

February 24, 1971

coming to a head again this fall. The time is already short for the Administration to begin its move.

If we are to succeed in any realistic effort to bring Peking into the United Nations, we ought to begin our effort now to improve every major aspect of our China policy. We must stop nibbling around the edge of travel and trade restrictions, and establish a much more far-reaching redefinition of our overall policy.

For example, as I urged two years ago, I believe we should now recognize Peking as the government of China. We should also withdraw our American military presence from Taiwan, while continuing to maintain intact our long-standing guarantees of the security of the island. Only by these sorts of important steps, I believe, can we convince Peking that we genuinely seek its full involvement in the world community.

In sum, the time has come to admit the reality of China. We must begin to build the bridges that are necessary if we are to restore the ancient friendship and respect between China and America, and attain the reality of the generation of peace the President has promised.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in the closing days of the 92d Congress, on December 29, 1970, the Senate unanimously approved the Social Security Amendments of 1970—H.R. 17550—which provided for an increase in the social security payments by an average of 10 percent. The vote was 81 to 0.

As we know, the House of Representatives declined to act on our initiative, and the bill died with the expiration of the 91st Congress.

I do not propose to fix or attempt to fix blame for that failure—or to say that any Member or any committee has been derelict or negligent or anything of that sort. That Congress is history, and that chapter is closed.

For whatever reason, the Senate attempt to raise social security payments failed. It should not have failed.

My purpose in speaking today is to urge that we put the social security package high on the agenda for the new Congress.

The new Congress is in a sense the tabula rasa that Hobbes spoke of—the clean slate. We have it in our power to use that clean slate for whatever purpose we choose. We can write on it what we will—responsibly, or irresponsibly—for better or for worse.

I must point out that the aged in our country, our older people, our retired people, are least able to protect their own interests. They are not to blame for the economic trouble they now find themselves in. Rather, they are the victims of circumstances beyond their control.

Our older people did not cause the inflation which is now eroding their ability to support themselves. They do not have the ability to cope with this inflation—they are often too old or too infirm to enter the labor market.

They frequently have no resources on which to fall back on; even if a man has been extraordinarily prudent about providing for his old age, with annuities, savings, or health insurance plans. Many a life's savings which in happier times would have been considered adequate by all prudent men for retirement has been dissipated by a combination of inflation

and the costs of catastrophic illness. Health costs have, as we know, gone through the ceiling in recent years.

From figures gathered by our special committee on aging we know, for instance, that the average costs for medicines, doctors, and hospital care for a person over 65 in 1969 were \$692, and only half that sum could be covered by medicare.

Our older citizens did not cause these incredible increases in health costs—again, they are the victims, not the culprits.

The older Americans do not have the influence in our national life which their numbers and their status deserve. About 20 million Americans today are over the age of 65. By way of comparison, let me point out that there are currently enrolled in all of America's colleges and universities some 7 million students. There are, then, roughly three times as many Americans in the over 65 category as there are college students.

Yet, we pay infinitely more attention to the views and interests of the college students than we do our senior citizens. This is not to say that we can or should neglect the needs of our college students; we cannot and we should not.

What I am saying is that we have a special obligation to our older citizens because, as a class, those citizens are least able to protect themselves.

Earlier this week the report to the Senate by the special committee on aging, on which I have the honor to serve, stated that we now have not a problem, but a crisis, in retirement income.

That conclusion was not a partisan statement—it was substantially concurred in by the minority members of the committee in our separate views:

We, of the minority, suggested that the chief problem of our older citizens continues to be the need to keep individual income at a tolerable level.

Our committee, under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), heard extensive testimony from citizens in all parts of the country. The committee—majority and minority members alike—has agreed that a new national policy for and commitment to our older citizens is not only justified, but is urgently needed.

In my judgment, Congress should act as quickly as possible on the 10 percent social security increase that died in the last Congress. And, when we do press that increase, we should make that increase retroactive to January 1.

This is not a question of "either/or"—either we pay proper regard to the needs of our older citizens or we take care of other pressing domestic priorities. There is nothing mutually exclusive about doing both. We have it in our power to do both. We are rich enough and strong enough and, hopefully, compassionate enough to do both.

This measure is not the cure-all for the ills of our older citizens. But it is a needed step at this time. For many of our older citizens, it is the difference between dignity and despair. We have the power to give our older citizens a measure of the dignity they deserve.

THE MEETING OF LEFT AND RIGHT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, based on the vitality of our society has been the continuing debate between people holding various political perspectives. Our history is replete with examples of various philosophies manifesting themselves in political parties, and in many cases their translation into national and international policy. The debate within our country has rarely been more fervent than it is today, nor has it taken as many forms.

One of the unique and well articulated new philosophies on the political scene is libertarianism. Although it claims a long history, it has not received much public attention until rather recently. Its proponents vary in their intellectual histories, coming to this point of view via the right wing of the Republic or on one extreme and from the New Left on the other.

Recently a number of articles, editorials, and television appearances focused on libertarianism. A most comprehensive and concise presentation of this perspective was published in the New York Times of February 9, 1971. The article was written by Professor Murray N. Rothbard, an economist who has written extensively on libertarianism. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rothbard's article be printed in the Record.

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

THE NEW LIBERTARIAN CREED (By Murray N. Rothbard)

Recently a great deal of publicity has been given to a burgeoning split in the right wing, a split between the dominant Buchanan Review conservatives and the libertarianism.

In their breakaway, the libertarians are strong on college campuses and among the youth, hark back to an older, most forgotten tradition of individualism that characterized the right wing of the 1930's and 40's. Led by such notable intellectuals as Albert Jay Nock and F. A. Hayek, and by the Taft wing of the publican party among the politicians, the older right wing was devoted to the defense of the individual.

It therefore led the opposition to the growth of Big Government in America, growth presided over by New Deal liberalism. This older right wing upheld liberty and the economic freedom of the market economy while opposing government intervention, conscription, military American intervention and imperialism.

Since the mid-1950's, however, the National Review has led the right into a conservative stance. In rhetoric, the National Review upholds a "fusion" of old and order: in which the liberty of the individual is judiciously contained within a matrix of order supplied by the state. In early days, William Buckley proclaimed himself a libertarian, with the single exception of the need to wage an all-out war against the "Communist conspiracy" at home and abroad. This concession was enough, as the entire thrust of his conservative foreign policy was redirected against the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

But since the mid-50's, as the conservative movement has moved ever closer to the seats of power, whatever libertarian

February 24, 1971

had been in the "fusion" have one by one disappeared. And so the National Review now supports, with scarcely a qualm, the gigantic misinvestment of the SST and space programs, the nationalization of passenger rail service, restrictions on imports, and virtually the entire Nixon program. It warmly supports laws enforcing moral codes, and opposes civil liberties, as well as the American tradition of separation of church and state. It was in response to this systematic shedding of their libertarian strands that so many right-wing youth have rebelled and have broken out on their own. The tensions and inner contradictions of the attempt to fuse liberty and order have finally split the conservative coalition apart.

The libertarian doctrine begins, not with the conservative community or state but with the individual. Every individual as an independent acting entity possesses the absolute right of "self-ownership," that is, to own his or her person without molestation by others. From this axiom we derive total opposition to conscription and absorption of the individual. Secondly, each individual then has the right to own any previously unowned resources (such as virgin land) that he finds and brings into use by exerting his personal energy upon the resource. From this is derived the right of "homesteading" landed property, and, as a consequence, all the other rights of private property. For if a man owns himself and his homesteaded land, he also has the right to own unmolested the land he has transformed into capital, as well as the right to give his property to anyone he wishes (hence the right of inheritance) and to exchange his titles to property with anyone else's titles (hence the right of contract and the *laissez-faire* free-market economy).

The conservative holds as one of his high goals the preservation of "law and order" but his "order" and his "law" is the arbitrary dictation of the state. Throughout history, and in the present day as well, the state has lived through the profound order of continuing aggression against the individual and property of countless individuals. Through taxation, enslaves through conscription and murders by way of club, riot, napalm and H-bomb. The libertarians hold that the state is permanent aggression and disorder, and that the National Review conservatives constitute some of the most articulate champions and apologists of the state.

Young libertarians are not simply reacting to Taft-era individualism. In asserting themselves as libertarians they are reacting as well to the tradition which once made America as the proud beacon of freedom, the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson and Garrison. And in doing so they are repudiating such conservative extremists as James Burnham editor of the National Review, who has conceded that there is no rational foundation for government and has asserted in a reversion to the despotic theories of divine right, that at times, before the illusions of science, corrupted traditional wisdom, the cities (states) were known to be "divine cities."

His recent call in National Review for Bismarck for America and for a return of fascism is the logical culmination of conservative statism and obedience. The libertarians, in contrast, are the standards of freedom and reason by which this country was founded.

ENVIRONMENTAL DILEMMA— BY SENATOR PERCY

SEN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), on Sunday delivered the

—240—Part 3

keynote address during Technology Week at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Entitled "The Environmental Dilemma," his remarks offer a cogent description of the choices we face in preserving and enhancing our environment. I think we can all benefit from the Senator's thoughts, and I commend them to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

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

THE ENVIRONMENTAL DILEMMA (By Senator Charles H. Percy)

I should like to thank your distinguished President, Dr. Hansen, for inviting me to participate in this important forum. Technology Week promises to add significantly to our knowledge of our environmental problems and to be useful in charting the course that must be taken if we are to avert ecological disaster.

I have decided tonight to eliminate the chronicle of environmental horrors that is customary at the opening of an address such as this. I have done so for two reasons:

First, statistics documenting the deterioration of our planet have, like body counts from Southeast Asia, lost their capacity to shock us. We know that we dump 48 million tons of raw sewage, chemicals and pesticides in the oceans each year, and that we discard 48 billion cans. Both of these figures are so large that they dull the senses. I doubt that even the phrase, "48 trillion," would be likely to have much impact.

Secondly, you will be hearing later in the week from individuals who have a much greater command of the facts and figures in their specific areas than I do. I will leave the gruesome details to them.

What I would like to do on this occasion is to offer some broad outlines that can either be filled in or erased in your subsequent discussions. If I can stimulate—or provoke—you, I will have served my purpose.

The single most important thought I would like to leave with you tonight is simply this: As human beings, as consumers, we all live in environmental glass houses, and we will achieve nothing if we continue to throw stones at each other. If we are sincerely interested in preserving and protecting our Earth, it is futile to attempt to assess blame for the conditions we face today.

Let me quote President Nixon on this subject:

"The fight against pollution... is not a search for villains. For the most part, the damage done to our environment has not been the work of evil men... It results not so much from choices made, as from choices neglected; not from malign intention, but from failure to take into account the full consequences of our action."

It seems to me apparent that a positive program, with a broad base of support and with the emphasis on cooperation and coordination, is required to reclaim the environment, and that name-calling can only be an impediment to progress.

Each of the groups represented here—business, government, education and technology—has a major role to play in any comprehensive plan for environmental management. Permit me to offer one Senator's thoughts on what these roles should be and how they relate to each other.

I will begin with business, to which I devoted a quarter-century of my life and which has had its knuckles rapped exceptionally severely by ecologists lately.

In my opinion, exhorting business to develop a more acute social conscience is an activity of limited value. This is not to say

that business is unconcerned about the physical and social environment in which it functions, yet the fundamental force operating on business is the profit discipline. Business must make money if it is to satisfy its stockholders and survive.

Herbert P. Doan of the Dow Chemical Company, which perhaps has absorbed more of the activists' ire than any other corporation, offers what I think is a completely reasonable view of the role of business in environmental protection. He says:

"Industry's responsibility is to create products and services within the limits of government policy and public attitudes. With the needs identified and proper incentives, industry can serve society at low cost."

In my judgment, we can most effectively enlist business in the environmental crusade by appealing to its economic self-interest. And this appeal takes its shape in the form of enlightened governmental policies and pressures exerted by the consuming public.

President Nixon spoke to this point in his message to the Congress on the environment this year when he said:

"Our goal must be to harness the powerful mechanisms of the marketplace, with its automatic incentives and restraints, to encourage improvement in the quality of life."

In general, the federal government must use its taxing authority to make it more expensive to pollute than not to pollute. This can be achieved through such devices as directly taxing the lead in gasoline and the sulfur in fuel, both of which have been proposed by the President, or through offering tax credits to those corporations which install pollution control equipment. But no matter what the technique utilized, the end result should be to put the polluter at a competitive disadvantage.

Where injury to our environment cannot be readily prevented through judicious application of the laws of the marketplace, government must use its regulatory powers—either separately, or in addition to a related tax payment—to discourage pollution. If the fines imposed were stiff enough—if, for example, industrial violators of water quality standards were fined \$25,000 per day, as Mr. Nixon has proposed—then results would be immediately evident.

Government's course appears reasonably clear, and there is no question but that we have made some progress. The Clean Air Act Amendments passed by the last Congress, for example, order the automobile industry to build by 1975 cars that are 90 percent cleaner than those which exist today—and auto exhaust fumes are responsible for between 60 and 80 percent of our air pollution.

Yet it is naive to argue, as some careless observers of politics and government have done, that if Congress were to act responsibly for a few months, we would be well down the road toward solving our environmental problems. The environment is a "motherhood" issue, so this simplistic line of reasoning goes, and any delay in implementing new anti-pollution laws must be ascribed to the venality or stupidity—or both—of the politicians.

To use the most elegant word that immediately occurs to me, this is hogwash. It is true that there is no overt pro-pollution lobby, but it is also true that any changes which involve serious economic dislocations will have some enemies, and the environment has its share. More to the point, however, "Where there are priorities there is politics," as Mayor John Lindsay of New York City has so accurately observed. And when competing interests struggle for limited federal funds, someone invariably loses.

The question is not whether or not we want clean air. Everyone, in and out of government, certainly does. The question is whether we want clean air more than we want, say, an airplane that flies faster than