

July 7

a distant repetitiveness, and Moscow will be unimpressed.

All the words we can say about Berlin are as fragile as the Soviet pledge to honor our access routes.

It is only what we do that will communicate our unalterable purpose.

The only rights that Khrushchev will respect are the rights that we are willing to fight for. And he has seen no evidence that we are any more willing to fight seriously for Berlin than we were to fight for Laos or Cuba.

There is one way, and one way only, in which we can make our determination so unmistakable that history can never record 1961 as a year in which we were tragically misunderstood by the Communist imperialism. That way is by clear preparation for a military engagement.

This will not be sabre rattling. There would be no threats of nuclear weapons; indeed no threat at all, merely the quiet preparation for defending the status of West Berlin.

What these preparations should be would depend on a careful calculation of the probable challenge. Presumably stockpiling of military and civilian supplies would be indicated in West Berlin and in the West German termini of communication routes across East Germany.

Armored trucks and trains should be readied, and fighter planes stationed at suitable West German airfields. Additional transport planes could be ferried across from this country.

These would conspicuously be the weapons of an engagement strictly limited to the enforcement of our rights of access to Berlin. They would be in no way aggressive in appearance. There would be no increase in the number of troops in West Berlin (United States, 4,000; United Kingdom, 3,500, and French, 3,500).

The entire deployment would be most unexcitably carried out, and we could hope that in the process our official spokesmen might exhibit the same confident good humor that President Kennedy exhibited when he suggested that Khrushchev not plan to nail up the tiger skin of economic victory until he had captured the tiger.

In all this we shall need the understanding cooperation of our NATO allies, and this may preclude any peacemaking role for Prime Minister Macmillan. For there not only can be no compromise which prejudices our position, there can be no indication that such a compromise might be considered.

In no way can we say in words that we mean to stand firm. The calm preparation to meet the challenge headon—that is what will say what we mean to say.

CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, much has been said in the past with respect to the proposition of Red China being admitted to the United Nations and, I assume, this controversy will develop even more fully in the immediate future.

My position against the inclusion of the Peiping regime in the U.N. is well known. If anything, I feel more strongly now that to admit Communist China to this international body would be one of the most tragic mistakes of our time.

A recent editorial in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, entitled "Campaign of Deception," refers to the admission of Red China to the U.N. as "the grand betrayal." This is an outstanding editorial. Its comments about the latest report of the National Strategy Commit-

tee of the American Security Council are most straightforward and informative.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this fine editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Manchester Union Leader, June 24, 1961]

CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

The latest report of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council presents an intelligent analysis of one of the most misleading of all arguments put forth by proponents of U.N. acceptance of Red China's membership.

We're referring, of course, to the non sequitur—"We can make no real progress with disarmament unless Communist China participates." Therefore: "We can make no real progress with disarmament unless Communist China becomes a member of the United Nations."

It should be obvious that the latter inference simply does not follow from the original premise. Yet, Peiping's apologists in our own country and throughout the world have sought to confuse the whole issue by writing supposedly learned epistles based on the illogical assumption that the admission of Red China to the United Nations would in some way aid the cause of disarmament.

The truth of the matter, as the ASC report points out, is that "admission of another Communist state would make it possible for the Communist bloc to take an even more rigid and belligerent position on all disarmament matters."

Of course, if Red China did qualify for membership in the U.N., i.e., if Red China were a peace-loving nation, if Red China accepted the obligations of the U.N. Charter, and if Red China was able and willing to carry out these obligations, then, the ASC report acknowledges, "the prospects for disarmament would be greatly improved."

However, the National Strategy Committee emphasizes, "the pious hope that making Communist China a member of the U.N. would force her to bow to the pressures of world opinion and abide by both the spirit and the letter of international agreements, is hardly a sound basis for the reduction of armaments."

The assumption that Red China's presence at the Conference in Geneva of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament this August would aid the Committee in its work is unbelievably naive.

The free world, unless it chooses to close its eyes to the facts—will see the type of obstructionism Red China would employ as a member of the U.N. when the Fourteen Power Conference on Laos attempts to reach a solution to that particular problem. And the ASC report is right on target with its analysis of how Red China's participation in this Conference "will undoubtedly be used propagandawise to emphasize the Communist line that a nation of 600 million cannot be ignored; that it is firmly established and will remain the true Government of China; and that it is prepared to work with other nations to contribute to a lessening of tensions. These themes will be played over and over again throughout the summer months, echoing from the sophisticated international Conference headquarters in Geneva throughout the capitals of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Indeed, Peiping's inclusion at the Conference table is a calculated move to wear down the opposition of Congress and the overwhelming majority of the American people to the grand betrayal—the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

TELFORD TAYLOR AND THE CIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger of June 14, 1961. This article appeared on page 1 under the heading "Protests Mount Against Telford Taylor as CIA Boss." It was written by Edward J. Mowery under a Washington dateline.

I think the information contained in this article may be of interest to the Members of the Senate because some confusion arises with respect to individuals named "General Taylor."

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

PROJECTS MOUNT AGAINST TELFORD TAYLOR AS CIA BOSS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—The active boom for retired Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor to head the Central Intelligence Agency has caused grave concern, even consternation, on Capitol Hill.

Allen W. Dulles, 68-year-old CIA Director (since 1953) has evinced no desire to step out. But he has been held personally responsible for the abortive, CIA-directed Cuban invasion and is expected to be replaced.

Taylor, a product of Harvard Law School, a native of Schenectady, and a New York City lawyer, is known as a perennial champion of leftists, whose professional talents have aided such individuals as Harry Bridges, various Smith Act defendants, and union moguls with asserted Communist leanings.

Others mentioned for the Dulles post are Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor (who heads a committee probing CIA), Deputy Attorney General Byron R. "Whizzer" White (reputed choice of his boss, Robert F. Kennedy), and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway (favored by Gen. Douglas MacArthur).

But the ground swell for Taylor's nomination, it was learned yesterday, has reached the cloakroom discussion stage, and Taylor has reportedly been interviewed extensively for the CIA post.

Taylor supporters claim they have the sympathy of Walter W. Rostow, deputy special assistant to the President for national security affairs.

Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle coyly dodged all direct questions relating to the Taylor rumors, but they did not mask their concern.

Congress, they indicated, will take a hard, solid look at any nominee for the important CIA directorship which requires Senate confirmation via the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—who also refused to comment on Taylor rumors—characterized the CIA top post as a vital rung in safeguarding America's security.

Dodd, who has served with Naval intelligence, the FBI, and as vice chairman of the Nuremberg war trial review board, declared:

"This position (CIA Director) is one of the most sensitive, delicate, and important in the Federal Government. Both the President and the country must have unquestioned confidence in whomever is chosen to fill it.

"I would place this position on a level with that of the Secretary of Defense and Director of the FBI, requiring the same kind and degree of confidence as that reposed in J. Edgar Hoover.

I recently read an editorial from his Oakland Tribune which illustrates this fact. The editorial, entitled "The Berlin Powder Keg," correctly states:

The supply of little surrenders has been exhausted. * * * On the issue of Berlin the chips are down and the sooner 180 million Americans face up to these facts the more likely our Nation is to survive and with us a free world of freemen.

Our actions with respect to Berlin could well be the deciding factor in the efforts of freemen to win the struggle with Communist oppression. A concession to Russian threats would be disastrous.

The editorial in the Oakland Tribune by our former colleague is an outstanding commentary on this crisis, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE BERLIN POWDER KEG

Will the lights be going out in Berlin before the year 1961 passes into history on December 31?

In Washington, Moscow, Bonn, Paris, and London the implications of the Khrushchev thinly veiled ultimatum is better understood than it is away from the capital cities.

Before we hardly know it summer will pass into fall and the preparations for Christmas with its message of "Peace on earth, good will to men" will be subverted by the rulers of the Kremlin determined to force a showdown even at the calculated risk of war.

They anticipate that their will and iron nerve will outlast what they consider "the decadent West" and will result in an abject surrender by the North Atlantic powers.

Despite the Munich-minded men in our own country and among some of the allied nations there can be no surrender of the free people of Berlin without destroying the morale of freemen everywhere to resist Communist tyranny. These are the stakes Moscow is playing for and determined to win.

The supply of little surrenders has been exhausted by the stalemate in Korea, the farce at Geneva, the offer of payment of tractor blackmail to Castro and the backdown, after brave words, in Laos.

On the issue of Berlin the chips are down and the sooner 180 million Americans face up to these facts the more likely our Nation is to survive and with us a free world of freemen.

At an early date the wives and children of our combat-ready forces in the isolated garrison of Berlin should be withdrawn, for no nonresident women and children should be available as possible hostages to communism.

It will soon be time for our forces and the city of Berlin to strip for action. No nonessential personnel or nonproductive workers should be left there to be furnished food, fuel, and clothing by airlift or otherwise.

As a completely surrounded outpost of freedom neither the token forces there nor the courageous civilians of Berlin could long hold out against a massive Soviet or East German Communist effort to take the city. But neither was the Alamo, Fort Sumter, or Corregidor able to hold out against the overwhelming odds against those garrisons. The forces which won the initial struggle lost the three wars against us.

But nothing will impress Khrushchev and his Presidium more than the certain knowledge that we have determined to preserve this island of freedom, that we understand the calculated risks involved and the potential costs. We will not fire unless fired upon

but if our garrison and the free city of Berlin is attacked by Communist forces, East German or Soviet, the Communists must know that we will fight with all the weapons and all of the power of a free people determined to remain free. This resolve was so clearly enunciated in the Declaration of Independence in these words:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

"HOW TO MAKE A PORK BARREL"

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "How To Make a Pork Barrel," which appeared in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal, provides a shocking revelation of the extent to which the urban renewal program is used and abused.

The facts brought out in this revealing column make previous advocates of pork-barrel legislation look like skinflints. When, in the name of urban renewal, a town can receive as much as \$478 in Federal funds for every one of its inhabitants, we have certainly hit a new high—or perhaps the word should be low—in fiscal irresponsibility.

I believe this commentary should be read by every Member of this body, and I particularly commend it to those Senators who champion the cause of a multi-billion-dollar urban renewal program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "How To Make a Pork Barrel" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOW TO MAKE A PORK BARREL

If the phrase "urban renewal" conjures up any clear image it is that of a street scene in one of our great cities, with its rows of tenements swarming with people lacking not merely room to move but air to breathe, a congestion that chokes not merely the view but the community that surrounds it.

Such, anyway, was the image that supposedly moved Congress to pass the multi-billion-dollar urban renewal program. There was little inquiry as to why the slums and congestion existed or why the cities were unwilling to renew themselves. It was sufficient that the condition was; therefore, to apply the familiar remedy of billions from Washington.

Well, the actuality has turned out to be something different, as a detailed report in this newspaper the other day revealed. Whatever else this program may be, it isn't urban renewal.

A more accurate name today might be "the village landscaping program" or, if people were willing to be bluntly honest, the Federal pork barrel project. That old favorite of Congress, the rivers and harbors bill, just can't compare with his handy, bulging cask for dipping into.

Take just a few samples from the many reported in our recent story: The metropolises of East Granby, Conn., \$246,000 of Federal funds for its 2,434 people. Lithonia, Ga., \$102,800 for its 1,667 people. Atchison, Kans., \$1,916,800 for its 12,500 people.

Or look a little more closely at the situation in Mercedes, Tex., a town of some 10,000 people. Here was a town which, by all the evidence, really did need a new sewer system, the cost of that program being about \$234,000. In the words of the mayor, "We would never have been able to finance that by ourselves."

So what happened? In the name of "urban renewal" this small town got a Federal grant of \$1.1 million not only to fix up its sewer system but also to pave streets and build a residential housing project. And now, again in the words of the mayor, "We're able to issue \$350,000 in bonds for a new civic center without even raising the tax rate." They can now build a civic center when they were too poor to take care of their own sewage.

Or look at Wink, Tex. Here the Federal Government has allotted \$478 for every man, woman, and child of its 1,800 population. This to completely remodel the town's business district, all three blocks of it.

To labor the evidence would be needless. As one of the officials of the Urban Renewal Administration quite frankly states, "There are no limits whatever on the size a city has to be to get urban renewal grants." And apparently none, either, on the kind of project for which towns and villages can tap the Federal till. The list of things which these happy folk are building with Federal funds includes parks, playgrounds, tennis courts, and swimming pools. All good things indeed for any town. And more blessed yet when they are paid by other people's taxes.

As a pork barrel this has the wonderful advantage that there's no need for any pretense about building a dam to preserve natural resources or dredging a creek for navigation purposes; the handouts can go to lovely, little towns like Princeton, N.J., or crossroad villages, like Wink, Tex., lost in the wide-open mesquite plains. All you need is a diligent representative in Washington.

It's hardly necessary to labor the editorial comment either. As the publisher of the Wink Bulletin remarked, "You can hardly spend money like this in a little town without doing some good." Or as the Mercedes mayor put it, "This is the greatest thing that's happened to us in years."

So it is. And also the greatest thing that's happened in years to the business of building pork barrels.

BERLIN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Boston Sunday Herald, one of the outstanding newspapers in the country, outlined in a frank and hardhitting manner the problem we face with respect to Berlin and the initial steps which should be taken to prevent a tragic misunderstanding by the Communist bloc of our intentions with respect to this strategic city.

The commentary rightfully points out:

All the words we can say about Berlin are as fragile as the Soviet pledge to honor our access routes. It is only what we do that will communicate our unalterable purpose.

I heartily agree. While we can hope for the best, we must of necessity be prepared for the worst, and I, for one, hope we will not be tardy in making these preparations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Boston Sunday Herald be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

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

FRAGILE WORDS ON BERLIN

We cannot say enough times that we will not get out of Berlin to convince the Soviet that we will not.

We can string out one no after another until the processions of negatives fade into

1961

"I personally believe that the individual (named to the CIA), his qualifications and background will come under exhaustive scrutiny by the Congress * * *"

Who is Telford Taylor, an apparent front-runner in the scramble for the top job in the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency?

HELD MANY POSTS

Newspaper files, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and other data disclose that Taylor (now 53) entered Government service as a young New Deal lawyer in 1933 in the Department of the Interior.

He served successively in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Attorney General's Office, and Federal Communications Commission (General Counsel) before entering the Army in 1942.

After a brief stint in military intelligence (Europe), Taylor became a staff colonel (1945) at the Nuremberg war trials and chief U.S. counsel at proceedings subsequent to the Four Power trials of principal defendants. He became a brigadier general in 1946.

ATTACKED IN SENATE

The "Nuremberg Trial Scandal"—alleged procedures under Taylor's direction—erupted before Presiding Judge Charles F. Wennerstrum left Germany. The judge bitterly attacked prosecution procedures.

Charges against Taylor exploded in the Senate in two stages. On May 1, 1950, Mrs. Freda Utley, a self-described former member of the British Communist Party who lived 6 years in the U.S.S.R., described Taylor as being "sympathetic" to the Soviet Union, "one of a number * * * with leftish sympathies."

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee (p. 777 of the record), Mrs. Utley (an author) said she considered America to be the hope of the free world, "and people like [Owen] Lattimore a menace to our freedom."

MADE CHARGE IN BOOK

"Question. Did you write 'The High Cost of Vengeance' (a book about Germany) and did you refer to Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor as being sympathetic to Soviet Russia?"

"Answer. In a chapter I referred to a number of people with those kind of leftish sympathies * * * who has been placed in high position * * * and I referred to Telford Taylor. That was the general opinion of Mr. Taylor * * *"

(Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan, had previously demanded an investigation of Nuremberg trial procedures and the "Communist clique" which had assertedly penetrated the Taylor staff.)

TRUMAN APPOINTEE

On December 18, 1950, the late Senator William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, startled members of the Senate Judiciary Committee with this assertion:

"If the payrolls are subpoenaed * * * it will be seen that practically the entire (Nuremberg) staff was composed of leftists and men * * * since exposed as Communists and members of Communist-front organizations."

Taylor next appeared on the Washington scene (1951) as head of the Small Defense Plants Administration (a Truman appointee), and in November 1953, the Harvard lawyer touched off a real hassle with the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy with a speech before the Cadet Corps at West Point.

BLASTED MCCARTHY

Taylor called the Senate Government Operations Committee probe of espionage at the Ft. Monmouth, N.J., radar center "a shameful abuse of congressional investigating power." And McCarthy, Taylor said, was a dangerous adventurer.

The Wisconsin Senator's quick rebuttal took the form of a bombshell.

McCarthy announced that Taylor's civil service record was "flagged" with the notation, "unresolved question of loyalty."

Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young told newsmen that the "flagging" meant either that a loyalty investigation was underway when Taylor left the Small Defense Plants Administration (September 18, 1952) * * * or one had been made without a decision.

He assumed the "flag" would stay on Taylor's record, Young explained, unless the "Commission takes action to remove it * * * the matter has never come up."

Three weeks later, McCarthy reported receiving a list of "about" 125 Reds who allegedly had infiltrated the staff of John McCloy, High [U.S.] Commissioner for Germany * * * "who were brought in by McCloy, Telford Taylor, and others."

McCarthy charged that the persons were identified Communists who fled Germany, became U.S. citizens and returned to work in McCloy's office.

DEFENDED BRIDGES

Newspaper files (including those of the Daily Worker and People's Daily World) picture Telford Taylor as frequently defending accused Communists.

He has appeared as defense counsel twice to stymie government efforts to deport Harry Bridges, and is quoted as having described Bridges' long pro-Red record as the record "of successful trade union leadership."

Taylor also has appeared for seven Smith Act defendants in Hawaii, for 14 officers of the Communist-controlled International Mine, Mill & Smelters Union, for Junius Scales, described by the Daily Worker as a victim of the Smith Act, and for six U.N. workers whose dismissal stemmed from their alleged leftist views.

BOOMED AS CANDIDATE

Scales' conviction under the act's Communist Party membership clause (with a 6-year prison term) was upheld June 5 in a startling Supreme Court decision.

Taylor's rising star as the professional champion of leftists triggered one unique proposal that he be boomed for Attorney General.

Testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee concerning Communist political subversion—page 7341 of the official record—unfolds a speech by Corliss Lamont at a party sponsored by the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born.

Lamont told his enthusiastic audience that Telford Taylor should be appointed Attorney General of the United States.

This may have been a protective measure by Lamont and the notorious committee. Lamont is vice chairman of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a cited Communist front.

The ACPFB, according to the Attorney General, is "subversive and Communist."

As one lawmaker commented concerning the CIA:

"Whoever pops up as the suggested nominee for Director * * * will get a hard, thorough appraisal."

ONE THOUSAND VOTES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press has added its commendations to that being heard throughout the Nation on the occasion of the 1,000th consecutive vote of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. The Press says, "In 6 years, Maine's voice not once has been neglected." I would add only that in the years that Senator SMITH has been in

the Senate, neither has the national welfare ever been neglected by the senior Senator from Maine.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 19, 1961]

HEAP OF YEAS AND NAYS

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that faithful journal of the words and deeds of our Washington lawmakers, there appear every so often the results of the voting: Yeas, so many; nays, so many; not voting, so many.

With exceptions so rare as to be almost never, the "not voting" list is a part of the RECORD, usually preceded by formal apologies for the absentees, such as: "I announce that the Senator from wherever is absent on official business." Which could mean anything.

But never once, in about 6 years, has the name of MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the Senator from Maine, appeared on the "not voting" list. When the billboard test came to a vote Thursday, Mrs. SMITH answered her 1,000th consecutive rollcall.

This was such an unusual performance that the hardbitten male politicians of the Senate paused to note it with applauding oratory. Never before, in 172 years, had any Senator compiled such a consistency.

Now how a Senator votes, and how he attends to his duties otherwise, could be more important than fidelity in responding to the drone of the rollcall clerk. But this is a remarkable record, as evidenced by the fact that no other Senator ever approached it and that it was freely predicted by those lauding Mrs. SMITH that no other ever would.

In the Senate, as in other legislative bodies, there always are some who unavoidably are detained, some who deliberately duck, some who just don't get there in time to vote. For 1,000 rollcalls, vital or not, Mrs. SMITH has been in none of these categories. She was there.

And when you come right down to it, isn't that why we send Senators to Washington? To vote for us on the issues, great and small. In 6 years, Maine's voice not once has been neglected.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press, a highly regarded newspaper in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has endorsed the proposal by the distinguished Senator from Utah to prevent more back-door spending. The newspaper makes the point very simply, when it says:

The alternative is rampant Government debt, and quite probably further depreciation of the 47-cent dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 19, 1961]

DRAIN ON THE TREASURY

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Salt Lake City, is making a new attempt to shut the back door to the Treasury.

He is doing this in the face of an increasing number of programs sponsored by the Kennedy administration to expand this debt-making way of doing business.

Under the Constitution, taxpayer money is supposed to be spent only by specific ap-

proprations passed by Congress. The backdoor system sidesteps this constitutional mandate. Instead of making appropriations, Congress merely says to a Government agency: "We won't give you any money directly, but you go down to the Treasury and borrow it."

This eliminates congressional control on spending. The agency borrows from the Treasury and the Treasury borrows wherever it can get the money. Up goes the national debt.

Treasury Secretary Dillon has just been before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a proposal to permit the administration to take \$8,800 million through the back door of the Treasury for long-term foreign aid loans over 5 years. Mr. Dillon says this is the "most efficient and least costly" way to provide this foreign aid.

It is neither. Congress loses control. The debt increases. Inflation is stimulated.

"This is hidden spending of which people are often unaware," says Senator BENNETT. "Yet it hurts our pocketbooks, both in the form of tax drains and decreased purchasing power through inflation. It weakens control over Government spending in general. It can result in loss of confidence in our dollar at home and abroad."

Senator BENNETT has proposed a change in Senate rules which would prohibit any spending except by appropriations cleared by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In the House a similar rule has been blocked in committee. But if the Bennett proposal is approved by the Senate the effect will be the same as if both Houses had agreed to abide by the Constitution. At least in the Senate, any spending scheme must pass muster by the Appropriations Committee and there will be an annual limitation on handouts of the taxpayers' money.

The alternative is rampant Government debt, and quite probably further depreciation of the 47-cent dollar.

TRANSITION IN AFRICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the emerging nations on the African Continent present us with an extraordinary challenge in every phase of our national American economy and policy. We have not been adequately prepared for the swift developments in Africa, and in the effort to catch up numerous problems have been created, particularly in the economic area. Some of these are discussed in an article by H. S. Cummings, Director, Africa-Near East Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD his article entitled "Facing the Power Shift in Africa," which appears in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, July 3, 1961.

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

FACING THE POWER SHIFT IN AFRICA

(An analysis of the "mutual ignorance gap" between the United States of America and the emerging African nations)

(By H. J. Cummings, Director, Africa-Near East Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce)

Every businessman in America, indeed every taxpayer in America, is being affected in some measure by the major power shift now being carried out in a large part of the continent of Africa.

The transition from European control to African control of economic activities in Africa is now underway. This transfer of economic power from London, Paris, and Brussels to some 24 newly independent areas

of Africa is a matter of direct concern to Americans as well as to the peoples of the new African countries involved and to the citizens of former metropolises.

Our direct concern with this power shift is illustrated rather dramatically in the sudden change in economic relationships between the United States and the Republic of the Congo after the latter received its independence just a year ago. In the period 1955-60, U.S. exports to the Congo averaged about \$40 million a year and U.S. aid expenditures to the area during that period were nil. During the year following the power shift from Brussels to Leopoldville, the level of U.S. exports fell nearly 50 percent below the 1959 level and U.S. aid to the Republic of the Congo reached a level of about \$75 million.

POWER SHIFT COSTLY

This shift in power from Brussels to Leopoldville was sudden, disorderly, and very costly in terms of human life as well as in terms of money. Its effects in discouraging private foreign and domestic capital participation in African economic development have been felt in Africa far beyond the Congo's frontiers. African officials of countries located hundreds of miles from the nearest Congo border state frankly that their attempts to attract foreign capital and foreign technical and management assistance have been seriously hampered by events in the Congo. Experienced bankers and businessmen in nearby east Africa and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland attribute much of the capital flight from those areas in the latter part of 1960 to the failure of the power shift from Brussels to Leopoldville to take place in an orderly fashion.

This one tragic and costly breakdown in the power transfer process has served to focus attention on the nature of the problems to be faced in Africa during and following the transition period in which Africans assume responsibility for economic control of their respective countries. In order to understand these problems we must acquaint ourselves with the institutional arrangements that existed just prior to the transition period. These might be roughly and very generally summarized as follows:

Economic policy was developed in the metropole and carried out in the African territories largely by European staffs. In the private sphere international trading activities were handled by large expatriate firms. In short, the actual operation of both the public and private sectors of the economy was the responsibility of the European civil servant and the expatriate businessman. During this period the supporting institutions of both the public and private sectors were European and located in Europe. The highly developed and costly educational systems that produced civil servants, teachers, technicians, businessmen and professional men for the African areas were located in Europe and financed by Europeans.

LEADERS RECOGNIZE NEEDS

Many responsible African leaders recognize that the transfer of economic power from the metropolises to individual African countries did not carry with it the basic social and economic institutions essential to sustained and orderly economic growth. In the long run, such institutions must and will be developed in Africa. In the meantime, each African country must utilize to the fullest extent possible economic and social resources available to it from friendly non-African sources including the former metropolises.

In a few African countries aggressive programs for educating Africans abroad and for attracting foreign capital and management training to Africa are already underway. In others, such programs are still in the planning stage. In many African countries the leaders are expecting the United States to

increase its share of participation in the social and economic development of Africa.

These expectations are in many cases very general and are based upon impressions gained by African leaders during comparatively brief visits to the United States. Actually, most African leaders are quite unaware of the multifariousness of this country's training resources; most Americans likewise are unaware of the wide range of specific and urgent demands African countries have for know-how, technical and management training assistance, and for foreign capital—both public and private. This mutual ignorance gap cannot be closed by merely matching comprehensive catalogs of African requirements against American availabilities but such catalogs, if produced on a periodic basis, might be useful in determining program priorities.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PRIORITIES

The problem of determining development project priorities in Africa during the coming decade may be complicated by a number of factors that can influence regional as well as national economic growth rates. Should, for example, national rivalries in Africa be carried to the point where the large hydroelectric power installation becomes the preferred status symbol of national progress, then programs for diversified development will have to be scrapped or at least placed in the bureaucratic deep freeze, pending the coronation of the national kilowatt king. Since, in many instances, national boundaries in Africa were established with little or no regard for economic and ethnic realities, some national economic development efforts will be handicapped by a paucity of natural resources and the lack of a sense of national unity.

To minimize their handicaps, Africans will have to intensify their efforts in working out regional development schemes with their neighbors. Both Africans and Americans should develop effective methods for exchanging information and ideas on matters relating to specific African development needs and to specific American means of meeting these needs.

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL HELP

Effective methods cannot be worked out without first taking into account two basic ingredients in Africa's present and future development programs: the first is that Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, will continue to be the principal source of many of Africa's development needs that must be met from outside sources; the second is that many international organizations—such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, and many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, including the Economic Commission for Africa—will become increasingly important sources of assistance to Africa.

It might be well for everyone concerned in this matter to keep in mind that for the foreseeable future, global development requirements will run considerably ahead of the world's capacity to meet these requirements and that Africa will find itself in competition with southeast Asia and Latin America in its attempts to obtain capital and know-how.

Against this background Africans and Americans can develop effective methods of exchanging information and ideas on specific fields for African-American cooperation in African development. The first step in developing these methods would be to look at what of value is currently being done in this field. This would include an evaluation of African as well as of United States efforts. For sake of convenience, these efforts might be classified in three general categories according to their origin and source of finances—private, public, and combined pri-