

religion as a foot note to sculpture and chronologies. Religion, of course, is part of art and history, but the mere dry details in such a substitution in no way satisfy the requirement of the brotherhood of prayer which so many Americans believe should be an important part of the public school day. Another suggested substitute is a now and then read religion. God is included in a great book of noble citations for use at a teacher's discretion in an "opening exercise." We hasten to agree that the event might work out well and we know there are honest men who suggest this. What we contend against, note well, is the substitution of this eclectic series of readings in which God is incidentally present for the moment of common prayer.

Surely the reverent majority of the American people need not settle for an interstitial and non-participatory religion. Another suggested substitute is the moment of silent meditation. We have always conceded that a silent God is better than no God. But meditation is difficult and meditation has about it a strict singularity. To expect children to meditate wisely is mostly unreal. And even if they achieved perfection, this would remain a peculiarly personal experience in which the value of a spoken brotherhood of prayer would be lost. . . . In brief, while we must honestly probe toward additional spiritual components for public school education, we must not permit ourselves to be side-tracked from the clear necessity of repealing precedents which can only be repealed through a clarifying amendment.

There is one other point which must be made here. Admittedly the whole area of Church-State relations is a difficult area. There is room for honest debate in many places. Our opponents, for instance, have constructed a plausible case for the Supreme Court's majority reading of the First Amendment. We could spend the rest of the evening demolishing that case detail by detail. We shall not do so—and for one compelling reason. Even if the opposition is correct and, as a matter of exact wording, the Supreme Court did properly read the establishment and free exercise clauses, still our position is valid. In such a supposition, the words of the amendment no longer accord with the understanding of the amendment as evidenced by the consistent and continuous practice of the nation in the area of public reverence from its beginning. The words must, in this hypothesis, be adjusted to accommodate the will of the people. Otherwise the people are prisoners of language, which itself was designed to serve them. In either case, whoever is right, the task of finding a satisfactory language for the clarifying Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer has not been easy. Once again, in this as in so many critical areas of collective action, a way must be found to express as best we may the will of the nation. Otherwise, we create an intolerable situation in which, for want of words, that will is thwarted in a matter of major importance. We, in Citizens for Public Prayer, continue to have faith in the ingenuity, good will and ability of the Congress to discover the right language.

ACTION

What should now be the action stance of those who believe in the Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer? Two bench-marks must, first, be set down. These are based on our experience in the prayer fight.

a. support for the amendment announced by religious and civic leadership must go further than a mere one-time resolution. If a man really believes with us that this cause is of major and radical significance, he must be asked to give continuous evidence of his belief.

b. we have simply got to dramatize this issue. A silent gentle majority, it was proven in 1964, cannot accomplish its purpose. We must be noisy, we must be loud and long. We must pile-drive this issue—again and

again and again. One letter is not enough. One telephone call is not enough. One message to a Congressman is not enough. We have got to break through the very real sound barrier we have had to face in so many of the news media and demonstrate that the issue is alive, that honest men and women believe in it, and that the only victory is success of prayer amendment proposals on the Hill and, later, in each of the fifty States. The manner of dramatizing, the method of campaign must be left to the ingenuity of individual citizens. If our opponents are in so many instances, *generals without armies*—that is big name officials with mimeo machines and PR staffs but little public support even from their own apparent constituents—we are in a way armies without generals. We do not have the central moneys, the efficient headquarters, the paid propagandists. We must rely on the native, grass-roots action of millions of Americans in plain places with plain weapons. Such a force can, of course, be massive; but it will only be so if everyone who hears this message takes it to heart and dedicates himself to a continuous, all-out effort.

Four years ago, when we started this great grass-roots effort, many of us were new at the game of politics. We recognized that we had a supremely right cause. But I'm afraid we may have supposed that such a cause would carry on its own naked excellence, that we had simply to remind a willing Congress and we would win. We have grown since then. We are now veterans. We have the scars of old soldiers. We have learned the ways of war. We have discovered that wishing will not make it so, that for all its wonderful justice the cause of public reverence must like all other causes campaign over the tough terrain of politics if it is to succeed. Let me sum up some of the things we have perhaps come better to understand now, than when we began:

1. that unless and until a Congressman specifically promises to back a prayer amendment (NOT a resolution) and proves his promise by speaking repeatedly to his constituents and otherwise demonstrating that this is indeed a major issue for him too, he is not adequately with us. The same, precisely, is true of our religious leaders local and central.

2. that blocking action in a congressional committee can prevent even a matter in which 80% of the nation concurs from reaching the floor and that, when this action happens, we can anticipate precious little if any support from men and news media who otherwise blast chairmen of congressional committees who booby-trap action on other items.

3. that one-night stand involvement is useless, that we have simply got to become PILE DRIVERS or, as I said of Mrs. Murray O'Hair and myself after our Boston debate, BULL DOGS if we are to win. Again and again and again, using every resource and outlet within our reach, we have got to grip this issue, we have got to pile drive it home.

4. that we fight a most resourceful and well organized opposition which switches from tactics of silence, substitution and selective citation to outright attack on us as fanatics, and that this opposition is notably assisted by the ambiguity and/or non-involvement of those who should be speaking loudly on our side.

5. that silent petitions and silent letters are not sufficient to political success, that notice must be directed to the stymied majority, that we simply must PUBLICIZE AND PRESS LOUDLY our cause in every way open to us.

6. that financial support is indispensable even to a grass roots cause such as ours. Contributions as well as prayers are urgently needed by each of the citizen prayer groups.

The key words are: pile driver, bull dog. They key phrase is keep your eye on the ball.

The key people are *God and us*. The key comparison is that we must be as alive in our effort for this civil right as are our neighbors in their effort for other civil rights. What a tragedy it would be for America if the fight for human equality were won in the same generation which, by its apathy and astigmatism, lost the fight for God as a real presence in its public assembly. What a tragedy if we attain the brotherhood of man and deny our children and ourselves the civil right to declare reverently the fatherhood of God in public places!

Perhaps I can best conclude with another excerpt from the testimony I offered before the Senate Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee in Washington on 5 August last:

The effort here is not for school prayer alone but rather to arrest once and for all at the prayer point a process of secularism which unless radically checked, must erode away all public reverence.

This is a great cause, ladies and gentlemen. This is one of the greatest causes ever before the conscience of the nation. With His help we shall indeed overcome.

Latin American Political Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an unusually thoughtful speech on the subject of political development in Latin America has been brought to my attention. The speech was delivered by Dr. John A. Plank, a senior staff member at the Brookings Institution. The occasion was the January 12 annual meeting of the trustees of the Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women Voters in Washington.

Dr. Plank described the "profound political change" that is in the air of Latin American nations. He stated his opinion of the situation as "being full of opportunities to be seized rather than as being laden with risks and dangers to be suppressed or evaded." And he developed a strong case for active U.S. involvement in the political development of Latin America, with particular emphasis on the involvement of the private sector.

I request, Mr. Speaker, that the full text of the speech be reprinted here:

There was a time, not many years ago, when a talk like this one could quite properly begin with the story of the young Peruvian who was taking tea one Sunday afternoon with a proper Bostonian lady at her Beacon Hill home. The conversation moved along graciously if aimlessly, the lading asking the standard array of conventional questions, the young man giving the conventional answers. Suddenly the young man announced, "You know, senora, in my country bull-fighting is our favorite sport." "Oh!" exclaimed the lady, "Isn't that revolting?" "Ah, no, senora, in my country revolting is our second favorite sport."

Times change. I still like the story very much and will share it on every appropriate and inappropriate occasion. But I can no longer tell it with the justification that it is not only funny but also useful in reflecting something important about Latin American politics. For it was clearly the case, in my view, that until very recently Latin America

was politically among the most stable areas of the world, despite the surface political pyrotechnics, despite the impassioned rhetoric, despite the violence.

Today what we see in Latin America is not "revolting," but revolution in the most comprehensive and profound sense. It is needless here to detail the revolutionary forces at work in the region, for they are now commonplaces to you. We all know what they are and that they affect every dimension of Latin American life—social, cultural, economic to you. We all know what they are in no country in the area that is immune to them—except perhaps and marginally Haiti. And we know that there is no country in the area whose leaders are not obliged to respond to these forces in an effort to control them, to canalize them, to accommodate them.

CHANGE IN THE AIR

The old order is breaking up with amazing rapidity in Latin America, and if Whirl is not King, Whirl is ever-present as a lurking possibility. Upon only one thing is there fairly universal agreement in Latin America today: the old order is unsatisfactory, the old institutions, the old ways of doing things, the old relationships both within societies and among them are inadequate to present and emerging requirements. Change is in the air and it must come, profound political change.

My own disposition—and, I am persuaded to believe it is also the disposition of increasing numbers of Latin America's elite groups—is to regard the present situation in Latin America as being full of opportunities to be seized rather than as being laden with risks and dangers to be suppressed or evaded. This is the time, if ever there has been a time, for innovation and invention, boldness and imagination, not for fear and trembling. The future is open in Latin America as it has never been before, everything is up for review and questioning. Latin America which in the past has contributed little to the world's store of constructive and political and social invention is today presented with its opportunity to make major contributions to political development, to demonstrate that political invention did not cease in 1787 or 1789, in 1917 or 1949, to demonstrate that it is indeed possible to have the Revolution in Freedom in which President Frei of Chile so devoutly believes.

I am far from suggesting that the political development task Latin America confronts is an easy one. For one thing, both the pace of change and the magnitude of the forces impelling change have no historic parallels—Latin American leaders today cannot do what their forefathers used so casually to do—reach out into the grabbag of constitutional and political experience elsewhere in the world (the United States, France, Germany) and blithely pick up a device and incorporate it formally if superficially into their political system. Latin America's political development task is new, and neither we nor they—nor, for that matter, the communist powers—have ready answers for them. For another, the challenge of political development is intrinsically a formidable one. For consider: what is required is the reconciliation of three not easily compatible elements: domestic order, rapid and effective growth in respect of the provision of social and economic goods and services, and meaning, and meaningful democracy—or to put the matter in alliterative terms what is required is peace, progress, and participation . . . as Vice President Humphrey recently expressed it, I know of no responsible Latin American who does not assign importance to each of these, although the priorities he establishes among them vary from situation to situation, country to country.

MEANINGFUL DEMOCRACY

In Brazil, for example, highest priority has been assigned to efficiency measured in growth terms, even at substantial cost—in view of most of us—of meaningful democ-

racy. In Argentina immediately after the overthrow of President Illia last June first priority went to order: the integration of the Argentine nation, the assertion of authority, the establishment of hierarchy. In Chile President Frei has not equivocated in assigning first importance to participation, to meaningful democracy for all who live in Chile, to distributive justice.

Had we time we could consider other approaches to political development in Latin America, the approaches of President Belaunde Terry in Peru, of President Carlos Lleras Restrepo in Colombia, of President Leonil in Venezuela. The approaches differ in accordance with the temperaments and experience of leaders, with the nature of the societies they govern, with the immediate problems they feel themselves obliged to meet. But I think it can be said and said persuasively that there is scarcely a leader in Latin America today who does not consciously think of himself as trying to lead a political revolution. There are no status quo Presidents in the region, no "Keep cool with Coolidges," no "back to normalcy" advocates.

It does not need to be stressed here that the task of political development in Latin America pertains overwhelmingly to the Latin Americans themselves. These are their societies, it is they who must and will develop, they who will find their own ways. It would be not only inappropriate, it would be impossible, for us in the United States to relate ourselves to their development process in other than marginal ways. Nevertheless there is a role, and a crucial one, for us in their political development process, and it is to that subject that I want to turn.

FOUR PREMISES

Let me before going further, set out a handful of premises that underlie my thought. First, then, it seems to me we should quite consciously and unabashedly accept that political development is a deeply moral enterprise, infused with value. What we are concerned about is the quality of human life, the life of persons, individual persons. We are ourselves products of the Judaic-Christian tradition, and the Latin Americans are too. We need not equivocate or dissimulate with respect to what our values are. Our political development activity should be consciously biased toward facilitating the emergence in Latin America of political systems that are meaningfully participant constitutional democracies, the emergence of governmental systems that are responsive, responsible, and effective. I stress this because a number of my academic colleagues are pushing hard for a "value-free" approach to political development, either on the ground that any other approach constitutes cultural imperialism, intolerable ethnocentrism, or on the ground that it is intellectual unrespectable to let values intrude in one's activity.

Second, I believe that we in the United States do have political knowledge, political skills, political experience that are relevant to and exportable to Latin America. I stress this because there are numbers who say that our experience is basically irrelevant to the contemporary situation in the developing world, or who say that any attempt to export is unwarranted interference or is too risky, of all areas, say they, the political is the most sensitive.

Third, it seems to me that although we live during a time of intense nationalism when the assertions of the perquisites of national sovereignty are frequent and vociferous, never has there been a time when national frontiers were more permeable. The revolution in communications insures this, a revolution for which we are largely responsible. We are flooding Latin America, not only as increasing numbers of us in public and private capacities move around in the area, but much more significantly through our domination of the media. The question,

then is not whether we shall or shall not breach "national" frontiers; the question is whether we shall breach them with conscious political development ends in view, or whether we shall breach them indiscriminately, non-purposefully. This situation is one to be viewed as full of opportunities to be exploited rather than of risks to be avoided or minimized.

Fourth, it seems to me that there is receptivity in Latin America to any constructive political development assistance we may be able to provide. The Latin Americans are confronting new situations for which little in their own experience has equipped them. They will accept help—why should they not? What is important is the way the help is offered and the assumed motivation that underlies the offer. I say this in full awareness of the ambivalence of attitude toward us in Latin America—on the one hand it is widely recognized that we do indeed represent "success" as success is measured by most relevant indices in mid-XXth century and therefore, in important ways, as something of a model to be emulated; on the other hand, national self-identification in Latin America is felt to depend upon differentiation and independence from the United States. But the kinds of political development assistance I have in mind and the kinds for which I believe there is receptivity do not imply subordination to the United States or conventionally defined United States interests.

ROLE OF PRIVATE SECTOR

So much by way of premises. What can our role in Latin America's political development process be? I should say at once that my concern here is exclusively with the role of the private sector. I do not want to minimize the role of the United States Government in political development activity. It is important and will continue to be so. Moreover, with the inclusion of Title IX in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 the Agency for International Development is now expected to give specific and systematic attention to one critical aspect of political development, popular participation both in decision-making and program implementation, in its assistance to developing countries.

Two thoughts occur, however. In the first place, the United States government is not the most favored or most indicated element to deal in political development matters. As a government it deals, *faute de mieux*, largely with other governments, whereas political development is something that occurs in areas far removed from government as usually conceived: political development has to do with the acquisition of skills, attitudes, values, behavior patterns of political actors, the bolstering of institutions of all kinds that have political development pertinence: interest groups, mediating groups, voluntary associations.

Second, it can hardly be thought desirable that the major responsibility for involvement in political development activities should fall to the United States government. Most persons who work for the government abroad are uncomfortable in political development roles: they are not professionally equipped for it, they are rather equipped with technical skills and are generally conditioned to regard political matters with reserve. And of course assigning principal responsibility to the United States government for political development automatically calls into play all the latent suspicion of United States policy in host Latin American countries. Finally, it is more difficult for the United States government as such to mount a sustained, disinterested, and consistent political development program than it is for private groups and agencies, for in the first and the last analysis the primary interest of the United States government is the United States, and it must respond to exigencies, forces, pressures that are not necessarily compatible

with the conceived interests and goals of the host countries.

PLEA FOR INVOLVEMENT

My plea, then, is for private sector involvement in political development. I am aware that you in this room are concerned about precisely the matter we are discussing—at least insofar as the activities of the Fund correspond to the activities of the League. I am in a sense, then, preaching to the converted. But I believe there is still something to be said, perhaps to you, certainly to other private sector elements.

Notoriously many private agencies are working in Latin America; church groups, farmers groups, labor groups, university groups, business groups, cooperative groups. How many of them are working with conscious political development concerns? There may—indeed often is—political development spin-off from their activities. A marginal political development increment can be derived from the setting up of a garden club—in respect of the acquisition of organizational skills and cooperative activity. Perhaps no more should be asked of private groups working in Latin America than that they continue to do what they have been doing. Perhaps we can operate on the assumption that the cumulative effect of their activities will be the emergence of decent and effective political systems—or that at least the net consequence of their work will be progress in that direction.

I should like to urge, though, that leaders of these groups at least think about relating their activities to an encompassing political development goal. I am concerned, for example, as much about linkages and effective communication among groups and strata in Latin American societies as I am about giving particular help to isolated elements within separate groups and strata. I am much concerned to see Latin American elites acquire the capability of accommodation and response to pressures from below as I am to see the underdogs acquire an effective voice.

But the matter goes beyond this. As it seems to me the political development challenge in Latin America has an element of real urgency about it, and that its implications transcend both immediate problems of social and distributive justice and the problems we associate with the confrontation between democracy and totalitarianism. What bothers me is a problem that will be very real for us in forty years time but one which we must begin to meet now. The problem arises directly from the disproportionate rates of population growth and growth of product. Unless massive efforts toward effective democratization are undertaken in Latin America now, unless skills, attitudes, values, institutions appropriate to democratic political behavior are acquired very soon, I fear that with the passage of another generation the sheer requirements of organization and distribution will conduce Latin American leaders toward sharply authoritarian or totalitarian political dispensations. And it is unlikely that a totalitarian clampdown under such circumstances, given the availability of contemporary instruments of persuasions, coercion, and control, could be undone. That is the real, the long-term challenge of political development, and that is why I think it demands the best efforts of all of us as citizens.

THREE AREAS OF ACTIVITY

Speaking broadly, I think private agencies involved in Latin America could concern themselves with three areas of political development activity. In decreasing order of abstractness, they are (1) conceptualization; (2) research; and (3) training. By conceptualization I mean simply the thinking through of present and emerging problems and the construction of possible resolutions of them. Two examples are on my mind. In Venezuela, because of its extraordinary endowment, the Venezuelans have been able to

march very rapidly along the path toward industrialization. The Venezuelans have been heard to say, "We dropped from the trees into Cadillacs in one generation." What is true is that Venezuela has been able to import, as other Latin American countries have not yet, mid-XXth Century technology at a vertiginous rate. This means increasingly an automated technology. Yet Venezuela has one of the highest rates of population growth in the world, and estimates of Venezuela's unemployment rate range anywhere from 14% to 25% of the adult employable population. It is often maintained that if these persons had appropriate skills, they could be readily employed. Perhaps. But I see a problem emerging sooner for Venezuela than for most other countries. Some new distributive mechanism is going to have to be devised, for increasing numbers of Venezuelans are simply not going to be able to earn their wages in the market. (We, of course, may soon have to confront the same situation with many of our marginal population groups in this country—the rich get richer, the poor get poorer.) What we need is fresh thinking, innovative thinking, about the socio-political problem that automation poses for a country like Venezuela. There is no reason at all to suppose that any constructive suggestions any of us might have would be received and weighed by the Venezuelans. It is their problem; they will need a resolution of it. That the solution originates in the mind of a non-Venezuelan is not going to be controlling. But who among us is giving thought to this matter in other than a hand-wringing way?

In Chile, the government of President Frei is persuaded, on the basis of Chile's historical experience and the country's present, that conventionally accepted definitions of property are inappropriate. The Lockean definition will not do, in part because it violates the interpretation of Christian democracy that Frei has derived from his own process of maturing and from the most recent papal encyclicals, in part also, of course, because the Lockean definition has resulted in what—as seen by Frei—is gross inequity in respect of ownership of what there is to own. On the other hand, the collectivist approach to property is anathema to Frei, for he is profoundly Christian, most of all in the reverence he pays to the dignity and sanctity of the person. Frei is looking for a *tertium quid*. He has a name for it—communitarianism. He does not yet have operationally useful content for the name. He needs help. We as citizens can put our minds to work on that problem. The resolution of it, if one can be found (if, for example, we could get a viable operational handle on the thought of Simone Weil) the resolution of it would be helpful not only to Frei and Chile but to the rest of the world as well.

BOLD CONCEPTUALIZING

At less dramatic levels, it seems to me that representatives of groups can do much more imaginative and bold conceptualizing. Take the media, for example, and the critical role they perform in making possible a democratic polity. What can be done to make more likely that the media will behave responsibly. One does not like to think that the proposed Brazilian press law is an answer. On the other hand, when President Frei before the last congressional elections suggested that all papers should carry reliable information about the programs and activities of all contending political parties, he was condemned. One irate editor shouted, "No one is going to force me to print in my paper anything I regard as violate of the good, the true, and the beautiful"—or words to that effect; and Frei's initiative repercutted throughout Latin America. But an informed electorate is a *sine qua non* for democracy; and the electorate in today's world in the last analysis can only be informed through the media.

Let me move rapidly to the second level, that of research. What I have in mind here is research of a special kind. There does not yet exist, though I hope one day it will, a sub-discipline properly to be called "applied political science." What is wanted is research that falls somewhere between "grand theory" and "art for art's sake" and short-term, operationally oriented, project feasibility studies. What is needed is research that looks at a situation or a group or a sub-system with an eye not only to adequate description and analysis but to getting a handle on it and relating it to other parts of the system for constructive political development result. Where are the points of friction, where the points of access? This kind of pragmatic social science research is not yet well-established in Latin America and in not yet universally well-received. Indeed, pragmatism itself tends to be a dirty word. Yet helping the Latin Americans to acquire this ability to look at their own reality, coldly, objectively, and operational ends in view will have very useful results for political development. Here again research conducted jointly by host-country nationals and functionally specific private United States groups will pay off not only in increased knowledge of country reality but also in increased capability on the part of research collaborators. The only cautionary word I would introduce here is that to the maximum possible extent Latin Americans should join with us here in the United States in poking and prodding at us as we attempt to handle our political development problems—and we've got some and we're going to have more. I see no reason why this kind of activity cannot be carried on by most groups, most emphatically including our own political parties in league with Latin American political parties.

Finally there is the aspect of training. Whatever functionally specific task the training may be designed to accomplish, I think it important that political development training, in terms compatible with the underlying tenets of constitutional democracy, be built right into it. This falls under the broad rubric of "civic education." What is being transmitted here, obviously, is not ideological or specific programmatic content, but skills, underlying attitudes, patterns of interaction and cooperation, broad perspectives.

I have gone on much too long. And yet the theme remains scarcely touched. Let me conclude by saying only that I do not put these thoughts forward in the firm belief either that they will be picked up or that, if picked up and implemented, they will yield the political development results I think desirable and even essential. All I can say is that there is no challenge more important or critical than that of political development, and that I feel simply obliged as to give it our best efforts. I hope this morning to have conveyed to you some notion of my sense of urgent concern, and what underlies it. I do not mean to sound hyperbolic in saying that I believe there is a world at stake.

H.R. 8000—The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because of the fast-growing evidence of widespread national support for a program of