

gunship and headed for safety in South Vietnam. But soon after takeoff the aircraft was hit by enemy fire, began to burn and limped into another South Vietnamese artillery base about a mile from Landing Zone Ranger. There, too, Fujii radioed directions for American air and artillery strikes.

Several hours later, Landing Zone Ranger was overrun by the North Vietnamese. The toll was 100 dead, 145 wounded and 78 missing.

After two more days and nights at the second artillery base, Fujii was flown to a hospital at Phu Bai, South Vietnam. There he received the Silver Star and Purple Heart decorations. His shrapnel wounds were not serious.

This is Fujii's second tour in the war zone. He enlisted in the Army in 1968 and completed the requirements for his high school diploma while in the service.

After paratrooper training, he went to Vietnam as an infantryman. He volunteered for another tour in order to get out of the Army six months early—in September. The same day he was stranded at Landing Zone Ranger, he was promoted from Spec. 4 to Spec. 5.

WHO NEEDS WOMEN'S LIB?

Mr. HANSEN, Mr. President, on Sunday, February 21, 1971, an article appeared in the Empire supplement of the Denver Post entitled, "Who Needs Women's Lib?" This article, written by Thyra Thomson, Wyoming's secretary of state, is a very thoughtful and objective appraisal of the current status of the women's rights movement in the United States.

Mrs. Thomson and I were both elected to public office in Wyoming in 1962. When I was Governor, we worked closely together because Mrs. Thomson's duties include serving as acting Governor of Wyoming when the Governor is absent from the State. Many of my colleagues have had the opportunity to know her because her husband, Keith Thomson, served 6 years in the Congress.

All Members of Congress can gain a better understanding of the status of women's rights in this Nation by reading the analysis prepared by Thyra Thomson. She points out many of the reasons why women find themselves in lower paying jobs and emphasizes, as she has for years, the need for women to get as much education as possible before marriage and to update their skills whenever possible. In addition, Thyra Thomson does not overlook the very real need for women to be different from men. As she says:

I wish we could see equality as something we share with men instead of trying to be the same as men.

Wyoming is known as the Equality State. Wyoming was the first territory and the first State to grant women equal rights, including the right to vote. Wyoming elected the first woman Governor in the United States. We are all very proud of the outstanding manner in which Thyra Thomson carries on the long tradition of active participation by women in the government of the State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of Thyra Thomson and the article entitled "Who Needs Women's Lib?" both of which appeared in the Empire magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHO NEEDS WOMEN'S LIB?

(By Thyra Thomson)

(NOTE.—Thyra Thomson of Wyoming, is one of eight women secretaries of state in the nation. But Mrs. Thomson ranks highest because she's the only elected secretary of state who also serves as lieutenant governor. She was elected Wyoming's first woman secretary of state in 1962, and reelected in 1966 and 1970. She's a native of Florence, Colo., and an honors graduate of the University of Wyoming. Her late husband, Keith Thomson, was a three-term Republican congressman who was Wyoming's senator-elect when he died in 1960. Mrs. Thomson has three sons: Bill, 27; Bruce, 24, and Casey, 18.)

Every time I read about Women's Lib demonstrators burning their bras or crashing for-men-only saloons, I wonder when the voice of sweet reason will penetrate the current crusade for women's rights.

I think it's time women admitted we've had equal rights a long time. We simply haven't done much with them.

My own state of Wyoming has a very proud record in women's rights. The Wyoming territorial legislature gave women equal rights more than 100 years ago; it was the first government anywhere to allow women the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on juries. Wyoming can also boast the first woman judicial officer, the first woman state official and the first woman governor.

Yet in 80 years of statehood, only 21 women have served in the Wyoming legislature. While male political leaders don't exactly encourage many female candidates, it's obvious that very few Wyoming women have taken advantage of their right to run for office.

I am one of the few. I have been secretary of state since 1963. Yet, while my husband was alive, nobody suggested I run for public office. The idea didn't occur to me then, either. I was too busy with my husband and children.

Most women don't worry about equality with men when they are young. They're too wrapped up in the primeval desire to love and be loved, to marry and to nest. I doubt if many young women think beyond the day when they don a wedding veil.

Yet it is a fact of modern life that 8 out of 10 women work outside the home, and 64 per cent of the women who work are married. And those who return to work after having a family can expect to spend 23 years on the job.

How galling it is, when a woman does return to work, to realize she is locked into the lower-paid, tedious jobs. She will not only probably make less money than a man, but have far less chance of promotion.

Yet, I must point out that there is no law confining women to inferior jobs. Women themselves must bear a large share of the blame for their plight. Women don't buck for promotion the way men do. Men look forward to a better job, and expect it. Women don't. They can handle responsibility as well as men, but too many women seem to think it's unfeminine to do so.

The underlying problem is that women are not motivated by job prestige. A man may be measured by his work, but a woman measures herself by her success with men. That's something Women's Lib wants to change, and if this means judging women as people rather than sex objects, I'm all for it. But I wouldn't want to change the innate desire of women to be attractive to men.

Instead, I'd like to teach them that for many years of their lives, they have to be attractive to employers, too. Let's teach women how to get a job as well as how to get a man. And let's teach them early.

Most women don't really plan careers until they're "empty nesters" in their 30s. Unless a woman prepares for that work before marriage, while she's still in school, she may not find her career opportunities satisfying, useful or equal.

I often speak to high school and college girls on the need for obtaining all the education possible before marriage and then for updating their skills at every opportunity. For many girls, this means office skills—typing, shorthand, the ability to run a copying machine. Those are the starting skills that get a job. And you need that first job before you can start climbing the executive ladder.

I made that comment to a young feminist recently, and I could see by her face that she was thinking: What does Mrs. Thomson know about it? She was elected out of sentiment for her late husband.

That is largely true. Wyoming voters were very good to me when they elected me their first woman secretary of state, partly out of sentiment and partly because my name was familiar as a result of my husband's work in the U.S. Congress.

But would they have re-elected me twice if I hadn't been able to do the job as well or better than a man? I doubt it.

I didn't learn how to do the job in a blinding flash. I worked as a secretary before I was married. I had studied business administration, sociology and psychology in college. I kept up my skills and got a lot of on-the-job training working with my husband in Washington. I earned equality in a far more practical way than burning my bra.

The mere idea of women's rights generally raised hackles at the time the Wyoming territorial legislature took the bold step of giving women suffrage in 1869.

Women's Lib now likes to point out that the legislators thought it a big joke (they went down to the lusty bars in Cheyenne and raised their glasses "to our lovely ladies, once our superiors and now our equals") and that they were being more practical than chivalrous (women voting made a higher citizen count to apply for statehood) and that they even tried to repeal it (Gov. John Campbell, a bachelor, vetoed the repeal). But the remarkable thing is not that there were skeptics and controversy. The remarkable thing is that when the men of Wyoming wrote, enacted and brought reality to equal rights legislation, they opened a frontier which was to change the lives of half the people on the face of the earth—women.

By the time Wyoming did achieve statehood, in 1890, the legislators had no doubts. The state constitution said:

"Both male and female citizens of this state shall equally enjoy all civil, political and religious rights and privileges."

The legislators were told the woman suffrage amendment would probably cause the statehood application to be rejected by the U.S. House of Representatives. They sent a wire to Washington which I wish every Women's Lib advocate would memorize. It said:

"We may stay out of the Union a hundred years, but we will come in with our women."

I like that "with." I wish we could see equality as something we share "with" men instead of trying to be the "same as" men.

Still, I have a hunch the men won't suffer. In fact, I believe that in the long run the Women's Lib movement will help men more than it does women.

Women will eventually achieve wage parity: equal pay for equal work. When they do, employers will probably hire more men, and more women will stay home.

An indirect result of men's demanding higher and higher pay in the past was that women were hired. It was simple economics. Women worked for less.

When men and women command identical pay, women will forfeit the advantage of

being low bidders and probably end up with fewer jobs.

Women have some disadvantages in job hunting. While the empty-nester going back to work becomes a faithful, stable employe, her skills are usually rusty and her education out of date. She starts again at the bottom of the ladder and pay scale.

Young women on the other hand usually don't stay on the job long enough to warrant training them for well paid, responsible positions.

They average less than two years. Marriage, or a baby, or a husband being transferred are the major reasons they quit. And they don't see anything wrong with that.

Recently, one girl in my office resigned because her husband had been transferred out of state. I asked if she would consider giving up her husband instead of her job. She thought I had lost my mind. But if you believe in equality, it's a valid question. Certainly, it never occurred to her husband to give up his new assignment because his wife liked her work.

A bank president told me recently why, he thinks there are few women executives in his field. He said:

"Schools of banking were opened to women in the 1930s. But women don't attend them. If I ask one of the girls in my bank to attend a banking school for three months, she says she can't leave her husband and children for that long. But if I turn to the man occupying the desk next to hers and ask him to attend the school for three months, he's eager. He knows he is being prepared for promotion, he thinks of a raise, he visualizes himself as president of the bank, and so he kisses wife and children goodbye, and is off."

Men are far more willing to do the extra-curricular chores that lead to the top. They volunteer for Chamber of Commerce work, serve on committees—all the extra things that are part of the climb to management positions. Most women put that extra time and effort into their families.

I don't know whether it's simply custom, or deep-seated instinctive urges that cause women to do this, but the point I want to make is that women ought to do what makes them happy. And they shouldn't blame men if they aren't happy at what they're doing.

For most women, true happiness is in helping the men in their lives to their mutual goals. They are working *with* their mates, and I can't think of a more noble objective in life. But for some of us, this isn't possible.

Women make up one-third of America's labor force and the majority take jobs for exactly the same reason men do: To support themselves and their dependents. I agree with Women's Lib that they should have the same earning power, the same opportunity for advancement as men.

I agree that women should share responsibility for solving our political and social problems, for running our government, ensuring our future.

None of us could imagine or tolerate a return to the thinking that existed before Wyoming's action of 1869, when women could not hold property in their own names, or be paid directly for their work, or even act as guardians for their own children.

But that was 102 years ago, and it's been 51 years since all American women won the right to suffrage by national amendment.

We can't blame men alone for inequalities that still exist. We have to liberate ourselves by changing our attitudes and accepting the reality of a world which requires us to be both wives and workers.

Somehow I find it difficult to view men as the enemy.

JUSTICE FOR ALASKAN NATIVES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the 92d Congress has a rare opportunity to

begin dealing honorably and justly with America's native population.

The legislation we enact to settle the land claims of 60,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts of Alaska can stand as a unique and classic example of enlightened Government acting in good faith. Of it can simply continue a long and tragic record of actions to deprive the American Indian of his land and resources, and to foster his desperate economic and cultural impoverishment.

It is important to approach this issue with a keen sense of our past mistakes.

In November of 1969, the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education published a searching examination of congressional action and policy in the field of Indian affairs. Among its central findings was a conclusion that our policy has been dominated by the practice of "coercive assimilation," a program for the destruction of Indian culture and Indian identity.

We have simply told the Indian that his tribal way of life is uncivilized and inappropriate, and that it must, therefore, disappear. We have told him that he must be melted in the melting pot, that he must dive into the mainstream and sink, float, or swim, regardless of whether or not he believes the mainstream to be polluted.

The Indian has displayed a strong, often heroic resistance to assimilation. The policy has not worked.

But rather than question whether it might be in fundamental error, our tendency has been to respond by making it still worse.

We have failed to understand the spiritual nature of the resistance. Instead, we have incorporated two stereotypes. Land reserves, commonly known as reservations, are regarded as one cause of the problem because they are like concentration camps that fence people in and prevent them from integrating into the dominant society. And the provision of Federal services and technical support to Indian communities on land reserves is another cause, because it makes Indians wards of the Government and condemns them to paternalistic dependency.

The logical next step is to "terminate" these facets of our policy; to eliminate the special treatment which allows Indian culture to continue. If Indians will not recognize the superiority of our values and our system on a gradual basis, while their physical survival is being assured, some have concluded that they might be more compliant if we made adoption of those values a prerequisite for staying alive.

The subcommittee report cited earlier suggested some underlying reasons for the policy of coerced assimilation:

A continuing desire to exploit, and appropriate Indian land and physical resources.

A self-righteous intolerance of tribal communities and cultural differences.

But whatever its reasons, its results have been:

The destruction and disorganization of Indian communities and individuals.

A desperately severe and self-perpetuating cycle of poverty for most Indians.

We need not question the good intentions of Congress in order to undertake

a new approach. We need only to recognize that good intentions can produce devastatingly bad results.

Indeed, many of our most substantial legislative failures have been blessed with the best intentions and have been clothed in the rhetoric of generosity and justice. The Allotment Act of 1887, for example, was supported on the floor of the House and of Senate as:

An act of emancipation which would bring the benefit of civilization to American Indians.

An act which would do away with "racial enclaves" and bring about integration of the races.

An act that would rescue the Indian from the taint of being an incompetent ward of the Federal Government.

An act that would free the Indian from the ravages of bureaucratic paternalism.

That act had the support of many humanitarian reformers who felt that manifest destiny would prevail, and that it would be impossible to keep white settlers off Indian land. They argued that this act was the best Indians could obtain from Congress, and that it would at least secure a portion of the Indian land base.

Yet the Allotment Act of 1887 was responsible for reducing the Indian land base by more than two-thirds, and for condemning most tribes to a State of abject poverty from which they have never recovered.

How familiar these arguments sound today. The smell of oil is in the air in Alaska, and it has ignited the fires of manifest destiny once again. And after decades of procrastination, it has lubricated the wheels of congressional action.

We have, therefore, good reason for concern about the possibility that the Native Claims legislation under consideration now could be just as disastrous for Alaskan Natives as the 1887 act was for the tribes of the lower 48 States.

We may proceed on the same false premises—that "racial enclaves" should be broken up, that native villages are not viable, that racial and cultural differences cannot work in our technological society and only impede assimilation, that Alaskan Natives are incapable of managing and developing their land and other resources, and that if we provide a little land and some cash we will have provided full compensation for the claim.

And if we do, we will have practiced again—now in an era which we like to think of as more enlightened—the same exploitive philosophy which has made our treatment of American natives one of the most tragic and shameful patterns of abuse in our national experience.

I hope the Alaskan Native claims issue will become a vehicle for putting those times behind us, and also for recognizing that our society is enriched by a variety of cultures and social patterns, and that for all of our wealth and wisdom, it might just be that our own lives could be improved by the incorporation of some of the more compelling native virtues.

Toward that end, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a number of documents which clarify