

Report from the Capital

MARCH 1968



Congressional Boxscore

MAJOR LEGISLATION IN 90th CONGRESS

Second Session
As of Feb. 15, 1968

Party Line-up

	Dem.	GOP	Vacancies
House Line-up	245	187	3
Senate Line-up	64	36	0

BILL	HOUSE	SENATE	STATUS
Tax Surcharge	Hearings Suspended		
Balance of Payments	Hearings Suspended		
Anticrime (HR 5037) (S 917)	Reported 7/17/67	Passed 8/8/67	Approved by Subcommittee
Wiretapping (S 928) (HR 5386)	Hearings Completed		Hearings Completed
Gun Control (S 1) (HR 5384)	Approved by Subcommittee		Approved by Subcommittee
Antiriot (HR 421)	Reported 6/29/67	Passed 7/19/67	
Manpower Authorization (HR 16406) (S 2938)			
Home Ownership			
Model Cities Funds			
Rent Supplements Funds			
Poverty Funds			
Child Health			
Hospital Aid			
College Assistance (HR 15067)	Hearings Underway		
Vocational Education (HR 15086)			
Civil Rights Workers (HR 2516)	Reported 6/29/67	Passed 8/16/67	Reported 11/2/67 Debate Underway
Foreign Aid Authorization (HR 16263)			
Truth-in-Lending (S 5)	Reported 12/13/67	Passed 2/1/68	Reported 6/29/67 Passed 7/11/67 In Conference
Scenic Rivers (S 119)			Reported 8/4/67 Passed 8/8/67
Air Safety			
Redwoods Park (S 2515) (HR 10851)	Hearings Underway		Reported 10/12/67 Passed 11/1/67
Congressional Reform (S 355) (HR 2504)	Hearings Suspended		Reported 1/16/67 Passed 3/7/67
Campaign Spending (S 1880) (HR 11223)	Approved by Subcommittee		Reported 8/16/67 Passed 9/12/67
Codes of Ethics			
Copyright Revision (S 597) (HR 2512)	Reported 3/8/67	Passed 4/11/67	Hearings Completed

Reprinted from
CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

"The standard reference on the U.S. Congress and politics for editors, scholars and reference librarians."

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL—a bulletin published 10 months during the year by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 190 Maryland Ave., N. E., Washington, D. C. 20002. The purpose of this bulletin is to report findings on the interrelations between churches and government in the United States. It affords church leaders a channel to understand developments, policies and trends affecting public policies and it affords public officials a chance to understand church structures, dynamics and positions. It is dedicated to religious liberty, to free and effective democracy and to equitable rights and opportunities for all.

The views of writers of material for *Report From The Capital* are not necessarily those of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs or its staff. The bulletin also provides for the sharing of views between leaders of the cooperating conventions and between leaders of various religions and traditions.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is a denominational agency

maintained by the American Baptist Convention, Baptist Federation of Canada, Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc., North American Baptist General Conference, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

Executive Staff of the Committee: C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director; W. Barry Garrett, director of information services; Walfrid H. Peterson, director of research services; and James M. Sapp, director of correlation services and editor of *Report From The Capital*.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Individual subscription, \$1.50 per year; Club rate for 10 or more, \$1.00 each per year; Bulk distribution of 10 or more to a single address, \$.75 each per year.

MARCH 1968—Volume 23, Number 3



Washington Observations

News — Views — Trends

March 1, 1968



THE CASE OF Flast v. Gardner will be argued before the Supreme Court on March 11. The Court will be asked to decide whether or not standing to sue should be granted to a person who does not suffer material injury from the operation of a government program that is alleged to violate a First Amendment right.

UNTIL THE PRESENT TIME, a tangible injury has been required before standing to sue was given. This has sharply limited challenges to government programs that are said to aid religious organizations.

TWO OF THE LAWYERS who will appear before the Court urging the broadening of the standing to sue rule will be Professor Leo Pfeffer and Senator Sam Ervin, Jr. The former is regarded generally as the most distinguished attorney for religious liberty and church-state cases. The latter is spearheading a congressional effort to grant the desired standing to sue by law.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S "Crisis of the Cities" Message has gone to the Congress in support of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. The thrust of his urban proposals in the State of the Union Message is translated into specific legislation.

MASSIVE NEW ATTACKS on the problems of the cities are proposed, including a broad public-private plan for rebuilding the residential hearts of our cities, relying heavily on private investment.

NO CONGRESSIONAL groundswell is apparent to move to change the February 16 ruling on graduate deferments by the National Security Council. The fact that several congressmen reacted strongly last week is offset by the intensified fighting in Vietnam, an election year, and no disposition to alter eight-month-old legislation.

A DISPOSITION to delay appointing a successor to John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is seen on Capitol Hill. The post becomes vacant today, leaving the largest of all government agencies without a secretary.

PUBLISHED SPECULATION about Gardner's successor has included the names of Henry Ford II, former governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina, Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, and Ben Heineman, board chairman of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad.

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL quoted "a government source" as saying "Heineman probably has the inside track right now," pointing out that he was selected by the President last year to serve as chairman of a broad study of welfare programs, and as chairman of the White House conference on civil rights.

The Impairment of The Religious Liberty Of The Taos Pueblo Indians By The United States Government

By DEAN M. KELLEY

Reprint of a guest editorial from the Spring, 1947 issue of *A Journal of Church and State*

Taos Pueblo is an Indian village on the Rio Pueblo de Taos at the foot of Pueblo Peak in northern New Mexico. Like other Indian tribes, the Indians of Taos Pueblo have found the lands they once owned progressively diminished by the incursions of the white man.

From the fourteenth century on, the Taos Pueblo people have occupied the same general territory, but in 1906, by proclamation of President Theodore Roosevelt, a large part of that territory was incorporated in the national forests without compensation to the tribe. The land confiscated included the watershed in which the tribe lived, now known as the Blue Lake area, upon which the tribe depends for spiritual as well as physical sustenance. When the Indians discovered that a vital part of their heritage had become a portion of the Carson National Forest, and that it was being developed for use and incursion by others, they began to take steps to regain the rights of ownership. After several decades, their claim was confirmed by the U. S. Indian Claims Commission. However, that tribunal can only award compensation for claims; it cannot return the land.

The area for which compensation is due the tribe under the Claims Commission decision is about 130,000 acres, plus some valuable property now occupied by non-Indians in the town of Taos. The Indians agreed in 1926 that they would not even lay claim to properties in the Town of Taos worth about \$300,000 if the Pueblo Lands Board of that period would return the sacred Blue Lake Area of 50,000 acres. Their generous offer was accepted, insofar as the loss of \$300,000 went, but the other half of the bargain was not fulfilled. So the tribe had given up a rightful claim and got nothing in return. As the result of a Senate investigation several years later, the Pueblo was instead granted a special use permit for a portion of the area, which will soon expire.

Of the 130,000 acres involved in the ICC decision, the Indians insist that for the 50,000-acre Blue Lake area they cannot accept compensation.

A bill was introduced in the last session of Congress by Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico (S. 3085) which would give the Indians "trust title" to

50,000 acres of the watershed in which they live.

As a result of the foregoing events, much interest has centered upon the claims made by the Indians that the headwaters and tributaries of the stream on which they live are essential to the religious freedom of the tribe. The Forest Service might be willing to give the Indians exclusive use of the rocky cliffs and barren slopes on the western side of the valley, but it seems anxious to retain as much as possible of the more fertile eastern slope, on which timber allegedly worth several million dollars is growing. The Forest Service has received an offer of extensive and recently-lumbered lands from a wealthy lumberman in return for timber rights on this eastern slope.

Opposition to the bill rests upon two fundamental misconceptions. The first of these is that the Indians have religious ties only to certain locations called "shrines" and that the remainder of the watershed is religiously neutral for them. This is not the case.

The relationship between the tribe and the land is an organic one; they feel that the entire watershed is integral to the life of the tribe, and is indissolubly linked with the tribe's long and continuous history of occupation of this region. The tribe and the valley have grown old together. The members of the tribe feel an ancient identity, not only with Blue Lake—the headwaters of their life-sustaining stream—but with the entire watershed, its plants and animals. Anything which mutilates the valley hurts the tribe. If the trees are cut, the tribe bleeds. If the springs or lakes or streams are polluted, the lifestream of the tribe is infected.

There are two high-altitude meadows (Pretty Park; Wild-Onion Park) where the Indians gather rare plants used for medicinal, nutritive, and ceremonial purposes: wild onion, wild strawberry, wild asparagus (o-sha). To these peaceful places individual Indians would come to commune with God, to pray for health, growth, and game. Unfortunately, grazing by the cattle of non-Indians has severely depleted these wild plants.

Some areas have been identified by the Indians with certain animals, such as Deer Lake, Deer Creek, Deer Canyon (also on

the eastern slope). These localities serve as shrines of honor and respect accorded the animals with whom the Indians share the woodland. Whenever an Indian enters Deer Canyon, or speaks or thinks of it, he salutes the species upon whose flesh and bone, horn and hide, he relies for many of his needs. Not only in these designated "shrines," but throughout the area, the Indians habitually clean and skim and deepen the springs and pools where the animals come to drink.

The watershed also supplies various natural objects used in ceremonial dances and for other ritual purposes, such as clay for paint (from Pueblo Peak and Willow Creek), evergreens and other plants and herbs (from the sacred lakes and various springs and streams), and the feathers of hawk and eagle (from their nesting-places on the high ridges). There are also annual ceremonial pilgrimages (in August) to Blue Lake, Star Lake, Buffalo Grass Spring, and other shrines.

The spiritual kinship which the tribe feels for the sources of their life and livelihood clearly cannot be localized in any one spot, but extends to the whole region.

A second and more serious misconception is that the timber or the land belongs to the government to trade to the lumberman in return for some of his used property. But the Indian Claims Commission has concluded that the government unjustly took from the Indians "without compensation" lands which the Indians owned. That land, morally and in justice, belongs to the Indians and is not rightfully available to the government to dispose of without the consent of its proper owners.

The land in question here is not mainly an economic issue, either for the Indians or the white man. Much of it lies near timberline or above, and the Indians do not wish to exploit it commercially. They simply want to keep it as it is, and to do so at their own discretion—as any owner would—and not having to obtain someone else's permission.

For centuries before the white man came to this continent, the Taos Indians had developed a close and continuous communion with nature which wove work and worship, life and land, more closely together than the white man can readily understand. This venerable and precious heritage should not now be disrupted by the white man or his government.

DEAN M. KELLEY is Director of Civil and Religious Liberty for the National Council of Churches. He is also a member of the Editorial Council of *A Journal of Church and State*, published three times a year by the J. M. Dawson Studies in Church and State of Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF FREE PRESS AND FREE SPEECH TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

By R. DEAN GOODWIN

A chief goal of life seems to be to get freedom of expression and to enjoy it forever.

Opposed to this sometimes are the fearful men to whom the chief goal of life seems to be to sit on the facts and suppress them forever. Is there a goal of life that neither the editor nor the fearful man have seen?

Both saints and devils, who have achieved their goals, enjoy freedom of expression when they have it, and yet freedom does not make them what they are. A state of freedom only provides opportunities and choices for them, and in that freedom each works out his own character.

Every kind of person fights against freedom at some time. The "establishment man" may want information suppressed if it hurts his cause.

The reader, the television viewer and the listener to radio, fight against the freedom of those who give them truth that destroys their prejudices.

I

Freedom of the press is required because man is man and not a machine. A machine can be objective; an adding machine gives the total sum without emotion or bias; the computer responds without feeling.

A person expresses himself and that self is a complex being made up of many factors: family traits and background, acquired notions and prejudices, commitments he has made, his lives and fears and hates.

All of these traits and more make up a person. Editors and broadcasters are employed because their personalities give, not objectively, but color, excitement, and judgements that please the public.

The communicator is a person who chooses what to report and what not to report, he decides what prominence or obscurity to give a news story, he decides how to write it, putting in what he considers important and leaving out what is unimportant in his mind.

If he is creative, he gets attention through his creativity. If he is not creative, he gets attention by criticism.

We need freedom of expression, then, not because a person is good and can be trusted to give us the truth; not because he is evil and must be censored and criticized, but because he is human and not objective.

The meaning of such lack of objectivity in persons is simply this: Truth does not come from one human source; it requires many free people expressing themselves so that the reader, the viewer, the listener may use his own mind to judge what is true.

II

If objectivity is not possible in persons, then is freedom possible? Freedom is "the quality or state of not being coerced or constrained by fate, necessity or circumstances in one's choices or actions."

All freedoms are relative; they are not absolute in practice. The law and other public regulations limit your freedom in many areas. They limit your freedom to drive your car and how, for example.

In terms of freedom of press and speech, there are words that cannot be used because they offend the ears of many; there are speeches that incite to riot that cannot be spoken legally.

Owners of publications and of broadcasting media may limit their editorial freedoms because each medium is owned for a purpose, usually to make money. Sometimes its purpose is to propagate an idea.

The owner is Democrat or Republican, he is conservative or liberal, he favors labor or business, he wants public housing or he is opposed to it. In these and other areas he uses his medium for a purpose and his staff may be restricted in what they can write or speak in order that the purpose may be achieved.

Freedom is also limited by the market—the readers, the viewers, the listeners and the advertisers. There are the people who make it financially possible to operate the communications business. The public will not support the medium that takes unpopular positions.

III

What, then, do we want from the media of communication?

If we want objectivity and freedom, but cannot have them without limits, then what can we have? What should we be able to expect of our media of communication?

(1) We want more than one source of information. We want more than one message-giver in the community. If there is only one newspaper, then there must be also the radio newscaster and the television news. Besides the local reporter there must be the network reporter and communicator. In addition to the local daily paper, there must be the national news weekly. Beyond these, the journals of religion must comment on and evaluate public matters.

(2) We are also asking for the communicators to create a climate for dialogue. Dialogue is not the same as debate. The debater determines to defeat his opponent by logical argument or other means. His purpose is to stop the argument, to end the talk, to get his point accepted. At his worst his purpose is to defeat his opponent verbally. The person who thinks of his role in these terms is a destroyer of freedom.

But laws cannot guarantee that a community will have dialogue. To achieve this, the editors and the broadcasters must themselves be committed to dialogue; they must have those resources of the spirit and mind that equip them for discussion with good will.

IV

We have said that complete objectivity is not possible; that freedom exists only within the limits of regulations; we have said that we want our laws to provide opportunity for more than one source of information and that we want communicators who will provide for dialogue.

But what does this have to do with religious liberty? Everything! Religious liberty can exist only if there are several sources of information and "truth"; only if there is that discussion among responsible men that we call dialogue. In the field of religion, that is what liberty is.

We ask only for the right to speak for and act out our Christian faith in a society that gives the same right to all others. Freedom with its limits is not a goal of life, therefore, but a necessary means by which we reach the goal, which is the life committed to our God.

R. DEAN GOODWIN is Executive Director, Division of Communication, American Baptist Convention.



Goodwin



QUEST FOR ANSWERS YOU IN THE "THINK TANK"

By W. C. FIELDS

The most fantastic data processing system in existence is still the mind of man. Hook up several of these cerebral units and you should have an intelligence mill *extraordinaire*.

But does it work so easily? Not always.

Connect us human beings in groups for thinking purposes and what happens? Do we stimulate and energize and lift each other to new levels of thought and understanding? Seldom. Do we utilize the full voltage of each member of a committee, work team or task force?

Fat chance. Instead of generating and multiplying brain power, we waste time and effort because of crossed wires, short circuits and blown fuses.

The Rand Corporation and other "think tank," brain-trust organizations, use computers and a lot of other clever aides in the process of cerebration. But their success is due not so much to their hardware as to their ability to link up human minds in an effective working order.

Group-thinking—i.e. committees, seminars, task forces, boards, commissions, even conventions—does not always add up to the sum total of each individual's intelligence. Out of such group efforts a majority may vote a right decision but with a superficial and dangerous misunderstanding of why they did it. What principles of group dynamics and of human relations can help us function more efficiently in the think tanks to which we are now and then committed?

1. *Ask the right questions.* At least ask them in your own mind. Find the answers to some basic matters. What is the real problem here? What are the facts? Am I certain of the facts? What are the opinions, attitudes and reactions of the people involved? Are we discussing the real issue or a cover for something else? Are we generalizing too broadly? Are we over simplifying?

2. *Set objectives.* Too many group discussions drift aimlessly here and there. Any group meeting should have a purpose. Objectives for the dialogue may be modest but to avoid wasting everyone's time they should be noted. They should be desirable, feasible and sound. Even in a wide-swinging, loosely coordinated, poorly led discussion you can discipline your own thinking.

3. *Look before you leap.* Whistling in the dark is all right as long as you recognize it for what it is. Face facts squarely. Separate fact from rumor and wishful thinking. Look backward. What are all the factors involved? Look inward. What opinions and attitudes are mixed up in the matter at hand? Look around. What are the alternatives? How have others solved similar problems? Look ahead. What are the trends and moods of the times? Where do the alternatives lead? What are the consequences? Remember that your choices may often be restricted to the lesser among evils.

Today our perceptions, the things we think we know and understand, are insecure. We worry over the fact that they are so often based on second-hand information, maybe on second-rate information. We have a lingering fear that our perceptions may be seriously inaccurate without us knowing it. And when we are unsure of our own perceptions we are bound to see the very devil in any fast-talking, rapidly moving people around us who may be doing a little maneuvering of their own. This is why group thinking and the conference approach have both peril and promise.

The free and orderly flow of information in any social or organizational situation is important for effective communication. In a series of studies of this problem by Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, N. J., employees in business and industry were studied. The researchers discovered among both managerial and production employees some

were obstructing internal communications for unworthy personal reasons.

These situations are not unfamiliar to churches and to religious organizations. Here are the classifications found by the research group.

1. *Gate keeping.* Lower echelon personnel communicated upward only what they thought their superiors wanted to hear.

2. *Use of information as a status symbol.* Inside personnel sometimes unnecessarily guarded important information since sharing it with others would in effect raise the outsiders to equal status as "inside" persons. In other cases a leader or superior may release just enough information to enhance his importance, but not enough to communicate effectively.

3. *Withholding information for personal advantage.* This usually springs out of some kind of rivalry situation.

4. *Unapproachability.* Some managers and leaders close off half of the communications process when they discourage associations or subordinates from approaching them. Some also tend to talk rather than listen. This stops the ping pong game.

5. *Buck passing.* These are persons who view things elsewhere with alarm so that they can point with pride to themselves. They want to look good, so they cover up their own shortcomings by suggesting that the failures and deficiencies are elsewhere.

Every reader of this article will doubtless be invited to step into some "think tank" of some kind within a short time after reading these lines.

Some group-think situation will call upon you to concentrate on some problem, share your wisdom on some issue, help bring similitude out of wild and woolly variety, or in some manner or other to pursue the illusion of reality. When this happens, maybe it will help each of us to recall the need for balance voiced by J. Robert Oppenheimer twenty years ago:

"(The means) of doing justice to the implicit, the imponderable, and the unknown, is sometimes called style. It is style which makes it possible to act effectively, but not absolutely; it is style which, in the domain of foreign policy, enables us to find a harmony between the pursuit of ends essential to us and the regard for the views, the sensibilities, the aspirations of those to whom the problem may appear in another light; it is style which is the deference that action pays to uncertainty; it is, above all, style through which power defers to reason."

W. C. FIELDS is Public Relations Secretary for the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention.

An Initial Reflection

By BROOKS HAYS

Editor's Note: Announcement last month of plans for an Ecumenical Institute at Wake Forest University invited Brooks Hays, a former Southern Baptist Convention president and advisor to two U. S. presidents, back into the arena in Washington, where he maintains his residence. The announcement marks the first time that a Baptist school has developed plans for a scholarly center to deal with Baptist involvement in the ecumenical movement. We asked Mr. Hays to give us his reflections on some of the thinking behind his acceptance of the post as director of the new institute.

Here and there, Baptists are expressing the view that we should begin to re-examine our relationships with other religious bodies. One obstacle to happier relations with the world's largest Christian body, the Catholic Church, has been greatly diminished by the influences set in motion by Pope John. His words to me, "Mr. Hays, we are brothers in Christ," symbolize for me a new Vatican purpose. Our response to these gestures of good will from many other faiths should reflect our noblest impulses and attitudes.

Another relationship, that produced by church-state principles, should be studied. Our discussion should be within the framework of the American doctrine of "Separation" and with good will for all. This doctrine has a special appeal for Baptists, for we cherish the concept of a "free church in a free state," and the principle itself seems secure.

However, "separation" stresses the negative. What about the positive forces that stem from the nation's institutional life? There is no threat to the distinctive political doctrine of separation in the idea of a proper fusion of politics and religion. Its purpose would be to strengthen the institutions of church and state, in their separateness, to do their work in the world.

The chief beneficiary would be the political institutions, but the church would also profit by acquiring the moral and spiritual exercise that derives from attacks upon evils that must finally have a degree of political treatment.

The great crises of the times are on the political side of the concept of separation, and they will not be resolved unless politicians are aware of, and have access to, the resources of religion. The separateness must be preserved, but relationships must be there to permit the fusion or commerce that produces strength.

So the political education of theologians and theological education of politicians becomes an imperative. This challenge, as well as the defense of our structure of government should be engaging the Christian.

It is not my purpose in this brief statement to enumerate appropriate methods for advancing such education. I merely insist



WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

The American Government

A series on possible projects or learning experiences for the Christian, or a group of Christians, to pursue in order to understand more perfectly the interrelations between churches and government in the United States.

QUESTION: What is the proper classification of the American government: republic, democracy, representative democracy or what?

ANSWER: Political terms do not have the precision of terms in some sciences. Thus, there is no classification that is authoritatively used by political scientists.

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTION AND ANSWER:

The term *republic* has been long used to describe any form of government whose executive head is a president rather than a monarch. It could refer to a government composed solely of a president elected by a plebiscite. So its utility is not very great.

Democracy has often been used to connote direct rule by the people in a small political unit: the city state of ancient Greece or the New England town meeting. Obviously, no such direct democracy can exist in the United States. Yet, speaking comparatively, the American government has democratic forms.

Representative democracy may be the best short descriptive term, for it implies that the people participate by means of elected officials. It too has problems, however. For the fairly simple model of the British representative democracy is a sharp contrast to the complex model of the American representative democracy. In Britain (ignoring the largely ceremonial queen and House of Lords) the elected agent, the House of Commons, is the source of the executive. British is unitary—that is, is the sole level of government in Britain. In the United States, there are three elected agents, House, Senate and President, and these govern only at the Federal level.

Representative democracy, then, may help us some, but it is a bare beginning in giving an idea about the nature of a government. We used to use such terms sometimes. But they are not precise descriptions, and should not be treated as if they were.

Where precision is required, perhaps many terms must be strung together. For example, American government is a federal, constitutional representative democracy with an elected bicameral legislature and president.

—Walfred H. Peterson

SUGGESTIONS FOR LEARNING EXPERIENCES:

1. Discuss with a history, government or political science teacher the most generally accepted classification of the American government.

2. Lead your church group or department to discuss with an elected official the democratic process and how one person can have influence on a particular issue. Select and make preparation on an issue of concern to Christians before meeting with the public leader and exchange views among yourselves on such issues as 1) religion and public education, 2) taxation of churches or 3) cooperation with government in the urban crisis.

that it would help if Baptists should acknowledge in large numbers, that we live in a pluralistic society and must, if the evils of our day are to be effectively confronted, have right relations with other faiths. No one religious body, acting alone, has the power to cope with them.

Therefore, the ecumenical spirit is essential to the achievement of some important goals in human existence, and is consistent with Baptist teaching and polity. I concede, of course, that a precise defining of the terms "fusion" and "ecumenical" is proper. Let the dialogue continue.

Church Groups Included In Massive Urban Plans

By W. Barry Garrett

President Lyndon B. Johnson challenged church groups as well as other private and governmental agencies to help solve "the crises of the cities."

The President in a message to Congress late in February called for a multi-billion dollar program to help meet urban problems which, he said, "rises from the decay of the decade."

"Today, America's cities are in crisis . . . The human problems of the city are staggering," the President declared. Among the problems he listed:

- Ghetto youth with little education, no skills and limited opportunity.

- Citizens afraid to walk their streets at night.

- Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans barred by prejudice from full participation in the city's life.

"Illiteracy and disease, a lack of jobs and even dignity itself—these are the problems of the city, just as its tenements, traffic jams and rats are problems," Johnson said.

"The problem is so vast," the President said, "that the answer can only be forged by responsible leadership from every sector, public and private."

The challenge "extends to church and community groups, and to the family itself," he continued.

Among the many proposals to help solve urban problems the President is asking for grants, loans and technical assistance for private non-profit groups engaged in housing projects. Many of these are church groups. The requests of the President are almost as staggering as the problems of the cities themselves. They run into the economy mood of the Congress that cut back appropriations for many government programs last year.

In spite of Congressional reluctance the Administration continues to call for a new anti-inflation tax, for fair housing legislation, for funding and strengthening of programs already approved, and for creative and expanded approaches to city problems.

In a press conference, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, Robert Weaver, said that the new proposals of the President "have a magnitude, a clout, that others have not had before." He expressed the hope that the new proposals were comprehensive enough to overcome the resistance of many in Congress who have not supported the President's program the past two years.

Editor's Notebook — This Issue

Report from the Capital

- Proposed taxes on travel abroad has made top billing along with the Vietnam War. The news media, election minded congressmen and foreign figures have all gotten into the act in recent weeks to take advantage of a relatively minor issue to get space in ink and on film. . . . The Administration's 1969 budget cuts spending for some education programs. The slowdown in government spending hits funds for college construction hard. *The Office of Education* will reduce construction projects on college campuses by 184. Other programs, such as aid to students, will largely just hold the line. . . . *Senator Dirksen* won his fight to be the sole chairman of the Republican Platform Committee. He beat out the governors who had called for a co-chairman in order to give younger men and younger ideas equal voice in steering the committee through election waters.

- The Congressional Boxscore on page 2 reflects inaction of the 90th Congress in its second session. With the election fever spreading rapidly, such inactivity will probably accelerate. . . . *W. C. Fields'* "Think Tank" piece (page 6) is an excellent appraisal of the group thinking process which has been so helpful to Baptists of all kinds, as well as others, during the past decade. . . . You will enjoy the case study of a modern day struggle for religious liberty by *Dean M. Kelley* on page 4. . . . Another *Dean, R. Dean Goodwin*, American Baptist's likeable communications expert, sets forth a good case for a free news media to those of use who are concerned with religious liberty (page 5).

- The influx of Texans into Washington in recent years has brought with it some of the nicest Baptists we know. . . . One of them helps us to keep up with our readers. She is *Mrs. Rosemary Brevard*, formerly of Fort Worth, who moved to Washington two years ago with her husband, who is a dam specialist with the Department of Agriculture. . . . Now she comes to the office three days a week to keep the renewals and new readers mounting. During January and February her work meant three new club subscriptions from churches plus considerable individual renewals and new subscribers. . . .

COVER

Floor-to-ceiling files crowd the House Document Room near Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol building.

This room houses measures introduced by Congressmen. The bills are card-indexed and kept for use by the current Congress. Later they will be sent for storage to the National Archives, Library of Congress, or basement and attic nooks about the Capitol.

The bills may be ordered by anyone by simply writing to the House Document Room, The Capitol, Washington, D. C. 20515. You will need to list the number of the bill, however, rather than the title.

As many as 20,000 bills may be introduced in a single session of Congress; of these, perhaps 1,500 become law.

Photo courtesy U. S. Capitol Historical Society

George F. Mobley, Photographer

Incidentally, her husband's recent promotion means they are no longer "temporary residents" of Washington. . . . We are glad!

- Next month's article, "Honesty in The Church," by *Wayne Oates*, will explore some of the questions behind the questions most often raised about honesty among church members. You ask, "Is this related to religious freedom?" You bet it is!

—James M. Sapp

Report From The Capital