

Taking away nothing from the very remarkable men who founded these United States, we would like to point out that, along with the disappointments, a lot of improvements have been made since those Good Old Days.

Tako 1789, the year George Washington became our first President:

The long, divisive war (opposed from the beginning by fully a third of the populace) had been miraculously won seven and a half years before.

Inflation and post-war depression had strained the public purse, temper and credulity.

After two years of debate, North Carolina and Rhode Island had yet to ratify the new Constitution and join the Union. More than thirty-five percent of all delegates at state ratifying conventions had, in fact, voted against the Constitution.

Even when ratified, what did the Constitution provide?

No guarantee of personal liberties, certainly. Our precious Bill of Rights would not be adopted until 1791—as a grudging compromise to the Nation's first protest movement, the Anti-Federalists, who feared unbridled government power.

No provision for religious freedom. In New Hampshire, Connecticut and Massachusetts separation of church and state was not to be achieved until well after 1800.

No solution to the agonizing slavery issue. It would take, seven decades later, history's bloodiest war and the loss of one out of five American men of military age to erase slavery from the land.

Nor was the right to vote guaranteed even to white males.

Every state had economic, religious or other restrictions on voting. In Rhode Island more than half of all adult white males would be disenfranchised until as late as 1843.

Women, of course, would not vote until 1920 and blacks in some parts of the country would be unable to exercise that right until a century after it was established in 1870.

Universal education, labor reforms, health laws—all were yet to rise out of nineteenth century humanitarian movements.

What the Constitution did provide was a beginning—a hard-won chance to build a Nation which, more than a century and a half later, laborer-philosopher Eric Hoffer would describe as "the only new thing in history."

The Revolution goes on. Sometimes peacefully, sometimes painfully.

And there is reason for confidence.

Ours is the first great nation, in the midst of unprecedented power and prosperity, to re-evaluate its own goals, question its own rightness and work from within to correct its injustices.

May we, as Marylanders, prove as equal to the task of doing the proper thing (if not always the most popular thing) as those first practical dreamers of the American Revolution.

Let's work together . . . Meeting the Baltimore Challenge.

THE SOKOLS

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, on July 17, I had the honor of addressing the 25th National Slet on the Slovak Catholic Sokol. At the convention, I was especially impressed by the sense of brotherhood of the Sokols and by their pride in both their ancestry and America. Since many of us are not familiar with the origin of Sokol organizations or of the particular character the organizations give to cities like Bethlehem, Pa., I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Bethlehem, Pa., Is Widely Known as a Sokol

City," published in the July 14 issue of the Falcon be printed in the RECORD.

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

BETHLEHEM, PA., IS WIDELY KNOWN AS A SOKOL CITY

Bethlehem, Pa., is truly called a Sokol City for the reason that it has two Sokol Halls and the members of both organizations live in peace, harmony and true brotherly Sokol love and spirit, as advocated by the Sokol founders.

Bethlehem, Pa., Slovak pioneers settled in this "Christmas City" 91 years ago. On June 29, 1971, we recalled the 80th anniversary of the ordination of their late great leader, Father Francis C. Vlossak, whose Centennial birthday we observed in 1964. Father Vlossak was a pioneer priest of Philadelphia archdiocese, out of which was created the Allentown diocese. He assisted the well known Msgr. William Heinen of Mauch Chunk, known as the "apostle of the Slovaks" in the Leigh Valley on account of establishing some 14 Slovak parishes.

Now what is the Sokol? It means Falcon and the Slavonic nations adopted the name to honor their heroes, who are called Sokols. The Sokol movement dates back to the boyhood of St. Methodius, who with his brother St. Cyril converted the Slovaks and the Slavs in the ninth century. It is related that St. Methodius as a boy was attached to a bird Falcon and practiced falconry, which was a popular sport among the European aristocracy.

The Slavonic poets and bards wrote about their heroes, whom they called Sokols.

But the movement was organized on February 18, 1862 in Prague, present Czechoslovakia by Dr. Miroslav Tyrš and his father-in-law Jindrich or Frederick Fugner for the purpose of Physical Fitness and training of members in virtues of life, also in perseverance to overcome the hardships of tyrannical governments, under which the Slavonic nations were forced to serve their oppressors.

The Sokols were known especially for their artistic banners, which were blessed by priests amid beautiful ceremonies. These banners were preserved and used in World War I., when the Czecho-Slovak Legions were organized in Russia by General Milan R. Stefanik, noted Slovak astronomer and scientist. General Stefanik was a Slovak and became a general in a French army within three years from an ordinary private. He served on General John J. Pershing's Allied Military Staff and visited the United States on several occasions. The first time in 1906 on his way to the Tahiti Island and the second time in 1917, when he was organizing Czecho-Slovak Legions with a Military Camp in Stamford, Conn.

General Stefanik wanted the Sokol (Falcon) to be the emblem of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and the highest decoration. Instead a lion was chosen.

A famous historian, Dr. Frantisek Rieger, exalted the Sokols over a century ago during one of their celebrations by naming them the Christian Knights of that period, who must always be ready to defend their faith.

The American Sokol took root after the Civil war in St. Louis, Mo., in 1865 and thus, in 1965 its Centennial was observed. It would have been started earlier but its leaders were occupied with the Civil War, aiding President Abraham Lincoln. For instance, on February 4, 1861, Colonel Geza Mihalotzy, born of Slovak parentage, petitioned President Lincoln for a permission to use his name for "Lincoln Rifemen of Slavonic Origin." The great emancipator "cheerfully granted the request."

However, after the Civil War, Sokol organizations began to flourish besides St. Louis, also in Chicago, New York, Iowa, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and other states.

It is noteworthy that during the Bi-Centennial of the city of St. Louis, former President Lyndon B. Johnson chose Stan Musial, noted baseball player, for his advisor on Physical Fitness for Musial, a son of a Polish father and a Slovak mother, born in Donora, Pa., received his first Physical Fitness training in the Polish Sokols, or Falcons.

The Bethlehem Slovak were also sports minded. The best proof is that way back in 1904 the young Bethlehem Slovaks organized the St. Anthony's Baseball Team. This team won 24 out of 26 games during that season under the captaincy of Charles Gostony, as reported way back in 1921 by John J. Bartos, one of the four living Sokol founders of Assembly 78 and our oldest Supreme Officer who were honored on December 5, 1970. During the same year the young Slovaks formed a football team. In 1908 they formed an Athletic Association of St. Anthony Juniors. In 1909 they formed the Athletic "Thomas" Club and a year later Assembly 78, was founded which was awarded many champion trophies by the Slovak Catholic Sokol organization.

The Bethlehem Sokols mindful of their duty for God and Nation, when World War I broke out, volunteered for the service in defense of their country. The records show that on June 9, 1917, first nine Slovak volunteered for the service of Uncle Sam. There were 93 Bethlehem Slovaks in the U.S. Army and 16 in U.S. Navy during World War I. George Silvay and John Nemcik paid the supreme sacrifice. The World War II gave a record number of young men and women to the service of their country and also during the Korean conflict and the present War in Vietnam.

And the Sokol organizations trained these men to be brave soldiers and loyal to their great country—the beloved U.S.A. Zdar Boh!

Your Editor,

JOHN C. SCRANKA.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROVIDING "SUPPORT" TO THAI TROOPS IN LAOS

Mr. CASE, Mr. President, it is more in sorrow than in anger that I report a glaring inconsistency in the administration position on the funding of Thai troops in Laos.

On July 15 I received an unclassified letter from the State Department which says that support for Thai "irregular" troops in Laos is being supplied under our military aid program for Laos.

This admission directly contradicts testimony given by Secretary of Defense Laird on June 14 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I believe it also violates the Fulbright amendment which forbids the use of Department of Defense money for funding foreign mercenaries in Laos.

During the June 14 hearing I asked Secretary Laird:

The military assistance program won't take care of the moneys being spent for regular or irregular Thai troops in Laos; that comes from somewhere else.

He replied:

That is correct. The military assistance program will not fund that program.

I continued:

In other words, you are not going to use military assistance or military credit sales in the future for mercenaries or other third-country military forces. This is not done now and you do not propose to do it in the future out of military assistance programs?

Secretary Laird answered:

No; the military assistance program is not used for that purpose and will not be used for that purpose.

And later, Secretary Laird said:

We can only provide excess military equipment to countries that have been approved for funding in the military assistance program.

I asked:

They cannot be used for irregular troops?

He answered:

That is correct; military assistance is furnished only to governments.

Yet a month later on July 15 the State Department wrote me:

Support for these [Thai] irregulars is supplied under the Lao military aid program which, as you know, is funded through the Department of Defense budget as "Military Assistance Service Funded" (MASF).

Secretary Laird's testimony may possibly be semantically in accord with the State Department letter if one were to accept that the military assistance program refers to only that part of military assistance funded through the Foreign Assistance Act and not to "Military Assistance, Service Funded." But since all military assistance to Laos and Thailand is "Military Assistance, Service Funded," this explanation would seem a bit attenuated, especially in light of the State Department's description of it as the "Lao military aid program—funded through the Department of Defense Budget as 'Military Assistance, Service Funded.'"

I stated in a speech on May 20, 1971, that I had learned "from Government sources that there are four to six thousand Thai troops in Laos and the U.S. Government, through CIA, is paying for them."

I stand by that statement, and I am glad we now have a better idea of where the money is coming from.

But the fundamental issue remains of the public's and the Congress' right to know what is happening in the "Secret War" in Laos. After all, the U.S. taxpayer is financing activities in Laos to the tune of at least \$350 million annually, not to mention the estimated \$2 billion cost for the air war over that country. The North Vietnamese and their allies certainly know we are fighting them in Laos, so why can the American people who are paying for it not have the same information?

An important first step would be for the administration to facilitate publication of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's staff report on Laos which is currently being delayed because of administration insistence that certain information, already reported in the press, be treated as classified. The administration apparently includes in this category details concerning the Thai troops in Laos, about which the State Department has just written me.

I would welcome an administration white paper which gives all the details on Laos: What it costs? Who is fighting? What agreements have been made with foreign governments; and of course most importantly, when will it all end?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that my letter to the State Department on the Thai troops in Laos, a Washington Star article, and the State Department's reply be included in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 21, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing Tammy Arbuckle's June 15 article from the *Washington Star* which reports that the Administration is planning to circumvent possible Congressional prohibitions on funds for Thai troops in Laos by supporting these troops with funds earmarked for assistance of Thailand.

I would appreciate it if you would comment on the points raised in Mr. Arbuckle's article and also answer the following questions:

1. Does the U.S. Government have any assurances from the Thai Government that assistance for Thailand will not be diverted to Laos or Thai troops serving in Laos?
2. What procedures does the U.S. Government have to insure that assistance to Thailand is not diverted to Laos or to Thai troops serving in Laos?
3. Is there any statutory basis for the Administration to authorize Thailand to divert assistance to Laos or Thai troops serving in Laos?
4. Does the Administration consider the anti-guerrilla campaign in Northeast Thailand to be another front of the war in Laos?
5. Are there any limitations on the use by the Thai Government of U.S. assistance?

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

[From the *Washington Star*, June 15, 1971]
OUTWITTING SENATE TO PAY THAI TROOPS
(By Tammy Arbuckle)

VIENTIANE.—The Nixon administration reportedly has a new gimmick ready to pay for Thai troops in Laos if the Senate prohibits funds for the Thais, informed sources here said.

The gimmick is to hide payment to the Thai troops serving in Laos in funds earmarked for Thailand itself.

"Formation of a force for antiguerrilla activities in northeast or northern Thailand will be announced," the sources said. "But these Thais will be sent to Laos and the money for that force will be used to pay for the Thais already serving in Laos."

The sources had no doubt this scheme would succeed. They said that although many Thai regular units were used in Laos, the Thai government as a whole was not fully informed of the situation.

The U.S. government, according to the sources, makes lump sum payments or bribes high-ranking members of the Thai army and government for the use of these units.

Some units are totally recruited from northeast Thailand, where Lao is the ethnic tongue, using the same system.

Recruiting is done there with the help of Thai military commanders. Sources gave this response to questions on feelings among Lao military officials following statements in the U.S. Senate about cutting the financing of Thai troops.

"Now you can see why the (Lao) generals are not worried," sources said on the Senate outcry.

Another Lao source said "you must understand we need the Thais."

None of the Lao generals was willing to send reinforcements to Gen. Vang Pao, the 2nd Military Region commander whose Meos

have been taking the brunt of North Vietnamese attacks in north Laos.

Lao military sources said Premier Souvanna Phouma himself requested additional help for Vang Pao, who lost most of his able-bodied Meos in action.

Meanwhile, Thai troops in North Laos are taking serious casualties, now estimated at 700 killed in action, over half of them this year.

The high casualties were caused because the Thais, with some bravery, made infantry charges up the hill slopes at Ban Na on the edge of the Plain of Jars against dug-in Vietnamese machine gunners. Lao troops who did not expose themselves to fire in the same action, suffered few casualties. "We did not just charge up the hills like the Thais. We were acting independently," said a source.

Thailand's two battalions which took part in the Ban Na attack were further decimated by three accidental U.S. air strikes on them. These U.S. errors took place on April 1, April 4 and April 6 this year on Thai battalions 904 and 600.

Thirty seriously wounded Thais were taken to Udorn hospital in northeast Thailand and 40 more were treated at Long Cheng.

All told an estimated 100 Thais were killed on the slopes near Ban Na, where the incidents happened.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1971.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of June 21, 1971, enclosing a *Washington Star* article by Tammy Arbuckle concerning U.S. financial support for Thai forces operating in Laos and posing questions about the Thai use of U.S. military assistance.

Since there are no Thai regular troops in Laos, we presume reference is being made to the Thai volunteers who are operating in irregular guerrilla units in Laos under the command of the Royal Lao Armed Forces. Support for these irregulars is supplied under the Lao military aid program which, as you know, is funded through the Department of Defense budget as "Military Assistance, Service-Funded" (MASF). Under current appropriation legislation, such funds can be used to support local forces in Laos. The Royal Thai Government has not control or part in the dispensation of Lao MASF, and no equipment, supplies, or funds are provided to the Royal Thai Government for the irregular Thai volunteer units in Laos. As you may recall, I have made other comments on the subject of Thai forces in Laos in my letter of May 19, 1971 to you.

Military assistance to Thailand, both formerly under the Foreign Assistance Act, and, more recently, under service-funding (MASF), has been furnished for the purpose of contributing to the defense of Thailand, including its internal security. The limitations on the use by the Thai Government of U.S. assistance are stated in the agreements between the U.S. and Thailand respecting provision of military assistance, in particular the Agreement of October 17, 1950, TIAS 2434. The Agreement includes undertakings by the Government of Thailand to use military assistance provided by the U.S. only for the purposes for which it was furnished except with the prior consent of the Government of the U.S. and to retain title to and possession and control of any material, unless the Government of the U.S. shall otherwise consent.

The limitation in the 1950 agreement is reinforced by the Military Procurement Authorization Act of 1970, PL-91-441, Section 502, which applies to the question of the Administration's ability to consent to a transfer by Thailand of U.S.-supplied military assistance to another country. The Act provides that no defense article may be fur-

nished to Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam or to local forces in Laos and Thailand with funds authorized for use of the U.S. Armed Forces (i.e., MASF, the current basis for funding such military assistance) unless the government concerned—in this case Thailand—shall have agreed that it will not, without the consent of the President, transfer the article, permit its use by anyone not an officer of the government, or use or permit its use for purposes other than those for which it was furnished.

The Act provides that, when the article is no longer needed for the purposes for which it was furnished, it will be returned to the U.S. unless the President consents to another disposition. The Act further provides that before the President may give his consent to a transfer or new use he must provide written notice to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate 15 days in advance of his proposed action.

There is accordingly no statutory or international agreement authorization for Thailand unilaterally to divert assistance received under Thai MASF to the Government of Laos or to the Thai volunteers in irregular forces operating in Laos. No unauthorized or authorized diversion of Thai MASF has occurred nor are there plans for any such move. I can assure you that we do take precautions against such diversion. Military assistance to Thai forces in Thailand is carefully monitored. Requirements for military assistance are developed in the field by the MAAG in consultation with our Embassy in Bangkok and the Ambassador. These requirements are validated at CINCPAC and forwarded to Washington. In Washington they are jointly reviewed by the Departments of Defense and State before programs are finally approved. Close interdepartmental scrutiny is given to the programs.

This Administration has followed, and intends to follow, existing laws. We are concerned with effectively implementing the Nixon Doctrine which would encourage Asian regional cooperation. One example of such cooperation is the assistance which the Thai Government and Thai individuals are providing to Laos. This assistance reflects a genuine Thai interest in its neighbor. Thailand shares a 1,000 mile border with Laos and has a natural concern over the impact that developments in that country may have upon Thailand's own security.

You asked about the relationship between the anti-guerrilla campaign in Northeast Thailand and the war in Laos. The Thai counterinsurgency campaign in Northeast Thailand is an internal defense effort and not another front of the war in Laos. However, this is not to deny the obvious—namely, that the unstable situation along the porous Lao/Thai border enhances the ability of the Communists in Thailand to receive materiel assistance from outside sources and to use neighboring areas of Laos for sanctuary and training purposes. It should be noted that the Thai Communist Party is an independent entity and, as far as we are aware, does not have any organizational connections with the North Vietnamese Communist Party or its offspring, the Laos Communist Party.

I hope the above provides satisfactory answers to your questions.

Sincerely,
 DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
 Assistant Secretary for Congressional
 Relations.

AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on May 24, 1971, I introduced the American Folklife Foundation Act to recognize and build upon the vital role of folklife within American culture.

On July 2, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey and I held hearings on this legislation. Among those testifying, all of whom were either involved in folk culture or dedicated leaders in its promotion and support, were Vine Deloria, Jr., author of "Custer Died for Your Sins," Johnny Shines, a modern blues guitarist from Alabama, and Dewey Balfa, a Cajun fiddler from Louisiana. This hearing dramatized the need to invest in our human resources, in the quality, range, and talent of Americans, much as we invest in our other natural resources. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that hearing be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION HEARING, JULY 2, 1971

Senator HARRIS. I welcome you to this "Folk Hearing" on legislation which Congressman Thompson (D., N.J.) and I and others have introduced to create an American Folklife Foundation.

These hearings will be transcribed and printed in the *Congressional Record* for use in connection in the official hearings held in the Senate and the House.

I would first like to thank S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of Smithsonian Institution, and other officials of the Smithsonian Institution for making it possible for us to conduct this hearing as a part of the Smithsonian Institution's 1971 Festival of American Folklife.

The bill which Congressman Thompson and I have introduced would create an American Folklife Foundation within the Library of Congress. Through this Foundation, vital public support would be lent to a wide ranging effort designed to foster both a broader and deeper understanding of this country's rich folklife. This festival, itself, may I say, is an outstanding example of an effort which the American Folklife Foundation could support.

I have a special interest in American Indians, American, English dialects and in blue grass music, but I am interested in all aspects of American Folklife culture. I am very much interested in this effort here that has been going on at the Smithsonian for several years.

Additionally, the American Folklife Foundation could support scholars and field researchers and thereby give us all a better understanding of the cultural history of America. But the purpose of this legislation is not simply to know what was and then to store it in an archive to gather dust. Rather we are interested in bringing the American folklife of 200 years ago, as well as the folklife of 20 years ago and of today, to bear on the daily lives of today's Americans. While we contemplate pure academic research in this bill, we also contemplate much more than that. We contemplate dissemination and preservation of America's folklife in such a way that it can bring understanding and perhaps even some wisdom to the decisions that our people—both individually and as a society—must make today and tomorrow.

The witnesses then we have today are people that effectively promote our folk culture, and I appreciate their willingness to participate in this hearing and their dedicated support of America's folklife.

I am Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma and the House sponsor of this bill is Representative Frank Thompson of New Jersey who will now make an opening statement and present our first panel.

Representative THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Senator. I join Senator Harris in my enthusiasm for this and my gratitude to those who have agreed to testify. We shall

first hear from Dr. David C. Sweet, Director of Ohio Department of Development and Ohio Supervisor of the 1971 American Folklife Festival; Reverend Mel Klokow, a minister of the Moravian Church in Ohio. His congregation will conduct a Love Feast at the festival, for which they are baking right now; and Dr. Francis Utley, Folklorist, Ohio State University. Gentlemen, we welcome you indeed and are pleased you can be with us.

The Festival of American Folklife has attracted hundreds of thousands of people in past years, and proved the widespread grassroots interest in the ethnic and folklore traditions of our nation. America has always taken pride in the diversity of its people, and the great contribution which many ethnic and racial groups have made to our culture, such as we have just seen in the Ohio exhibit. Many groups are represented. Building a strong nation does not require the sacrifice of cultural diversity and individuality. Quite the contrary, our nation will be the stronger, the more we learn to appreciate and value the many folklife traditions which shape our culture.

The bill which is the subject of this hearing is designed to develop, promote, and implement a broadly conceived national policy of support for American folklife. The definition of American folklife contained in the bill indicates the broad area of our national heritage which the bill encompasses. It reads:

(a) the term "American folklife" means the traditional customs, beliefs, dances, songs, tales, sayings, art, crafts, and other expressions of the spirit common to a group of people within any area of the United States; the term includes, but is not limited to, music (vocal and instrumental), dance, drama, lore, beliefs, language, humor, handicraft, painting, sculpture, architecture, other forms of creative and artistic expression, and skills related to the preservation, presentation, performance, and exhibition of the cultural heritage of any family, ethnic, religious, occupational, racial, regional, or other grouping of American people;

This Folklife Festival is a fine example of one type of activity which the legislation would promote and support. The bill would also provide for a number of other things, which the Senator has mentioned:

(a) research, scholarship and training in American folklife;

(b) a national Archive for the collection of creative works, handicrafts, objects of art, films, audio recordings, and other records which represent or illustrate some aspect of American Folklife;

(c) The production of films, exhibitions, and displays which represent or illustrate some aspect of American folklife;

(d) dissemination of information on folklife traditions and arts by the broadcasting of appropriate films and by loaning displays and exhibitions to museums, schools, and other groups;

(e) the production of materials specifically designed for use in classrooms, to be made available to educational institutions;

(f) the support of live performances, and workshops.

American Folklife has a fundamental impact on the beliefs and values of our people. It is appropriate, therefore, for the Federal Government to act now in developing a program of support for preserving and disseminating our folklife traditions and arts.

Now we shall hear from Dr. David C. Sweet.

Dr. DAVID C. SWEET. Senator Harris, Representative Thompson, thank you. The Department of Development is charged with the responsibility of making effective use of Ohio's resources to achieve economic development in the state. Business and industry assess the quantity and quality of a wide variety of a state's resources in their decision to invest capital in new or expanded facilities. We have learned that the most important resource a state can possess is its human resources—the quality, range and talent of