

The technology of the nuclear industry has raced ahead of our ability to keep up with the safety problems it leaves in its wake. We have scarcely mastered the difficulties of disposing of these highly radioactive wastes; we have done almost nothing to ensure their safe transport.

Is there even one person in this country who has never witnessed an accident on the freeway, never read about an overturned truck spilling its cargo? I would think not. But apparently, Department of Transportation officials don't drive and don't read newspapers. They insist that trucks carrying nuclear waste "cannot overturn," and that the containers "cannot leak"—much like the argument of a shipbuilder who claimed the *Titanic* could not sink.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues, the DOE's claim that the risk of incident is "infinitesimal" is absurd. It admits the possibility of a risk, however slight. It admits that as trucks roll through some of the most densely populated areas in the country—the City of New York and the Counties of Queens, Nassau, Westchester, and the Bronx—a disaster of catastrophic proportions could occur that would threaten the lives of millions of Americans. It admits all of this, but refuses to prevent it.

Even if one were to presume that the containers are leak-proof, one cannot presume that tractor-trailer trucks do not overturn.

The Department of Transportation has constructed its entire premise on a fantasy that ignores a key element: the New York City driver. It also pays little heed to driving conditions in New York City, and ignores national highway statistics. And under real highway conditions, this fantasy could quickly become a nightmare.

Everyone within the Metropolitan New York Area with a radio on in the morning hears almost daily of an overturned truck on the Long Island Expressway (L.I.E.), tying up major arteries all over the New York City region, and delaying hundreds of thousands of people. Can you imagine the panic and delay if it were a truck with nuclear waste, even if it were safe? Can you imagine the goings-on while waiting for experts to be flown in by helicopter to verify no leakage? DOE doesn't know for sure that its containers don't leak. DOT does know for sure that trucks overturn on the L.I.E. every day of the week.

We hear of overturned trucks on the L.I.E. hundreds of times during the year. We never hear of an overturned barge.

The question of where to route nuclear waste has no attractive answers. Every option is flawed to some degree. But to choose a route that endangers the safety of the greatest possible number of citizens is senseless. It flies in the face of reason. The report prepared for the City of New York verifies what common sense dictates: that there would be less danger to even fewer people if the waste were ferried across the Long Island Sound to our interstate road network for its trip West.

Let's put an end to this Orwellian "double-speak," and do what is safest, and therefore best, for the largest number of people. Let us act responsibly and transport future shipments of dangerous, radioactive material by barge. And let us eliminate the "infinitesimal" risk that, in the City of New York, could become a full-fledged tragedy. ●

I'M OK. YOU'RE OK.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1985

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, often in the political arena, to ascribe blame is to excuse hate.

The following letter written by Dr. James Armstrong, vice president of the Committee on Dialog and Development, constitutes a departure from the deadly game of "good guys and bad guys" and ushers in the concept of "I'm OK. You're OK" for international and especially inter first, second, and third world relations.

It is the stuff of Ghandi and King and worth congressional attention:

COMMITTEE ON DIALOGUE AND DEVELOPMENT,

WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 13, 1985.

The Rev. JAMES G. CALLAWAY, JR.,  
Executive Assistant to the Rector, Trinity  
Grants Program, New York, NY.

DEAR FATHER CALLAWAY: I wish to submit this request for the Trinity Grants Program to become an "early on" partner in the formation of the Committee on Dialogue and Development. The Committee (henceforth referred to as the CDD) has been incorporated to reduce the schism that currently exists between business leaders in the industrialized west and liberation theologians, Christian activists, and public leaders in the Third World.

The schism is reflected by the angry dismay many executives of transnational corporations feel when confronted by inaccurate and uninformed attacks on the free enterprise system originating in the Third World. They are mindful of the overt hostility directed against multinationals by an assortment of ecumenical pronouncements (see "Churches and the Transnational Corporations: An Ecumenical Program," published by the World Council of Churches in 1983). At a meeting of CDD leaders with the staff of the International Division of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, one of the Chamber staff members said, "Many Latin American businessmen feel the church is their most hostile critic."

On the other hand, Christian leaders in the Third World feel they have been mistakenly labeled Marxists for identifying with the poor on the basis of their biblical and theological perspectives. Their dismay and despair are registered when an affluent First World appears to turn a deaf ear to the world's hungry and oppressed. Both groups have "tuned each other out." They tend to listen to their own voices while discrediting their "enemies." The manifestation of this disharmony in the organized church is most discouraging when one realizes that the majority of corporate leaders are active church members who want to feel a sense of Christian mission in their vocation.

Although its self-image is "religious and ethical" the CDD will operate outside organized structures of the church. It will utilize contacts with the business community, academe, the public sector and church hierarchies and agencies to bring about dialogue between the two parties.

This broader dialogue will have three programmatic methods to bring about harmony and forward movement in commonly held social goals.

(1) Conflict Prevention.—The CDD will seek to identify emerging issues pertaining to corporate activities and Third World reality with a potential for adverse impact—economic, social and cultural—on affected groups and societies. It will try to position itself in a way that will prevent an emerging issue from becoming a negative, societal problem. It will initiate special studies and research programs that will help corporate leaders and Third World activists identify emerging issues, delineate their magnitude and scale, and suggest directions and strategies for future action.

(2) Conflict Containment.—The CDD will work vigorously to encourage constructive dialogue and maintain open avenues of communication among the affected groups where public policy matters impact transnational corporations, local business communities and the living and working conditions of the people immediately involved. It will seek to bring about a constructive reapproachment between conflicting parties keeping in mind both the positive impact of corporate investments and activities and the need for balancing the interests of the various parties. Above all, it will try to involve the most significant groups with a stake in the issues, facilitating communications among them.

(3) Conflict Resolution.—The CDD will act in the role of an honest broker and a voice of reason, justice and compassion in social conflicts where positions have hardened and mutual distrust prevent serious discussions and/or negotiations between affected parties. It will explore and cultivate the common ground that will facilitate new levels of trust and develop bases for mutual understanding and cooperation.

Among others, the CDD has met with representatives of the following organizations that have engaged in significant business/church dialogue and interaction:

(a) Berkeley Center for Ethics and Social Policy;

(b) Trinity Center for Ethics and Corporate Policy;

(c) Center for Ethics and Religious Values at the University of Notre Dame;

(d) U.S. Council on International Business (re: its dialogue with the American Lutheran Church);

(e) Center of Concern (re: its educational program on the U.S. Catholic bishops' pastoral letter on "Catholic Social Teachings and the U.S. Economy");

(f) YMCA's Center for International Management Studies (re: the Dakar consultation on "Development and Multinational Enterprises");

(g) Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility;

(h) Interfaith Committee on Economic Justice (re: the Overseas Development Council's experience with "business briefings"); and

(i) Council of the Americas (re: Board Room dialogues for corporate executives).

The CDD expects to network and cooperate with these programs and to help facilitate their important learnings into the Third World arena.

There have also been conversations with Christian leaders from around the world. Their supportive guidance has proven invaluable. Some of the leaders consulted have been:

(a) Emilio Castro, general secretary of the World Council of Churches;

(b) Ernesto Cardinal Arns of Sao Paulo, Brazil;

(c) Julio de Santa Ana, former director of the WCC's Commission on the Churches' Participation in Development;

(d) Dr. Jose Miquez-Bonino, liberation theologian, academician and former president of the WCC (1975-1983);

(e) Dr. Kim Choon Young, Korean Council of Churches;

(f) Bishop Federico Pegura, president, Latin American Evangelical Council of Churches; and

(g) Dr. Rubem Alves, liberation theologian, academician, author and poet.

These religious leaders noted their concern for the financial instability of their countries because of the international debt crises, for widespread unemployment—especially among the young—and for the disastrous impact of poverty and hunger on the women and children of the Third World. They feel that their church's faithfulness will be measured by its advocacy of the rights and needs of the poor.

The CDD is now in the process of testing the interest of financial leaders in United States and transnational companies. One executive at Morgan Guaranty Trust said it could be "an important program if you can find meaningful ways to implement it." A meeting with seven staff members, including the director of the International Division of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, indicated their keen interest. They feel business in the developed world would be benefited by the CDD program. One staffer said, "If the right climate is created—then education can take place."

To implement the CDD program a "start-up fund" of \$77,940 is needed for the first year's core budget. (It should be noted that it is possible to get underway with this small amount because of the volunteer commitment of board members, the utilization of consultants and the sharing of office space and secretarial resources.) Attached is a budget and statement of expenses and income to date. The budget is developmental and as CCD becomes more functional there will be a need for permanent staff members. A 20-percent reserve for operating contingencies has been added because of the unpredictability of initial costs without the benefit of prior experience.

The budget provides a modest sum to employ a part time executive director to coordinate present activities, service the board's governance and handle legal matters.

A similar sum is proposed for an organizational development consultant to guide the planning process for the new organization. This would enable a feasibility study on CDD's potential to perform a unique, unduplicated service that would attract future funding and generate self-earned income through conference and seminar participation and publications. This person in cooperation with others will assume primary responsibility for developing lists of potential funders, resource persons, board members and future staff. He/she will also write grant proposals.

While CDD's mission will be global, there are dominant hemispheric considerations. A south Florida connection, linked with a university, seems highly desirable. A consultant has been identified who for a small stipend and expense reimbursement will establish local business, media, educational and institutional support to augment initial programs.

Consultation with members of the Council of Foundation's Committee on International Grant Making, and the Council of Americas, indicate their feeling that the CDD will offer a unique program. Most see a combination of church and corporate grants to provide necessary start-up funds.

Because of Trinity's historic relationship with the business community and its innovative grants program with a Third World

priority, CDD would hope that Trinity would become an early partner with a \$35,000 grant toward the first year start-up budget.

Thank you for encouraging this submission. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Parks, Dr. McCoy and Charles Schmidt for making yourselves available to our consultant Frank Kiehne and myself as we have explained our reason for being and have sought your guidance in this grant process.

Sincerely,

JAMES ARMSTRONG ●

## GROWING POLARIZATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, observers can only marvel at Pretoria's continuing inability to come to grips with what is happening among black South Africans. The white populace seems to have an uncanny habit of misperceiving and misinterpreting black grievances and black leaders. This became painfully obvious when President P. W. Botha summarily rebuffed Bishop Desmond Tutu's requests for a meeting.

It seems to me that Botha could decisively avert a bloodbath by opening a dialog with Bishop Tutu and ANC leader Nelson Mandela. These leaders are respected by all blacks, and would be able to allay the rage which has claimed hundreds of lives. Unfortunately, Botha has been obstinate in his refusal to strike a deal with them.

The fuse of revolution has been lit. If Pretoria does not relent, all of South Africa will be ravaged by rebellion and racial confrontation. I insert the following article in the hope that this trend does not continue.

The article from the Washington Post, July 31, 1985, follows:

SOUTH AFRICA: SETUP FOR A SHOOT-OUT?

(By William Raspberry)

Last week, Bishop Desmond Tutu was warning angry blacks that he would leave the country and perhaps even abandon the liberation struggle if there were any more lynch-mob attacks on suspected police informers.

This week, South African President P. W. Botha was refusing the Nobel Peace Prize winner's request for a meeting to find a way to end the violence.

The two events say a good deal about the moral and physical courage of the Anglican bishop and perhaps more about the dismal prospects for peace in that racial time bomb of a country called South Africa.

Tutu is respected around the world as a man of peace and yet held in high regard by South Africa's black militants. That combination of attributes made it possible for him to elbow his way through an enraged crowd three weeks ago to rescue a man suspected of being a police informer and, last week, to threaten to quit the liberation struggle if lynchings continued.

That same integrity would have made him almost uniquely able to lead the near-revolutionary black population and the white government away from the brink of chaos. He was willing, even eager, to try.

"I have tried; I have failed," he said the other day after Botha decided against meeting with him. Tutu first broached his interest in such a meeting during two broadcast interviews. Botha, perhaps looking to his right flank, said he could not respond to offers made through the media but was prepared to talk to Tutu or anyone else "provided a proper appointment is made."

Tutu, who might have bristled at the rebuff and turned away, instead sent Botha a formal request for a meeting. Botha's office at first announced his willingness to talk with Tutu but later rejected the bishop's request, adding—incredibly—that he would talk only with people who had denounced both violence and civil disobedience.

That new condition eliminated Tutu, who refuses—disobediently—to carry the "pass" that South African law requires all blacks to keep with them. The bishop, who already had risked his credibility among blacks by seeking the meeting with Botha, could hardly afford to be seen as begging for an audience. So that, presumably, is that.

But important questions remain. For instance, what does the Botha government have in mind? Surely its refusal to talk to Tutu is a calculated move implying that it sees no point in enhancing the credibility of black moderates. The result can only be to render the moderates irrelevant or, more likely, to radicalize them.

Tutu, and men like him, could have been bridges, making it at least theoretically possible for the two sides to come together. Does the bridge-blasting, implicit in Botha's rebuff of Tutu, mean that the government has given up on a peaceful resolution of the current crisis? Is the scene being set for a full-fledged shoot-out?

And what, if that happens, will be the position of the Reagan administration? The White House, while continuing to assert its opposition to economic sanctions, is at least more vocal in its apparent consternation with Botha's obstinance, particularly with his refusal to meet with Tutu. Will Botha's continued obstinance transform that consternation into active impatience?

What will be Ronald Reagan's reaction if Tutu and other moderates are jailed? Where will America be if the crisis escalates, whether into revolution or all-out repression? When, in short, will this country gather up the political and moral courage to declare just which side it is on? ●

## REMEMBER OUR HEROES

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention as well as that of my colleagues an important tribute paid by the city of Hawthorne, CA, and the Hawthorne Veterans Council to the war heroes of our country who gave their lives in defense of democracy around the world.

It is with great pleasure that I submit to the Members of this body the text of a letter I received informing me of this community service, and inviting my participation in the activities. Perhaps my colleagues may find the initiative taken by my constituents worth staging in their congressional districts. The message is quite clear: