecution.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance, and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. These are the United States—a united people with unity of purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness, wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a government we can unite upon a program which is wise and just, enlightened and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet

any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say that I need your help; I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans in all America.

This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and to show that we are capable of decisive action—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From the Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar—to the expansion of our foreign trade—to the reinforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere.

On the 20th of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished "in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." But—he said—"let us begin."

Today, in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue.

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yet, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law.

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color. There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the earliest passage of the tax bill for which he fought all this long year. This is a bill designed to increase our national income, our Federal revenues, and our insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay, means more security for those now working and more jobs for those now without them.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is a time for action—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America—strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bills, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor easing executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs—and strong, forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills.

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of the Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality.

I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. This does not mean we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously, and speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now. I ask your help.

I know we meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance, and mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another.

Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream.

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our sorrow. Let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain.

And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing and give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

"America, America,
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good
With brotherhood
From sea to shining sea."

COLUMBUS DAY, U.S.A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULTER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who, for many years now, have been asking that the Congress of the United States pay proper tribute to Christopher Columbus by recognition of October 12 as a national legal holiday. The 88th Congress alone has already produced 26 bills seeking to accomplish this fact.

All but 16 of our States already commemorate Columbus on October 12, and it is time we do him the honor as a Nation. In this regard we lag behind most of our sister nations in Latin America, who have long since made a special day of October 12 on their calendars. My own State, California, first established this day in 1909, although for 2 years it was designated as "Discovery Day." In 1911 the name was officially changed, and properly so, to "Columbus Day."

In saluting Christopher Columbus we not only pay respect to a courageous and tenacious man who sailed uncharted waters and proved the world was indeed round, and not only to the man who opened the door to the exploration of two vast continents, but in saluting Co-

lumbus we acknowledge our debt to all those of Italian blood who have come to these shores, since that first remarkable son of Italy set foot on San Salvador in 1492.

Columbus was not content with one epic voyage. He returned to the New World again in 1493 and in 1498, and 1502. And he was followed by another daring Italian navigator who sailed under the English flag and who is usually referred to by his anglicized name, John Cabot. Other Italian explorers came later, such as Fra Marco da Nizza, who explored what is now Arizona. Men with the euphonious names of Francesco Chino, Enrico and Alfonso Tonti, and Umberti Beltrami helped to establish such early trading posts as Chicago and Detroit. Amerigo Vespucci, another great Italian navigator and mapmaker, even gave us his name.

Amerigo's signature on his early maps of the New World became the common name for that strange and savage land that was interesting to explore perhaps, but hardly worth considering as a decent place to live. We have come to love the word, "America" so much that we tend to think that we always had it, when actually Mr. Vespucci's given name was borrowed and given a fame he never dreamed of.

Nor did Christopher Columbus dream of the consequences of his bold venture, that the explorers would be followed by colonizers, and that out of the fragile Colonies mighty and independent nations would grow to challenge the concepts and the power of the monarchies of Europe. And at each step of the development of the Americas there would be countrymen of Columbus contributing their special talent and industry.

During the Revolutionary period of our own country, President Thomas Jefferson had the benefit of close association with Dr. Filippo Mazzei, his physician and counselor. Those wonderful words from the Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal" are derived from the philosophy of Dr. Mazzei. William Paca was one of the signers of that declaration. Col. Francesco Vigo made an outstanding contribution as a military leader during those hard years of struggle to survive as an independent nation.

President Lincoln promoted Francis Spinola to brigadier general for gallantry in action during the Civil War, and he was also awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. By World War II, there were 20 men of Italian descent so decorated. Those who have distinguished themselves in battle for America have demonstrated their direct relationship with Columbus in their gallant courage, but the sons of Columbus have contributed in ways and places far removed from the battlefield.

The Italians who came to this country in such large numbers after 1880 came to make a better life for themselves and their children, and they succeeded in enriching the lives of the rest of us. In this great melting pot culture, "Italian" means to most of us music, art, good food, and a tolerant, cheerful attitude toward life. In the early years of this

century struggling musicians who were not Italian commonly adopted Italian names, and perhaps they still do in the hope that managers and the public would be more favorably disposed toward their talents. The Italian cuisine has become a part of and improved our best American fare, and I dare say the young people of today could not endure life without pizza. The contributions in the field of art, architecture, and artisanry are so extensive that enumeration is pointless.

In the United States we now have over 4½ million citizens either born in Italy or of the first generation. The number who have Italian blood by longer descent is much greater, of course. In California there are approximately 350,000 foreign-born or first-generation Italian-Americans, and they have continued and expanded upon the achievements of the earlier Italian settlers. Many of our finest farms, orchards, and vineyards were started by those early immigrants, and today every business and profession has outstanding Italian representatives as well. Mr. A. P. Gianini, the founder of the Bank of America, is known all over for his success in building the largest bank in the world, but he is known in California, too, for his concern and faith in the small businessman, the farmer, and the little guy trying to get started.

Public service has attracted many of the first-rate sons and daughters, and the State, city, and National Legislatures have the able advantage of their leadership. Our late President recognized that leadership when he chose Anthony J. Celebrezze for his Cabinet.

Time and space do not permit me to detail further the many notable achievements of our citizens of Italian descent, but in giving recognition to Christopher Columbus, we celebrate them all.

Under a joint resolution of Congress approved April 30, 1934, the President is requested to proclaim October 12 of each year as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America. In so proclaiming for the year 1963, the late beloved President Kennedy stated:

Whereas the vision, courage, and dedication of Christopher Columbus destined him to be the discoverer of the New World; and

Whereas his voyage, under the Spanish flag, across uncharted seas to an unknown land, will forever stand for us as a symbol of the zeal for new ventures which has characterized our Nation; and

Whereas we continue to honor Columbus' daring as we search out the far reaches of space and of human possibility; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by a joint resolution approved April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), requested the President of the United States to proclaim October 12 of each year as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America.

It is appropriate that we now make this annual proclamation final and binding and declare October 12 a national legal holiday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for the period January 8 to 15, 1964, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 60 minutes, on January 20, 1964, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 30 minutes, on January 13, 1964, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHANSEN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth;

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; and

S. 1524. An act for the relief of Hai Yung Jung and Johnny Jung.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that

I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: J. J. PICKLE, 10th District, Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1514. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1515. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps since their incorporation by the 87th Congress in September 1962, pursuant to Public Law 87-655; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, with respect to positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress within the purview of subsection (c) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 9601. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 606. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct within or without the United States studies and investigations in certain matters under its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9602. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9603. A bill for the relief of Maropi Paraskevas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 9604. A bill for the relief of Margaret Miklos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, the Republic of Chad will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and on this memorable occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbaye, the President of the Republic of Chad; and His Excellency Adam Malick Sow, the Chadian Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic of Chad achieved independence from France on August 11, 1960, but the formal independence day celebrations were deferred until January 11, when the seasonal rains were over. Thus, January 11 became the anniversary date on which Chad's independence is commemorated, the date on which we offer our congratulations to the people of Chad.

Chad, a landlocked country in central Africa, is a territory of great geographic variety. It is a land of desert in the north which becomes savannah, then plain, then intense forest as one travels southward. It is a land of mountains and rivers and of abounding bird and animal life. Its people are as varied and interesting as its topography—Arabized nomads, Negroid herdsmen, fishermen and primitive villagers, Moslems, Christians, and Animists. Over the centuries nomads from the north and sedentary populations from the south have mingled in Chad. Islamic conquerors penetrated in the 14th century to find flourishing African empires, and in the 19th century the Europeans began explorations of Chad. Chad has been a melting pot of ethnic groups, for it has long been one of the most active crossroads of trade between the East and tropical Africa.

But the new independent Chad is no longer satisfied just to be a crossroads. It is determined to build up a reputation of its own on the world scene. Chad and its former ruling colonial power, France, have continued on good relations since independence. On independence day President de Gaulle sent a telegram which said:

Chad enters the concert of nations. In the heroic days of the war she did not fail to stand by France. She can rest assured today that France will not fail to stand by her.

In turn, Chad negotiated agreements with France for close cooperation in foreign affairs, defense, and financial and economic matters.

Chad has made commendable progress in developing its economy since independence in spite of drawbacks such as inaccessibility, transportation difficulties, and the great distance to major seaports. At independence Chad had

under 1 mile of paved road, from Fort Lamy, the capital, to the airport. Roads are being improved, however, and Chad's airlink to the outside is becoming increasingly important. Chad's chief economic asset is cotton, which makes up approximately 80 percent of the country's exports. The basis of the economy is agriculture, and about 96 percent of the population are engaged in subsistence agriculture, stockraising, and river fishing. Chad has begun an industrialization program, however, and already there are a handful of cotton gins, soap factories, peanut oil mills, and brick kilns.

Over half of Chad's imports come from France, but Chad has started importing some American products such as gasoline, trucks, lubricating oils and greases, air conditioners, and refrigerators. Chad's ties with the West are strong, and the Government is trying to attract foreign capital to develop a new industry of potential importance: tourism.

On the third anniversary of their independence we congratulate the people of Chad for the progress they have achieved thus far and wish them every success for the future.

Communist Party Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the House and of the citizens of Michigan and Detroit particularly, to a matter of very serious concern.

I have recently learned that a John F. Kennedy Memorial Tribute Committee meeting scheduled to be held next Sunday, January 12, in the auditorium of the Copernicus Junior High School in Hamtramck, Mich., is in fact a Communist Party affair.

The gathering, ostensibly sponsored as a memorial meeting commemorating the death of President Kennedy, is actually a Communist Party ad hoc committee meeting under the auspices of the Communist Party of Detroit.

This Communist Party ad hoc committee has made arrangements for the use of the Copernicus Junior High School auditorium at 11410 Charest, Hamtramck, and the Detroit Communist Party group is going all out to make the meeting a huge success.

It is my further information that Coleman Young, a Negro leader for many years in the Michigan district of the Communist Party and currently affiliated with the Communist Party, U.S.A., is scheduled to be a speaker at this rally. Young reportedly is also being promoted

as a candidate for Congress in the next election.

The Communist Party ad hoc committee has sent letters under the name of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Tribute Committee to prominent political leaders announcing the meeting as being sponsored by "Americans of Polish Descent" in honor of the late President's memory.

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House is to alert prospective invitees and participants to the actual nature and sponsorship of this meeting.

The Marine Technology Society: A Long-Needed Organization in a Vital Scientific Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues an organization which I believe will make a great contribution in the future development of a vital and challenging science—oceanography—the study of the vast, almost limitless resources of the seas.

The organization, the Marine Technology Society is a nonprofit venture. Its purpose is to bring together scientists, engineers, businessmen—in short, all those who have an interest in developing oceanographic knowledge to tap the physical resources beneath the surface of the oceans.

The group is incorporated in the State of New York, but already has a nationwide membership. Its headquarters are in Washington, D.C. Its formation is timely. The House has passed a national oceanographic bill. The Federal Government has announced a long-range program of oceanographic research. This professional group can help meld the many discoveries and potential projects into a uniform source of complete knowledge about what's going on in oceanography. Its purpose is not to compete, but to collect information and see that those who are working in the complex field of oceanography are aware of the achievements that have been made and the experiments underway.

I personally am pleased to have the opportunity to join this organization. I believe it offers a vehicle for the exchange of information, the collating and disseminating of ideas and the ideal focal point for discussion of and formulation of valuable oceanographic projects. My home district of San Diego County, Calif., is the center of varied and advanced oceanographic research.

The Marine Technology Society has been very active since its relatively recent

formation. It has launched studies and programs aimed at establishing sound marine conservation policies. It is investigating the problems of the standardization of oceanographic instruments, a necessity if world progress in the arts of underwater science is to progress rapidly.

The MTS is not interested primarily in academic knowledge alone. One of its chief projects is studying how marine sciences can help the economics of nations which now have limited technological and economic resources.

Now in progress is an evaluation of present undersea vehicles available for oceanographic work, and a projection of the future requirements for such vehicles.

Another project involves checking the practicality of using obsolete underwater communication cables for oceanographic data retrieval.

Perhaps its most ambitious program, and one of unquestioned value and need, is the collecting and classifying of all now available technical literature pertaining to marine science.

In essence this group is aiming to bring together the many separate phases of oceanographic discovery into a coordinated, knowledgeable, workable organization. Much like the creation of a fabric, it will weave together the various strands of research which hitherto have been pursued largely in random, uncoordinated fashion by many organizations having diverse interests.

Since the House and the Federal Government have embarked on an ambitious oceanographic program, the Marine Technology Society has scheduled its first national conference, a symposium on "buoy technology" to be held in Washington, D.C., on March 24 and 25, 1964.

Congress has a great interest in the success of MTS in realizing its objectives. It will be helpful toward making our Federal oceanography program an effective operation. It will establish the preliminary forum for discussions concerning the important interchange of oceanographic data between nations—a step toward world accord, cooperation, and ultimate greater prosperity.

My colleague, Representative HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography, wrote the secretary of the society, shortly after its formation:

The objectives of our legislation seem well in line with the objectives which your proposed new society would seek to promote. It would seem to me that a professional society of the caliber you have in mind could be most helpful to various interests within and without Government who are concerned over the need for the prompt and effective advancement of a national oceanographic program.

It has been said that we know more about the surface of the moon than the ocean's floor. We are now striving to push our sum of knowledge about the ocean and its floor. The Marine Technology Society may well become the hub of a united drive to explore, analyze and utilize the full depths and expanse of the world's oceans.

Remarks on the Inauguration of the Korean President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made while attending the inauguration of the South Korean President, Mr. Chong-hui Park. At that occasion I had the good fortune to express my sentiments to the Korean Committee of the Relations Center International, Allies of the Korean War which is the worldwide organization of the Korean veterans who are bound by ties of having participated in the Korean fight. It is my privilege to include my statements at this time.

REMARKS ON THE INAUGURATION OF KOREAN PRESIDENT

Two years ago, in a White House conference with President Kennedy, General Park pledged that elections to return the Republic of Korea to civilian control would be held in the summer of 1963. In honoring that pledge, General Park greatly strengthened the cause of the free world and bound even closer the ties between his country and mine. Today, General Park is President of the Republic of Korea, the choice of his people in a free and open election. This demonstration of political stability and maturity in a land that not long ago was a battleground in the global conflict between democracy and Communist aggression does honor to the people of the Republic of Korea. It means that the Republic of Korea will remain a bulwark in the struggle to preserve freedom against those who would impose tyranny upon the world.

As we all know, this struggle suffered a severe blow in the tragic death last month of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in whom the free world had found a leader of imagination, courage, and vigor. When the bullets of a mentally warped youth—a Marxist, I might point out—robbed us of this great leader, there were doubts of America's political stability and maturity expressed in some parts of the world. There was a question, implied if not expressed, that, if such a deed could be committed in the United States of today, was the United States ready to assume the burden of leadership of the free world?

First, let me say again that this was the deed of a madman; he was a Marxist, yes; but probably his Marxism was incidental. In the past month I have read totally unfounded stories in the foreign press which hinted darkly that the assassination of President Kennedy was the result of a political plot—perpetrated either by rightists or leftists, depending upon the point of view of the writer. The possibility that the President was a victim of some sinister cabal has, of course, been thoroughly investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Not a shred of evidence has been unearthed to support such a possibility. In fact, no American President has ever been a victim of a political assassination, and by that I mean a plot to usurp power through the murder of the existing President. In every case, these crimes were the deeds of deranged men.

Our Government, like yours, is a government of law, not men; a government of free

choice arrived at openly. Those in other parts of the world who feared that the assassination of President Kennedy would rob the United States of the power of decision at a critical time in world history obviously were not familiar with the democratic process. The death of a Chief Executive of the United States has never, even for a day, interrupted the continuity of its government. The Communist world, I am sure, took sober note of the smooth transition of power from President Kennedy to President Lyndon Baines Johnson—and noted too how swiftly the people of the United States closed ranks, regardless of their political attitudes, behind their new President. In his initial address to the Congress of the United States, President Johnson made two points crystal clear:

(1) That the death of President Kennedy would in no manner whatsoever lessen the resolve of the United States to further the cause of freedom everywhere.

(2) That the United States would continue to meet its worldwide commitments, military, and economic.

Thus you may rest assured that the United States will fulfill its international role. Obviously, my country cannot bear the full burden alone. In order to triumph in this global conflict between the free world and the slave, we must have dedicated, steadfast, and progressive allies. In the Republic of Korea we have such an ally, and in President Park we have the firm, purposeful leader demanded by the magnitude of the task before us.

Earlier, I mentioned the ties that bind your country and mine. Let us examine those ties again. It was here in Korea, on June 25, 1950, that communism unleashed its first post-World War II assault on a then uncomprehending world. On that fateful day, 60,000 Communist-indoctrinated troops, led by 100 Russian-built tanks, struck a daggerlike blow at the free world everywhere. Let it be remembered that the United States—though still not recovered from the strain and shock of a bitter, global war—answered the Communist challenge without hesitation. With our gallant comrades in arms—notably the resolute troops of the Republic of Korea—we met the Communist onslaught and turned it back in bewildered defeat only to face at a later date the hordes of Communist Chinese. And these too we drove back, though greatly outnumbered. As a young infantry officer, I myself took part in that bloody conflict and was wounded in it; thus, like millions of my countrymen, I have a personal stake in preserving the freedom of your country.

All told, 5,720,000 Americans served here in Korea in the active phase of our joint battle against the Communists—and I say active because that war has never really ended. Of those almost 6 million Americans, 54,246 gave their lives here, and 103,284 were wounded. The casualties of the troops of the Republic of Korea were equally heavy. During the conflict and in the subsequent years the United States has gladly contributed \$5.4 billion to keep the Republic of Korea militarily and economically strong. Today, 50,000 American troops still face the Communists along the truce line, where they stand shoulder to shoulder with your soldiers to make certain that never again will we be taken by surprise.

Thus we are bound by ties of blood and common aspiration; together we threw back our implacable foe and together we will contain that foe. Here in Korea you have proved that not even the upheaval of a terrible war—an unfinished war—can shake the basic strength of democracy nor impede its progress toward a better life for its people. In the United States we have shown that not even the shock of a President's assassination

can shake the basic strength of a government of law nor impede its progress toward the fulfillment of the democratic ideal—the dig-

nity of man. Our countries are indeed fortunate to have two strong leaders—President Park and President Johnson. Under them,

I am certain we will achieve our common goals—security with honor and freedom with responsibility. Thank you.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in changing and troubled days we come to this altar of devotion, praying for quiet hearts and for conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the awesome times in which our lot is cast.

We confess the things in our own dear land of liberty which weaken and betray the faith we profess. We acknowledge the selfishness which dominates groups caring only for their own fenced-in interests; the partisanship which sees clearly the next election, while ignoring the next generation. We bemoan the narrow nationalism which is oblivious to the fact that exploitation and injustice anywhere poison the arterial blood of the race. Our hearts cry out in such a time, O America, America, God mend thine every flaw, and fit thee to be the channel of His redeeming grace for all the earth.

To transform this earth, which could be so fair, God bless America as she throws her might, moral and spiritual, across the path of ruthless, godless materialism. May our strength, through Thy will, be a radiant factor in bringing to pass a just peace in our time, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 8, 1964, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate today: FRANK CARLSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas; JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; and A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-

dent of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1295. An act for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon;

H.R. 1450. An act for the relief of Maria Mangano;

H.R. 1455. An act for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen;

H.R. 1723. An act for the relief of Agnese Brienza;

H.R. 1725. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Werner;

H.R. 2190. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leung Chi King;

H.R. 4361. An act for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge;

H.R. 4972. An act for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture;

H.R. 5617. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer;

H.R. 6092. An act for the relief of Alexander Haytko;

H.R. 6748. An act for the relief of the J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7347. An act for the relief of Teresa Eliopoulos and Anastasia Eliopoulos;

H.R. 7821. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Pytlak Jarosz; and

H.R. 8322. An act for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth;

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; and

S. 1524. An act for the relief of Hai Yung Jung and Johnny Jung.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1295. An act for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon;

H.R. 1450. An act for the relief of Maria Mangano;

H.R. 1455. An act for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen;

H.R. 1723. An act for the relief of Agnese Brienza;

H.R. 1725. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Werner;

H.R. 2190. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leung Chi King;

H.R. 4361. An act for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge;

H.R. 4972. An act for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture;

H.R. 5617. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer;

H.R. 6092. An act for the relief of Alexander Haytko;

H.R. 6748. An act for the relief of the J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7347. An act for the relief of Teresa Eliopoulos and Anastasia Eliopoulos;

H.R. 7821. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Pytlak Jarosz; and

H.R. 8322. An act for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements in the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has a matter he wishes to discuss.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe morning business should be completed before I address myself to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well, Mr. President. I merely wished to have notice given to Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of December 31, 1963, there was an aggregate of 2,180 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.,