

August 6, 1965

This change of climate has heartened population experts, who have often felt that they were lonely voices crying in a wilderness of indifference to the dangers of population inflation.

"Why am I optimistic today?" asks Frank W. Notestein, president of the privately financed Population Council.

GROWING OPTIMISM

"For two reasons: First, a real awareness of the problem on the part of the people and governments; and second, the recent improvements in contraceptive techniques, with the breakthrough on the pill and the IUD (intrauterine device) in the last few years."

In the United States, President Johnson's state of the Union message last January heralded a more affirmative and aggressive Federal policy on birth control.

With only 25 words, Mr. Johnson went further than any other President to back population-control efforts:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources."

Then, the President called on all nations to "face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations" when he spoke on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations in San Francisco.

"Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth," he told the delegates.

SHIFT IN SENTIMENT

Other recent events reflect the shift in sentiment toward the Government's role in birth-control efforts:

Ten bills relating to birth control have been introduced in this Congress. A Senate subcommittee is now holding hearings on a bill that would set up two posts in the State Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department to deal with population problems at home and abroad.

Last year, the number of States offering birth-control services in tax-supported medical and welfare programs rose from 21 to 35.

So far this year, some 11 States have taken action either to repeal old State birth-control bans or to provide family-planning services. The Supreme Court recently struck down the Connecticut law that forbade the sale or use of contraceptives.

The Interior Department announced it would offer both birth-control advice and devices to American Indians on reservations, natives of the Pacific Trust Territory, and Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts in Alaska.

It thus became the first Federal agency to supply contraceptive devices directly. The program, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall emphasized, is entirely voluntary.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, as part of the war on poverty, has said it will provide funds for family-planning services as part of an overall program if approved by a general community consensus.

Corpus Christi, Tex., received the first grant, for \$8,500, for a 6-month pilot project of neighborhood clinics in low-income areas. Programs have also been approved for Oakland, Calif., Austin, Tex., St. Louis, Nashville, and Buffalo.

OPPOSITION

Local Catholic opposition has held up approval of a grant to Milwaukee.

Last March, the Agency for International Development sent out a directive to its missions to supply technical assistance—but not contraceptive devices—to governments requesting it.

The same month AID granted \$45,000 to the Jamaica Planning Association to buy vehicles and other equipment for a birth-control education program.

U.S. Surgeon General Luther L. Terry urged the World Health Organization to take positive action in the adoption of a clear-cut policy on birth control.

Who voted unanimously to supply technical assistance to members requesting it but not to involve operational activities—reportedly a compromise to allay Catholic fears.

Until recently, the Federal Government has carefully avoided direct involvement in the touchy field of birth control. It has been considered politically explosive both at home and abroad.

The Roman Catholic Church has presented the most formidable and unswerving opposition to public birth-control policies and programs.

CATHOLIC REVIEW

Today the church is undergoing a searching review of its position on the regulation of childbirth. Pope Paul's pronouncement—the ultimate decision is his—may come before the bishops of the Second Vatican Council convene September 14 for their final session.

In the United States, there are 50 million Catholics, nearly a quarter of the population. Latin America, where population is growing the fastest, is predominantly Catholic.

Pope Paul appointed a special commission of clerics, scientists, and married couples to advise him. The commission, which has been meeting more than a year, has been reported as divided.

Some commission members are reported standing firm against any change in the church position. Others are believed in favor of sanction for use of contraceptive pills. And still others have been reported to be supporting a wider range of contraceptive means.

THE PILL

The only means of birth control now approved by the Catholic Church is total abstinence during the wife's fertile period—the rhythm method.

The pill offers a method that is not unrecyclable to Catholic teaching, its supporters argue. It suppresses ovulation, they emphasize, without use of mechanical barriers condemned by the church.

One of the pills' developers is Dr. John Rock, a Catholic himself. He has emphasized that canon law defines the end of marriage as both the procreation and education of children and speaks of a "fusion of these obligations."

Shortly before his death in 1958, Pope Plus XII condemned the pill as a "sterilizer." The antipill school argues that it represents a kind of direct intervention, previously condemned by a number of Popes.

THE IUD METHOD

The IUD (intra-uterine device) also could pose an intricate problem for Catholic doctrine. The question here may be whether the loops of the device prevent fertilization—before embryonic life is formed—to act to prevent the fertilized egg from taking hold in the uterus. In the latter case, the coil may be viewed as an early abortion-producing device and open to unyielding condemnation.

Last October at the third session of the Vatican Council, four cardinals spoke out for a redefinition of the church position on birth control.

Leon Josef Cardinal Suenens of Belgium urged the Council "to meet the immense problem posed by the present demographic explosion."

"The matter is difficult, but the world is waiting," he added.

Public opinion polls have shown that many Catholics favor birth control and practice it by other means than the rhythm methods. A recent Louis Harris survey showed a 3-to-2 majority of Catholic couples favored relaxation of the church's rigid stand.

In South America, some priests have avoided taking a stand rather than obstruct birth control efforts among their poor parishioners. In Europe, several of the countries with the lowest birth rates are predominantly Catholic—Austria, Belgium, France, and Italy.

THE WAIT

But until Pope Paul makes his pronouncement the Catholic doctrine remains that of centuries.

"Despite popular opinion to the contrary, the attitude of the Catholic Church to contraception is still one of condemnation as a moral evil," Monsignor John C. Knott, head of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Council, has declared.

Not every one thinks the world has population problems. Some reputable scientists and demographers feel that we shouldn't underestimate the ability of science to take care of rapid growth in the years ahead.

Malthus was proved wrong once, they point out, and they decry the alarmists and the "popular prophets of demographic gloom and doom."

But more and more people and governments are becoming worried over the problems of overpopulation.

They see serious consequences for mankind—in the search for world peace and order, in economic growth in the underdeveloped countries, in the hopes of the world's poor for a little better life, in the welfare of the individual family.

The quantity of human life could well wipe out much of the quality of human life, they warn. Children born today will be 35 in the year 2000, when there will be twice as many people on earth. Some will live to see a world three times as populous as today's if present growth rates continue.

Population control certainly won't solve all of man's troubles. But it is close to the center of many of them.

Fe 
VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday there was brought to my attention a speech delivered by Mr. Steve Allen before a benefit of the SANE Nuclear Policy Committee this last May 16. Because I consider it one of the most remarkable speeches on the subject of Vietnam that I have yet seen, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Allen's statement printed into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Speaking as a liberal to the audience of an organization that has generally been critical of administration policy in Vietnam, Mr. Allen told his listeners:

It is not particularly wise to view the present confrontation in southeast Asia as just another competition between nations in the more or less historic pattern, nor, as just as a simple matter of revolutionary nationalism. For what is involved here essentially is a philosophical confrontation. There is a contest going on in the world to determine whether men can be left to work out their own economic destinies in a more or less loose democratic framework—in which the at least relative freedom and dignity of the individual is basically important—or whether it is necessary to achieve certain economic ends by state coercion of the people, strict dictatorship that denies freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of belief, and freedom of assembly, all of which we insist we hold dear.

At present, we are justifiably concerned with the denial of civil rights and liberties in this country because such denial is an abuse of our professed philosophy. But in Communist states such denial is not regarded as an abuse but is defended as part

the Communist bloc. The Asian country that controls its population growth probably will be the first to achieve an economic takeoff to offer people a better life.

Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago demographer and former acting director of the Census Bureau, has pointed out that the other underdeveloped countries are closely watching the race between India and Communist China.

BIRTH RATE MAY DECIDE

Both are trying to achieve a higher standard of living—one by Communist methods and the other by a modified democratic way. "Success or failure in this fateful contest may well hinge on the ability of the nations involved to decrease their rates of population growth," Hauser emphasizes.

Burdened down by a high birth rate, India is in a painful struggle to modernize for economic growth. Its official family planning policy has shown few results over a decade, partly because of indifferent government leadership and bureaucratic snarls.

In 1956, Communist China launched a family planning drive, stressing contraception, sterilization, and induced abortion. In less than a year the campaign was turned off and the government turned its energies and verbiage to the "Great Leap Forward."

The reasons for the abrupt about face never were explained—there was a good harvest that year, the family planning drive ran into peasant resistance, and justification required some nimble flip-flops in the Marxist line.

REVIVED ON LOWER KEY

The population control campaign soon was revived in a lower key, with emphasis on delayed marriages and children.

In an interview last year with journalist Edgar Snow, Premier Chou En-lai supported planned parenthood as "conducive to raising the standard of living." China, he told Snow, had sent a delegation to Japan to study how that country had reduced its birth rate. It also has had its scientists at work on a birth-control pill, Chou said.

No one knows for sure how many people live behind the Bamboo Curtain or how fast the population is growing. The estimate is that the population may be around 750 million and the growth rate about 2.5 percent.

The international political situation gives special significance to population growth, and the implications extend far beyond the race between China and India.

POOR AREAS BURSTING

Today a little more than two-thirds of the world's people live in the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Within 35 years, these areas probably will hold four-fifths of the world population. Today 6 of every 10 new persons added to the world population are born in Asia. Another two are born in Latin America and Africa.

The overweighted racial imbalance is obvious. But more significant in the long run is the widening gap between the "have" and the "have-not" nations. This is something that could have a profound impact on world peace and world order.

Hauser points out that this widening gap between the rich and poor nations could lead to a North-South division of the world to replace the presently polarity between the East and the West. The "have-nots" now have had a glimpse of a better life; if their aspirations are blocked, they may blow off their frustrations in revolutions and convulsions of unrest.

ASIA'S BIG PROBLEM

The world's biggest population problems are concentrated in Asia, which now has 56 percent of the global population.

The only Asian nation that has succeeded in controlling its population growth is Japan.

And that country—highly literate, modernized, and industrialized—cannot serve as a model to guide the other underdeveloped countries of Asia.

In just a decade, Japan halved its birth rate, the fastest decline in history. In 1947, the rate was 34.3 per 1,000 of population. Ten years later it had dropped down to nearly 17.

Japan, a crowded island with a population half that of the United States crammed into 5 percent of the land space, came out of the war with its industry smashed. More than 5 million men came home from the Pacific islands.

JAPAN ACCEPTS ABORTIONS

In 1948, the Japanese government passed a national eugenics act that liberalized the laws on legal abortions. But even before this, the Japanese people had made their decisions and started limiting families.

The birth rate had been falling even before World War II, but rose temporarily with the postwar baby boom.

The Japanese have no religious qualms over abortion and relied largely on this method to limit their families. Now, with improvements in contraception in recent years, there are moves to encourage greater use of more conventional birth control methods. But there still are about one million abortions each year in Japan.

Within the last two or three years, there have been hopeful signs that other Asian nations are making gains in population control.

RATE DIPS IN HONG KONG

Taiwan and South Korea have turned to the intrauterine device (IUD) to push family planning and have expanded pilot programs into national policy. In Taiwan, the birth rate dropped from 42 per 1,000 in 1958 to 35 last year. Ceylon, with technical assistance from Sweden, is now moving ahead on its program.

In Hong Kong last year, the birth rate fell below 30 per 1,000 for the first time. This island city is incredibly congested because of the immigration of mainland refugees. It is an artificial situation, but it does point up what can happen as population swells—in low-income public housing only 24 square feet, perhaps the size of a railroad compartment, is allotted to each person.

Rats, given ample food but jammed in crowded pens, have become neurotic and frustrated and develop rat societal problems. How human society will bear up under the stress of such crowding is something for speculation.

For the present, the heart of the world's population problem does lie in Asia. But it is tropical Latin America that has the fastest rate of growth.

Though rich in space and natural resources, Latin American countries are having serious population difficulties. Their people are poor, and more and more are being born without any hope of adequate food, housing, or clothing.

The late President Kennedy took note of the situation in his 1961 message on foreign aid:

"The magnitude of the problem is staggering. In Latin America, for example, the population growth is already threatening to outpace economic growth—and in some parts of the continent living standards are actually declining."

BABY BORN IN BRAZIL

In many South American countries the population growth rate is 3 percent or better. Brazil, the giant of South America, has a birth rate of about 45 per 1,000 and is growing at a 3.5 percent clip. At this rate the population of 80 million will double in two decades.

On the hills around Rio de Janeiro, more and more poor crowd into the miserable slum "favelas," looking down without hope on the bright lights of the beautiful city.

The picture in Latin America is grim. Some Asian nations are at least beginning to talk about their population problems. No one seems concerned in many of the Catholic countries of Latin America.

However, concern over the rising number of abortions is growing in a few countries. In Chile, which has added family-planning services in hospitals, about a fourth of the maternity beds have been occupied by post-abortion patients. The estimates are that there are three abortions to every live birth in Uruguay.

PUERTO RICO CUTS RATE

Puerto Rico, which had some pioneering private family-planning programs as early as the 1930's, has slowly reduced her birth rate. Part of the drop undoubtedly is due to the emigration of young people. But one survey has shown that one in five women between the ages 15 and 44 had had "la operacion"—voluntary sterilization.

There is no world population problem as such. The problems are different with the countries and areas.

Both the United States and Russia may be said to have a controlled population—although some say it is controlled at too high a growth rate, between 1.6 and 1.8 percent. The Soviet Union recently admitted it was having trouble finding jobs for its youths, much like the problem in the United States.

In both countries, the birth rate has dropped slightly in recent years, edging down to 20 or 22 per 1,000. But this still is above that of Japan and most countries of Western Europe, with birth rates well below 20 per 1,000 and growth rates at 1 percent or below.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 6, 1965]

VATICAN REEXAMINES STAND ON BIRTH CONTROL: OUR CROWDED EARTH—VI

(By Jean M. White)

Perhaps by mid-September, or soon thereafter, Pope Paul VI will make a pronouncement on "the problem which everyone is talking about, that is birth control."

The long-awaited statement will be a momentous one for millions of devout Catholics throughout the world. It will come after a searching dialog within the Roman Catholic Church, among the hierarchy, theologians, and lay men and women.

Only last June, Pope Paul asked with respectful urgency that his special advisory commission speed its report to him. Earlier, he had spoken feelingly of the anguish of many souls waiting for the church to re-examine its position on birth control.

INTENSE PROBE

The reexamination has been intense within the framework of centuries of Catholic teaching and opposition to artificial methods of contraception. It comes at a time of considerable change of sentiment in both public and private sectors toward birth control.

Within the last few years, there has been a turning point in public awareness of the problems of overpopulation, both for a family and for a nation.

This has brought demands for more government action in the field of family planning. More and more nations, particularly in the struggling underdeveloped areas of the world, have come to the decision they must adopt and pursue family-planning policies for the well-being of their people.

So birth control—once considered off limits in national and international politics—is now a proper subject for public discussion and action.

and parcel of the status quo. More power, then, to those who uphold freedom, justice, democracy, civil rights, and liberties—but let us demand these glorious ideals universally.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that my colleagues will find the time to read Mr. Allen's statement which I feel deserves far more attention than it has heretofore received.

Though there are some liberals who pretend that the liberal community in this country is solidly opposed to the President's policy, Mr. Allen's statement is another proof, if proof were needed, that many of the most prominent members of the liberal community are completely behind the administration's determination to prevent a Communist takeover in Vietnam and southeast Asia. I would remind my colleagues, among other things, that the AFL-CIO, which certainly must be considered the most significant single segment of the liberal community in our country, has gone on record in repeated resolutions in support of the administration's policy.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article by the noted columnist, Ralph DeToledano, commenting on Mr. Allen's speech.

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

REMARKS AT "SANE" BENEFIT

For several years the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy wrestled chiefly with the specific dilemma to which the organization's title refers, the question of how to live in a world bristling with nuclear weapons.

The achievement of the test ban treaty was an important milestone in the eternal quest for peace with freedom, security, and rationality. But once that point had been passed Sane found itself drawn to address a wider range of foreign policy questions. It is true that behind all these questions there still lurks the very real danger of nuclear war, for the weapons continue to exist and they are still being added to but I assume that even if all the worlds' nuclear weapons were to disappear this evening we would still concern ourselves, as individuals and/or as members of Sane, with the various difficult situations that threaten international peace.

Presently we are much concerned with the problem of the war in Vietnam. On the basis of my brief visit to Saigon last summer I could see that the American commitment there was going to be stepped-up and increased, and nothing that has happened since that time has come as a surprise to me.

As regards the question: what should be done, I have a few observations that you might consider helpful.

First of all, nobody knows. Everybody is guessing. And this is the case partly because no one, apparently, is able to command all the factors that make up the problem. The future cannot be predicted, the possible alternatives open to both sides are numerous, and as emotional forces become dominant it becomes increasingly difficult to determine the factual realities and recommend policy based upon them. All of which adds up to this: that it is unwise—whatever one's point of view or prejudice—to be dogmatic about Vietnam. We are all guessing, feeling our way, and I think it would be helpful therefore if, in making our various suggestions, we advanced them more often in a helpful and constructive spirit.

Secondly I would observe that it is not particularly wise to view the present confrontation in southeast Asia as just another competition between nations in the more-or-less

historic pattern, nor as just a simple matter of revolutionary nationalism. For what is involved here essentially is a philosophical confrontation. There is a contest going on in the world to determine whether men can be left to work out their own economic destinies in a more-or-less loose democratic framework—in which the at least relative freedom and dignity of the individual is basically important—or whether it is necessary to achieve certain economic ends by state coercion of the people, strict dictatorship that denies freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of belief, and freedom of assembly, all of which we insist we hold dear.

Whatever the merits of Marxian economic theory it is clear from massive historical evidence that in the hands of Socialists of the Western European type it is content to work toward its ends by education, propaganda, and the ballot, whereas in the hands of Communists it is prepared to resort to the prison camp, the firing squad, and the secret police to achieve what it considers necessary. There is, you understand, no expression of opinion involved here. I am simply outlining the true situation as it has revealed itself during the past half century. I have opinions and prejudices about the matter—as we all do—but I am content now merely to draw your attention to what exists.

At present we are justifiably concerned with the denial of civil rights and liberties in this country because such denial is an abuse of our professed philosophy. But in Communist states such denial is not regarded as an abuse but is defended as part-and-parcel of the status quo. More power, then, to those who uphold freedom, justice, democracy, civil rights and liberties—but let us demand these glorious ideals universally.

So, to return to my main theme, I think it is necessary to consider the Vietnam dilemma as part of this larger historic context rather than purely as another example of standard international power politics.

Now American Communists are naturally anxious for the United States to simply pull out of Vietnam, period. Their sympathies are no secret and they can certainly not object to being accused of that of which they daily boast. They hope for the triumph of communism in southeast Asia and there is, as I say, nothing mysterious about the prejudice that makes them advance their recommendations. Some of them would hope for a Russian presence and influence in southeast Asia, some are sympathetic to Chinese influence, and a third group of American Communists hope for the achievement of Communist states in southeast Asia but with a considerable degree of national independence, along, say, the Yugoslav model.

But even many anti-Communists have grave reservations about the wisdom of American policy in Vietnam and the surrounding areas. It is entirely clear, in fact, that the overwhelming majority of criticism currently being directed at our Vietnam programs and acts comes from non-Communist sources.

Even these critics, however, must be on guard against succumbing to the appeal of winning the argument as distinguished from getting at the truth. At this moment many non-Communist critics of administration policy are saying that we should stop bombing and start negotiating.

But we cannot negotiate with ourselves. President Johnson has repeated Secretary Rusk's statement that the missing factor needed for negotiations to begin was "any indication—from anyone" that the north was prepared to stop the infiltration of men and supplies in the south. We have also indicated time and again our willingness to support a vast regional development plan if a satisfactory peace can be achieved in southeast Asia. The administration has furthermore made what seems to me the quite remarkable announcement that the United

States is prepared to pull its troops out of South Vietnam if Hanoi were willing to do the same with its guerrillas.

Unfortunately the response from Communist capitals has been a flat rejection of American suggestions that negotiations might be advisable. In fact, at the very same moment that President Johnson was being criticized for failure to seek negotiations, Hanoi radio was contemptuously describing the United States as begging for such negotiations. Hanoi also bitterly attacked Tito of Yugoslavia for having had the temerity to suggest that the United Nations might be instrumental in working toward a solution. And just yesterday Hanoi rejected Indian overtures toward initiating negotiations, and this at a time when for 3 days there had been no American bombing raids in the north.

I will take no more of your time here to elaborate on the subject. I recently delivered a talk on Vietnam that ran for an hour and even at the end of that time I felt I had only begun to scratch the surface. But I did want to suggest that there is a danger of imbalance in criticism that is directed only at Washington and never, or rarely, at Hanoi or Peking. Hanoi does not hide the fact that it wishes to control all of Vietnam. It is therefore out of the question for us to simply pull out of the area—as some are demanding—without having a clear understanding as to what sort of political climate would prevail after our departure.

That the United States had made mistakes in Vietnam, and is likely to make more in the future, seems a safe, if depressing, assumption. But the most helpful public criticism will be that which takes not a limited but a full 360-degree view of the situation. Which is to say that what is needed is criticism that—while not underestimating the serious danger of stumbling into war with China, or even of open infantry war with the large North Vietnam Army—is nevertheless at the same time aware that, if we are serious about our commitment to certain basic Western political ideals, we must also recognize the danger to world peace posed by the tendency of Communist powers to extend their influence by military means to nations and peoples not presently under their domination.

[From King Features Syndicate, New York, N.Y.]

STEVE ALLEN AND THE LIBERALS—A HELPFUL NOTE?

(By Ralph de Toledano)

I hope I have established myself sufficiently as a conservative to write this column without any misunderstandings. Before my allotted words are up, you will see why.

Recently, Steve Allen sent me a copy of some remarks he had made before a national committee for a sane nuclear policy group. Mr. Allen, I am sure, defines himself as a liberal—and his views on nuclear testing have brought him the sharp stings of many conservatives and some fellow liberals. But he is a man who is ready to discuss differences in an honest, calm, and reasonable manner, which is rare, indeed, in these feverish days. He is also ready to speak his mind without fear of antagonizing those among his friends whose blindfold is showing.

Therefore, what he had to say about Vietnam—a country he has visited—assumes importance, particularly since Mr. Allen is the articulate spokesman of a point of view we cannot blink away. He writes me that "the night I made my remarks there was an audience of what looked like a thousand or perhaps 1,200 people. About four or five of them hissed when I got into the meat of the talk. At that about a hundred others began shushing the hissers."

What was the meat of that talk? To begin with, Steve Allen politely noted that much of the criticism of our Vietnam policy is based on guessing—and this, I might add, includes some of my journalistic colleagues.

But he went on: "It is not particularly wise to view the present confrontation in southeast Asia as just another competition between nations in the more-or-less historic pattern, nor as just a simple matter of revolutionary nationalism." How that must have jolted some of the audience, suckled as they are on slogans that lost their validity in 1945.

"What is involved here," Steve Allen went on, "is a philosophical confrontation. There is a contest going on in the world to determine whether men can be left to work out their economic destinies in a loose democratic framework * * * or whether it is necessary to achieve certain economic ends by State coercion of the people, strict dictatorship that denies freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of belief, and freedom of assembly, all of which we insist we hold dear."

Much of this receives lip service from many on both sides of the liberal-conservative barricades, but Steve Allen began cutting to the quick when he added:

"At present we are justifiably concerned with the denial of civil rights and liberties in this country because such a denial is an abuse of our professed philosophy. But in Communist states such denial is not regarded as an abuse but defended as part-and-parcel of the status quo. More power, then, to those who uphold freedom, justice, democracy, civil rights and liberties—but let us demand these glorious ideals universally."

How many of those who picket for freedom—and who upset the orderly process of education with obscene whoops—raise their voices against Communist tyranny in Cuba or Red China or behind the Iron Curtain? How many of them protested when a Yugoslav writer was tried recently for speaking out against Soviet oppression? Mr. Allen pointedly referred to this when he warned his SANE audience of the "danger of imbalance in criticism that is directed only at Washington and never, or rarely, at Hanoi or Peiping."

Let me quote his summation. First noting that the United States has made mistakes in Vietnam and will make others in the future—his idea of those mistakes and mine would, I assume, differ rather sharply—he pleads:

"What is needed is criticism that—while not underestimating the serious danger of stumbling into war with China or even of open infantry war with the large North Vietnam army—is nevertheless at the same time aware that, if we are serious about our commitment to certain basic western political ideals, we must also recognize the danger to world peace posed by the tendency of Communist powers to extend their influence by military means."

These are sentiments which would not be shared by that somewhat addled apostle of unilateral nuclear disarmament, Bertrand Russell—or by otherwise sane Americans given to what some conservatives would call in-SANE-ity. His remarks on Vietnam I find highly encouraging, for they point in the direction of a dialog with conservatives and liberals of good will to arrive at minimum positions which will insure the safety and the security of the United States—and, in the long run, the entire free world. If we can arrive at those minimum positions, then the garbled and acrimonious debate which has convulsed this country could move upward to a plateau of rational discourse.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] spoke this week in New York on the way in which the Food and Drug Administration has misused the powers which the law and the Congress have bestowed upon it.

Mr. President, I have always supported an adequate pure food and drug agency in order to help protect the consumer and the public against fraud and deceit and noxious foods. One of the sad events, to me at least, has been the way this agency has emphasized its "police" powers and downgraded its scientific staff and work in comparison.

As a result we have an agency which has been lax in its efforts to protect the public against high drug prices and highly toxic drugs put out by the big drug companies, but which, instead, spends most of its time, through its disproportionately large investigative and inspection staffs, harrasing and harrassing the small vitamin manufacturer or the distributor of what some might call unorthodox foods which are nontoxic and harmless.

And, in doing so, as Senator LONG so well provides example after example, they resort to illegal, unethical, and improper methods.

Senator LONG is doing a splendid job of trying to protect the public against these improper tactics of some Government agencies. The Food and Drug Administration, as his hearings have brought out, has been one of the worst offenders.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech to the National Dietary Foods Association on August 2, 1965, where he piles up the evidence against the FDA, be printed in the body of the RECORD. While public regulation of improper practices is necessary, we cannot permit a self-perpetuating bureaucracy to us gestapo tactics and to violate the legitimate rights of citizens which we have supposed were guaranteed by the Constitution.

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

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG, OF MISSOURI

As a Senator, and especially as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, my first interest has been to preserve and expand the freedom and rights of the individual. The primary goal of the National Dietary Foods Association is to promote better health for all Americans. It is one of the blessings, as well as one of the problems, of our modern society that both our primary interests have become thoroughly intertwined.

America and all aspects of American society have been growing at an ever expanding rate. The problems which confront us today on every hand have grown more complex. Our capacity to solve such problems has also grown but, unfortunately, not at the same pace.

I do not intend, today, to mull over gen-

erally the problems of our complex society. I would, however, like to discuss one problem and one dilemma facing all of us today.

We are concerned about promoting better health for Americans. All of us are also concerned with preserving individual rights and individual freedom. For the preservation of our freedom we have created many institutions; yet the primary safeguard will always reside with alert and interested citizens. To promote better health, we have also created many institutions, one of these being the Federal Food and Drug Administration; yet to a large extent, we must and should rely on individual initiative and discretion.

To make the Food and Drug Administration an effective agency of the people, we have had to bestow upon it very large powers. Yet today, because of a perverse idea of the public interest, the FDA is misusing these powers.

Very recently, in a court of law, an agent for the FDA, a man who is supposed to be a servant of the people, stated that "I wouldn't hesitate to tell a lie if it would help the American consumer."

To a man like me; to a man who has grown up in our American democracy; to a man who firmly believes in those principles of democracy and individual freedom which have made the United States the great Nation that it is today, this thoughtless statement by an officer of the Food and Drug Administration cannot be less than horrifying and disgusting.

It is axiomatic that protection of the consumer is a worthy goal—but such protection is worthless if, in the process, the whole basis of the American governmental and political system is to be eroded and destroyed.

The employee of the FDA who made this statement is not alone. Many key employees and officials of FDA have exhibited over and over again that they have no true understanding of the American way of life and the American democracy—they have failed, over and over again, to see that as they trample individual liberties, they cannot possibly further even their own goal of protecting the consumer.

The Food and Drug Administration, as it was conceived years ago, had worthy goals. Unfortunately, the agency has not lived up to these goals. On the one hand, it has been virtually ineffective in controlling large manufacturers and powerful interests; on the other, it has ruthlessly persecuted many small manufacturers and relatively weak groups of people.

In pursuing the health of Americans, the Food and Drug Administration is today undermining the health of America.

Three of our most basic God-given rights are embodied in the Bill of Rights. These rights are stated in the first, fourth, and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

The first amendment, in part, states that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

The fourth Amendment guarantees for all Americans the security of themselves and their possessions from unreasonable and illegal searches and seizures.

The fifth Amendment guarantees that no person shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and that no person shall be forced to testify against himself.

During the investigations and hearings held by my Senate subcommittee, we were dismayed and sickened to learn that the Food and Drug Administration has violated each and every one of these basic rights. Under the pretext of so-called consumer in-