

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20407

development firm, which he serves as president.

But Mr. McCurdy's move to improve downtown Rochester came only after his department store had taken the defensive step of opening a suburban branch a decade ago.

"We had a number of friends in the branch business and we thought we would build one and see what happened," he says. "Our suburban branch was very profitable. But we soon discovered it's impractical to build branches of sufficient size to represent a store like ours. So we determined our next move would be to do our utmost to make downtown more attractive than any suburban shopping center could be."

Mr. McCurdy carefully emphasizes the Midtown Plaza project was designed with all downtown Rochester in mind. (His firm and the Forman company are 50-50 partners in the venture.)

Other storekeepers largely agree that whatever helps Rochester's central core should help them, too. But there is no question that some downtown merchants have been put at a competitive disadvantage by the shiny new midtown development, with its own captive audience arriving effortlessly by escalator, hour after hour, from the subterranean three-level parking garage.

Yet Sibley's and Edwards'—Rochester's other big department stores—also benefit from large, above-ground municipal parking garages, completed before Midtown Plaza was started. And, unquestionably, some shoppers park at midtown primarily to visit other nearby shops and stores in Rochester's compact downtown. But Vicki Newton, 22, a junior at the University of Rochester, is not not one of these.

"I used to go down one side of Main Street and up the other," she tells you. "Now I shop in Midtown all the time, constantly. And in the wintertime it's marvelous. I never go outside except to Sibley's." (Sibley's, across Main Street from Midtown, is upstate New York's largest department store.)

Older shoppers, too, are entranced. "My grandmother loves it," one youngster said. "She likes to sit and watch the people, and says to me: 'You run and do something and I'll sit here and look at the flowers.'" Alfred (Alfie) Valentine, 76, a retired music teacher, likes to visit Midtown once a week to meet up with friends. "This place was a Godsend to old people," he says. "Now they come here and see everything. It's an entirely new world." Gus Karner, 70, retired proprietor of Rochester's Nurenberger Hof restaurant, adjusts his straw hat, stomps his cane, and says: "I come in every single day—I live just down the way, across from the Knights of Columbus."

Far from worrying over the center's non-shopping attractions for older persons, Angelo Chiarella, a youthful architect who is Midtown's general manager, likes it that way. "Some do sit on the benches a long time," he says. "But we figure if they like what's going on here we must have struck just the human note that cities need."

One of the town square's attractions is its clean-lined architecture. Another is the sunlight flooding in from 12-foot-high clerestory windows surrounding the 60-foot-high ceiling. A third is the ever-changing throng of dressed-to-kill Rochesterians so obviously enjoying themselves. ("Ogling pretty girls is also a pastime," suggests an official of the Rochester Planning Commission.) But by far the most fascinating of the plaza's allurements is the Clock of the Nations—an artful \$35,000 creation in the center of the square. It stops all traffic every hour and half hour as it puts on a puppet show to the tempo of folk dancing tunes of a dozen foreign nations.

"That clock gave the best value per dollar spent on anything," says General Manager Chiarella. The Gruen architects had it spe-

cially made in Beverly Hills after unsuccessfully searching through Europe for someone to do the job.

Midtown Plaza's big lesson for cities seems to be that downtown business districts need enlivenment, however it is done. It demonstrates the importance of separating automobile traffic from pedestrian traffic (special underground ramps and surface loading docks are provided for delivery trucks servicing stores). It points out quick, easy means of transportation to shopping areas are needed (a subway station, for example, could complement onsite parking in a development like this).

In Rochester, an argument still simmers over how best to meet the changing downtown needs of cities. Mr. McCurdy, who spearheaded this notable project during the tenure of Republican Mayor Peter Barry, says it would have been impossible under Federal renewal procedures. The city's new mayor, Henry E. Gillette, a Democrat, fought the project in its planning stages, now concedes: "It does make Rochester more attractive." But he quickly adds:

"It's very unlikely any other city will attack the problem in this same manner because of the insufficiency of city funds. Cities will have to resort to the Federal urban renewal concept, using Federal, State, and municipal money."

However, that argument is settled, the people of Rochester are sure of one thing: They like Midtown Plaza. It makes the city more lively. As Mrs. Rae Ojalvo, a Rochester housewife, says: "It's something wonderful. It's beautiful. It's a meeting place for everyone."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Call file
THE FREEDOM ACADEMY AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while I am a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, due to unavoidable circumstances I was not able to attend the closing series of meetings at which the aid bill was finally marked up, nor have I participated up to the present time in the debate on the floor of the Senate. However, I have availed myself of some unexpected leisure time to read each day's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so as to follow the debate in the Senate very carefully. First, I congratulate the Senate for the fact that, for the first time in my experience, the Senate has really measured up to its responsibilities on foreign aid legislation and gone into the issues item by item and paragraph by paragraph to try to register its collective judgment in the improvement of a program which everyone knows has fast been going to pot during the past few years.

I especially congratulate my distinguished colleague on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for assuming leadership in opposition to accepting the results of the findings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations without scrutiny, and without amendment. The Senator from Oregon insisted that the Senate spend sufficient time on the subject so that all Senators might be fully conversant with the facts involved, so when they cast their votes they would be voting their independent judgment and the wishes of their constituents in-

stead of merely following the recommendations of the committee report. I think the proposed legislation is important enough to justify that kind of consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. But I wish also to thank the Senator from South Dakota for the assistance he has been to all of us who share that common point of view in our work on the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator was of great help during the hearings and during those sessions of the markup when it was possible for him to be present.

For example, the Senator will recall that it was the Senator from South Dakota who made the final motion by way of compromise in the committee on the contingency fund, about which he and I have been critical for many years, including what we consider to be a misuse of the contingency fund in some instances.

I thank the Senator for the great assistance he has been to those of us who feel that we owe to the American taxpayers the course of action we are following in the Senate on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I am indeed grateful to the Senator. What he has said brings to mind a statement he made one day on the floor of the Senate while I was absent in the hospital. He commented on what I felt was one of the most astonishing statements I have read in Washington newspapers in 25 years. Some columnist, whose name I have forgotten, chided the entire Senate because it was even debating the foreign aid bill, and suggested that such debate was a pure waste of time. I thought the Senator from Oregon, in his typical able manner, put that particular reporter in the spot in which he definitely deserved to be placed. I got a "kick" out of reading the remarks.

Up to now most of our discussion has dealt with the funding of the Foreign Assistance Act and with the way in which the program has operated in specific areas.

I wish to devote the body of my remarks today to a discussion of one of the basic reasons why I think the foreign aid program has fallen into such bad repute around the country. I think it is not primarily the size of the job which we have undertaken or the cost, but the fact that the failures at the end of the line and in the field are now so apparent that Americans generally are rightfully insisting that Congress dedicate itself to correcting such conditions.

I recall that a week ago today the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] took occasion in the course of the Senate debate to point out the need for more adequate training for the American officials who are responsible for the administration of the American programs abroad, and for carrying out the American foreign policies. I support completely the point of view which he expressed. One reason why so much of the \$100 billion we have spent in this

20408

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 8

area has been nonproductive, or perhaps, to use a favorite State Department phrase, even counterproductive, is that we have not had the trained personnel who clearly understood the scope of their jobs and the nature of the Communist menace which we are attempting to resist by the foreign aid program.

I share the skepticism of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] about our merely making multimillion-dollar appropriations for foreign aid while we in the Congress continue to fail to establish the training facilities for our officials which is necessary to enable them to implement the foreign aid programs effectively and produce the results which the country expects from them.

I have voted for far more foreign aid than I have opposed. I speak as one who has introduced several bills to provide for adequate training for those who represent America overseas. I speak as the coauthor of the legislation which the Senate enacted in 1960, moving toward that goal, but which unfortunately has not even yet been voted upon by the House of Representatives.

The best way to express the need for this type of legislation, and the potential for strength which is embodied in the Freedom Academy proposal, of which I am a cosponsor, is to repeat the greatly impressive statement in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Report No. 1689, of the 86th Congress.

I read from page 5 of that report, as follows:

The Communists have conquered a billion people during a period when their sphere was markedly inferior in industry, technology, science, and military capabilities—in fact, inferior in almost everything except power-seeking know-how. The Soviets have been able to expand their empire during this period of inferiority, because they have developed a science of protracted conflict in which they are able to gradually increase their relative power position, using a well-integrated combination of political, economic, and military methods while avoiding a sufficient provocation to invite massive retaliation. Central to their science of protracted conflict is their skill in political and economic warfare.

Soviet capabilities in political and economic warfare are not inborn. They are the result of a massive development and training program extending over several decades. This formidable program has given them a huge fund of political warfare knowledge, an effective operational science, and large numbers of highly trained cold-war professionals.

I continue to read, from page 6 of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary:

There are grave deficiencies in this country's preparation to defend itself and the free world in this unitary, total, unending war to the finish. At the top of the list, and underlying our other failures, is our failure to institute an adequate cold-war development and training program.

Mr. President, since the Senate is considering the present multibillion-dollar foreign aid proposal, it is a good time for Senators again to ask themselves the question, "Why is it that for 15 years, during which there has been an expenditure of over \$100 billion, we have so miserably failed to provide the essential training devices so that our cold war

operatives abroad can function as professionals and experts instead of as the giddy-eyed amateurs they are so demonstrably today?"

Mr. President, I continue to read from page 6 of the committee report, made in 1960:

1. No concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an integrated operational science from our side which will meet the entire Soviet attack and work toward our long-range national objectives in a coordinated manner utilizing every area of potential strength in the public and the private sectors. We have not thought through all of the short- and the long-range methods and means which freemen can properly use when faced with a Soviet-type challenge, and we have not integrated these methods and means into a broad strategic plan. This is especially true in political and economic warfare. Bits and pieces of the problem are being worked on within the Government and at some universities, and a part of this development work is of a high order, but the total effort falls far short of seeking an integrated, operational science and it does not begin to develop our true potential.

2. Nowhere today can Government personnel or private citizens receive broad spectrum training in cold war, especially in the large and highly complex field of political and economic warfare. Not only do we lack top-level schools, we do not even have intermediate or lower level schools. There is no place where the bits and pieces are pulled together and taught in concentrated form.

I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], a great and courageous Senator, was the author of the subcommittee report on which the Judiciary Committee report was based. The Senator from Connecticut is a coauthor of the current Freedom Academy bill, S. 414, which a number of us have been energetically trying to have approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations, approved by the Senate, and sent to the House of Representatives in time so that the House may approve it this year.

I wonder how far the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, would get if it came to the Senate to recommend an appropriation of \$500 million, or \$1 billion, for some aspect of nuclear science—perhaps development of an improved Polaris, or development of an improved delivery system for utilizing nuclear warheads abroad—in similar circumstances. How successful would we be if it came to the Senate, as the Committee on Foreign Relations has come to the Senate, to ask for \$3 billion, if, in connection with the appropriation we asked the Senate to provide, we told Senators candidly and honestly, as the Foreign Relations Committee virtually tells the Senate today, "If you give us the money, we will spend it, but you should be forewarned as to the fact that we do not have any experts in the field to utilize the money. Give us the money for nuclear warheads. Give us the \$500 million for an experiment in connection with nuclear warfare, and we will pick up some fine, idealistic, patriotic, unskilled amateurs who do not know a warhead from a mountain, and who do not understand anything about the basic science of nuclear physics. We will proceed, with those amateurs, to spend the people's money in our national defense."

I believe the Senate would unanimously reject such a request, if made by our Committee on Appropriations. If the Senate did not reject it unanimously, I suspect that the people at home would reject the Senators who voted for that kind of unconscionable squandering of the people's resources.

Yet that is precisely the situation in which we find ourselves as Senators today. The Committee on Foreign Relations is asking the Congress to approve more than \$3 billion of additional money to fight a cold war, and says, "Give us the money. We will see that it is spent. We will get some fine, patriotic, idealistic unskilled people to go overseas, and they will spend the money, even though they are complete amateurs in the entire cold war concept, even though they have never spent a single month in a training facility learning what the Communist apparatus is all about, how it operates, how it functions, and the devious tactics it employs. We will send these amateurs out with "star dust" in their eyes, with billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money in their pockets, to do battle against expert Communist professional operatives functioning in the same field, who have been trained for years in one or more of the six Soviet institutions set up specifically to train the cold war operatives functioning for communism."

Do Senators wish to know why there has been so much trouble with this foreign assistance bill? As I sat in the hospital and in my office reading the debate of days that I was absent it did not conjure up any mysteries in my mind. It did not cause me to seek out obtuse reasons why the debate continues day after day and week after week, as indeed it should. The reason is obvious.

The people of America have finally caught up with Congress, and have pointed the finger of responsibility at each of us. They say, "What gives? After spending \$100 billion, you want \$3 billion more for the same kind of enthusiastic inadequately prepared amateurs to squander overseas, trying to resist, to defeat, to turn back trained, skilled, professional Communist operatives who defeat us in the areas in which we come in contact with them."

I should like to talk about that fact. Now is the time to resolve to do something about it. Nothing has occurred since 1960, when the Senate passed the Freedom Academy bill overwhelmingly, to change the minds of the supporters of the bill or to change the minds of members of the committee. Our need for specifically trained personnel to win the cold war overseas is precisely today what the committee said it was in 1960.

S. 414, which was introduced on January 22 of this year, and which is basically the same as our Freedom Academy bill of 1960 has, as its cosponsors, in addition to the Senator from South Dakota who is now addressing the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from

Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Nobody can type that group of Senators, Mr. President. I defy anybody to label them as "a conservative bloc," "a liberal bloc," "a nationalistic bloc," or "an internationalistic bloc."

They are Senators who represent the whole spectrum of ideological, economic, political, and philosophic differences in the Senate.

But they agree on one thing, namely, that we cannot win a war against professionals if we are relying on amateurs. This does not mean that the amateurs are evil. This does not mean that the amateurs are bad. It merely means that golf tournaments are not won, either, when amateurs are playing against professionals. It means that football games are not won when amateurs are playing against professionals. It means that baseball world championships are not won by amateurs playing against professionals. And wars are not won that way. They are not won by arraying amateurs against professionals when the wars are hot. They are not won that way either when the wars are cold.

This continued squandering of the people's resources, now representing an expenditure of well over \$100 billion, has miserably failed to achieve its optimum results, because contests are not won with that kind of matching of unskilled and inadequately trained amateurs against highly trained professionals.

So, of course, the debate on foreign aid drags on. Of course, amendment after amendment is added to what the Committee on Foreign Relations brought before the Senate. And, of course, when it comes up for the second round, when appropriations must be made—remember, we are talking about an authorization bill only now—it is a foregone conclusion that additional sharp reductions can, and should, be made in those proposed expenditures. Such reductions will be sizable and substantial.

Certainly, these reductions will take place unless by that time the Senate has before it some type of Freedom Academy bill, assuring the American people, at long last, that we are going to train specialized people who will be able to do the job, just as we do in military matters, just as we do in the atomic energy field, just as anyone does in any area of activity whenever one is out to win. And, unless we have the desire to win the cold war, we are stupid indeed to sacrifice so much of our national resources on a formula of failure.

The original position of the administration and of the State Department with respect to our Freedom Academy proposal was indeed a rather curious one. It was said that the kind of training proposed by the Freedom Academy was unnecessary, and that this kind of legislation was not needed. In their enthusiasm, members of the administration even said that that kind of training was already being provided by a few lectures and very short-time, cursory

courses, by which newcomers to Government overseas service were indoctrinated and briefed.

However, after the country rejected that sanctimonious position, the State Department was compelled to change its tactics. After a commission had been appointed by the President to obtain the facts and verify the position of the State Department that it was doing the job, and that no changes and additional training facilities were needed, and after the Commission brought back evidence that the State Department was failing to do the job, that something new was needed, and that the proponents of the Freedom Academy were correct in labeling them as inadequately equipped amateurs who were being sent out to fight against professionals—after that adverse report came back and surprised the administration, the State Department changed its tactics. It countered the great and growing support for the Freedom Academy by proposing a very modest expansion of the present mission of the Foreign Service Institute. It proposed to change its name to something more grandiloquent. It proposed to construct a fine new physical establishment to carry on the Foreign Service Institute program.

The State Department proposal completely fails, however, to grapple with the basic problem which would be met in the Freedom Academy bill. One need look only at the budgetary proposals for the two institutions to see this. The present Foreign Service Institute budget totals around \$6 to \$7 million, including payments from other agencies, to the extent that it is able to train people in foreign language proficiency, to teach them the routine method by which cables are sent back and forth between State Department functionaries and those who are overseas, to teach them to maintain what I hope are adequate security arrangements—although what we read in the newspapers recently leads me to some skepticism as to whether they are doing that job very well—to train people how to act at cocktail parties overseas, and how to greet foreign visitors at embassies with a broad smile and a good hand-clasp; in these highly limited areas of training, the Foreign Service Institute renders a useful service.

The new Academy proposed by the State Department would have a budget of something like \$8 or \$9 million annually. Let us contrast that with what we propose in the Freedom Academy bill, wherein we seek to do the job of fully meeting the problems we face, and of training personnel in the hard-nosed techniques required in order to beat off the seductions and subversions and programs of the Communists, with a minimum budget of from \$35 to \$50 million annually to train the people to do the job.

That is a pretty modest proposal when we stop to think that these are the people who, along with their predecessors, have spent \$100 billion. These are the people who are now calling upon us to give them another \$3½ billion so they can spend it during the remaining of this fiscal year.

Certainly, a training program of \$35 to \$50 million a year to equip and to train properly the people who are going to spend these astronomical amounts is a very modest safeguard in making sure that the money is well spent.

The State Department's shifting from one type of position to another in order to fit into the climate of public opinion deserves to be remarked upon a little further.

First it was said that no training was needed. Then the Department, under pressure, under the severe criticism of its own commission, which it had hoped would pat it on the back, but which, instead, kicked it in the pants, when it got the evidence, reluctantly admitted that the training program was not adequate.

Then the Department moved to confuse and befuddle the issue by advancing a proposal to substitute for the Freedom Academy bill a substitute which, in reality, proposes only to expand, to a very modest degree, what the Department is already doing at its Foreign Service Institute.

For the information of the Senate and the country at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of S. 414, the Freedom Academy proposal.

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

S. 414

(In the Senate of the United States, January 22 (legislative day, January 15), 1963, Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CASE, Mr. DODD, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. SCOTT) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:)

A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Commission Act".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings and statement of policy:

(1) The United States in preparing to defend its national interests in coming years faces grave and complex problems in the nonmilitary as well as military areas.

(2) First and foremost are the problems raised by the unremitting drives by the Soviet Union and Communist China seeking world domination and the destruction of all non-Communist societies. The Communist bloc and the various Communist parties have systematically prepared themselves to wage a thousand-pronged aggression in the nonmilitary area. Drawing on their elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Communist leaders have developed their

conspiratorial version of nonmilitary conflict into an advanced, operational art in which they employ and orchestrate an extraordinary variety of conflict instruments in the political, psychological, ideological, economic, technological, organizational and paramilitary areas enabling them to approach their immediate and long-range objectives along many paths. This creates unique and unprecedented problems for the United States in a conflict that is being waged in student organizations, peasant villages, labor unions, mass communication systems, in city and jungle, and institutions and organizations of every description, as well as in the world's chancelleries. Recognizing that nonmilitary conflict makes extraordinary demands upon its practitioners, the Communists, for several decades, have intensively trained their leadership groups and cadres in an extensive network of basic, intermediate, and advanced schools. The Sino-Soviet conflict capacity has been immeasurably increased by the mobilization of research, science, industry, technology, and education to serve the power-seeking ambitions of Communist leaders rather than the needs of their people.

(3) Second, the problems of the United States are complicated by the emergence of many new nations, the unstable or deteriorating political, social and economic conditions in many parts of the world, the revolutionary forces released by the rising expectations of the world's people, and other factors, all of which increase the difficulties of achieving our national objectives of preventing Communist penetration while seeking to build viable, free, and independent nations.

(A) The nature of the Sino-Soviet power drive, the revolutionary and fluid world situation, the emergence of the United States as the major leader of the free world and the need to deal with the people of nations as well as governments, has compelled the United States to employ many new instruments under the headings of traditional diplomacy, intelligence, technical assistance, aid programs, trade development, educational exchange, cultural exchange, and counter-insurgency (as well as in the area of related military programs). To interrelate and program these present instruments over long periods already requires a high degree of professional competence in many specialties, as well as great managerial skill.

(5) However, the United States has fallen short in developing and utilizing its full capacity to achieve its objectives in the world struggle. Not only do we need to improve the existing instruments, but a wide range of additional methods and means in both the Government and private sectors must be worked out and integrated with the existing instruments of our policy. Otherwise, the United States will lack the means to defeat many forms of Communist aggression and to extend the area of freedom, national independence, and self-government, as well as to attain other national objectives. However, this will require an intensive and comprehensive research and training effort first to think through these additional methods and means, and, second, to educate and train not only specialists, but also leaders at several levels who can visualize and organize these many instruments in an integrated strategy, enabling the United States to approach its national objectives along every path in accord with our ethic.

(6) There has been a tendency to look upon strategy as a series of discrete problems with planning often restricted by jurisdictional walls and parochial attitudes and too much piecemeal planning to handle emergencies at the expense of systematic, long-range development and programing of the many instruments potentially available to us. While there has been marked improvement in such things as language training

at agency schools, and while university centers have made significant progress in area studies, nowhere has the United States established a training program to develop rounded strategists in the nonmilitary area or even certain vital categories of professional specialists, particularly in the area of political, ideological, psychological, and organizational operations and in certain areas of development work. Nor has the United States organized a research program which can be expected to think through the important additional range of methods and means that could be available to us in the Government and private sectors.

(7) In implementing this legislation the following requirements for developing our national capacity for global operations in the nonmilitary area should receive special attention:

I. At the upper levels of Government, the United States must have rounded strategists with intensive interdepartmental training and experience who understand the range of instruments potentially available to us and who can organize and program these instruments over long periods in an integrated, forward strategy that systematically develops and utilizes our full national capacity for the global struggle.

II. Below them, Government personnel must be trained to understand and implement this integrated strategy in all of its dimensions. Through intensive training, as well as experience, we must seek the highest professional competence in those areas of specialized knowledge required by our global operations. Government personnel should have an underlying level of understanding as to the nature of the global conflict, the goals of the United States, and the various possible instruments in achieving these goals to facilitate team operations. We should seek to instill a high degree of elan and dedication.

III. Foreign affairs personnel at all levels must understand communism with special emphasis on Communist nonmilitary conflict technique. It is not enough to have experts available for consultation. This is basic knowledge which must be widely disseminated, if planning and implementation are to be geared to the conflict we are in. (The present two weeks seminar offered at the Foreign Service Institute is entirely too brief for even lower ranking personnel.)

IV. The private sector must understand how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner. There exists in the private sector a huge reservoir of talent, ingenuity, and strength which can be developed and brought to bear in helping to solve many of our global problems. We have hardly begun to explore the range of possibilities.

V. The public must have a deeper understanding of communism, especially Communist nonmilitary conflict technique, and the nature of the global struggle, including the goals of the United States.

(8) The hereinafter created Freedom Academy must be a prestige institution and every effort should be made to demonstrate this is a major effort by the United States in a vital area.

(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the Commission established by section 4 of this Act to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (a) (7) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as set forth in this Act are to be broadly construed.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Freedom Commission established by section 4 of this Act; and

(2) The term "Academy" means the Freedom Academy established by section 6 of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION

SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission, and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies, persons, or the public, and, on behalf of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decisions of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and the Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve as such during the pleasure of the President, and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,500 per annum. Each other member of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

SEC. 6. The Commission shall establish under its supervision and control an advanced research, development, and training center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Commission and Academy shall be:

(1) To conduct research designed to improve the methods and means by which the

United States seeks its national objectives in the nonmilitary part of the global struggle. This should include improvement of the present methods and means and exploration of the full range of additional methods and means that may be available to us in both the Government and private sectors. Special attention shall be given to problems of an interdepartmental nature and to problems involved in organizing and programing the full spectrum of methods and means potentially available in the Government and private sectors in an integrated, forward strategy that will systematically develop and utilize the full capacity of the United States to seek its national objectives in the global struggle, including the defeat of all forms of Communist aggression and the building of free, independent, and viable nations.

(2) To educate and train Government personnel and private citizens so as to meet the requirements set forth in section 2(a)(7) of this Act. The Academy shall be the principal Government interdepartmental, educational, and training center in the nonmilitary area of the United States global operations. Authority is also granted to educate and train foreign students, when this is in the national interest and is approved by the Secretary of State.

(3) To provide leadership in encouraging and assisting universities and other institutions to increase and improve research, educational, and training programs attuned to the global operational needs of the United States.

(4) To provide leadership, guidance, and assistance to the training staffs of Government agencies handling United States global operations, including training programs conducted at oversea posts.

(5) To provide a center where officers and employees of Government agencies, as well as private citizens, can meet to discuss and explore common and special elements of their problems in improving United States capabilities in the global struggle.

STUDENT SELECTION; GRANTS; ADMISSION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

SEC. 7. (a) Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from those areas, organizations, and institutions where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed to achieve the objectives set forth in section 2(a)(7) IV and V. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All agencies and departments of Government are authorized to assign officer and employees to the Academy for designated training.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this Act. This authorization shall include authority to pay actual and necessary travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under this Act. The Commission is authorized to grant financial assistance to the dependents of students who hold no office or employment under the Federal Government during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act. Grants and other financial assistance under this Act shall be in such amounts and subject to such regulations as the Commission may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(c) Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(F)) for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney Gen-

eral. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1251, 1252, and 1253). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 344 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1254).

INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate, with or without charge, information and materials which will assist people and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle and building free, independent, and viable nations. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 10. (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission, nor shall the Commission permit any individual to have access to information which is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution until the Civil Service Commission shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual, and the Commission shall have determined that employing such individual or permitting him to have access to such information will not endanger the common defense and security.

(b) In the event an investigation made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty or is a questionable security risk, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action.

(c) If the Commission deems it to be in

the national interest, the Commission may request the Civil Service Commission to make an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of any individual under consideration for training at the Academy, and if the Commission shall then determine that the training of such individual will not be in the best interest of the United States, he shall receive no training under this Act.

(d) In the event an investigation made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty or is a questionable security risk, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action.

(e) If the President or the Commission shall deem it to be in the national interest, he or the Commission may from time to time cause investigation of any individual which is required or authorized by subsections (a) and (c) of this section to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation instead of by the Civil Service Commission.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

(2) subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission;

(3) to conduct such research, studies, and surveys as the Commission may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(5) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies and pay for such services, facilities, and personnel out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

(7) to utilize or employ on a full-time or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without requiring such personnel to sever their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons serving without compensation;

(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and, in addition, compensation at a rate not to exceed \$50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

(b) The personnel referred to in subsection (a) (2) of this section shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. No such personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of \$19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee.

GENERAL MANAGER OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a general manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The general manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$18,000 per annum.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 13. (a) To assure effective cooperation between the Freedom Academy and various Government agencies concerned with its objectives, there is established an advisory committee to the Freedom Academy (referred to hereinafter as the "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of one representative of each of the following agencies designated by the head of each such agency from officers and employees thereof: The Department of State; the Department of Defense; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Central Intelligence Agency; the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Agency for International Development; and the United States Information Agency.

(b) Members of the Committee shall elect a member to serve as Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman shall serve for such a term of one year. The chairmanship shall rotate among the representatives of the agencies who comprise the membership of the Committee.

(c) No member of the Committee shall receive compensation for his services as such other than that received by him as an officer or employee of the agency represented by him. Each member of the Committee shall be reimbursed for expenses actually and necessarily incurred by him in the performance of duties of the Committee. Such reimbursements shall be made from funds appropriated to the Freedom Commission upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

(d) The Committee shall—

(1) serve as a medium for liaison between the Freedom Commission and the Government agencies represented in the Committee;

(2) review from time to time the plans, programs, and activities of the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, and transmit to the Commission such recommendations as it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the improvement of those plans, programs, and activities;

(3) meet with the Freedom Commission periodically, but not less often than semi-annually, to consult with it with regard to the plans, programs, and activities of the Freedom Commission and the Federal Academy; and

(4) transmit to the President and to the Congress in January of each year a report containing (A) a comprehensive description of the plans, programs, and activities of the Commission and the Academy during the preceding calendar year, and (B) its recommendations for the improvement of those plans, programs, and activities.

(e) The Committee shall promulgate such rules and regulations as it shall determine to be necessary for the performance of its duties.

(f) The Commission shall furnish to the Committee without reimbursement such office space, personal services, supplies and equipment, information, and facilities as the Committee may require for the performance of its functions.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 14. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, these tactics of the State Department, dilatory in nature, doubtful in wisdom, can wear down some of the proponents of reform who operate independently of tax support.

The State Department is a permanent fixture. Its array of individuals can continue to do nothing and get paid for it, whereas those who advocate doing something in the field of thoroughly training our oversea personnel must do it at their own expense. The State Department receives its appropriation annually. Operating income is no problem. A delay of several years works against the continuing ability of persons working for reforms from the outside. Their assets are limited, and they can last only so long. The utter frustration of trying to move the immovable must surely seem completely futile.

Symbolic of this frustration is the recent announcement of the dissolution of the Orlando committee, at Orlando, Fla. After working hard for 13 years, the committee has been dissolved. I believe that all Americans should read the statement issued by the committee on its dissolution. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in its entirety, that statement.

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

The Orlando Committee for the Freedom Academy is disbanding today and will no longer actively seek passage of the Freedom Academy bill, S. 414, H.R. 5638.

Several reasons lay behind the decision unanimously approved by the committee Thursday night (October 11, 1963).

First, the administration, and in particular the Department of State, is now actively opposing the bill. This means there is little chance of passing the legislation in a form acceptable to the committee.

Second, we have reluctantly concluded that even if the bill is passed, it is unlikely this administration, as presently oriented, will establish the type of Academy envisioned by the Orlando committee and described in its "Green Book" and the supplement thereto. The State Department has developed a nar-

row, inhibited, and essentially defensive strategy in the global conflict. It has shown little interest in exploring the whole new range of methods and means by which we could seek our global objectives and has been satisfied to leave the Communists uncontested on much of the political, ideological, and organizational battlegrounds. State has proven especially inhibited, defensive, and even uninterested in the extraordinary opportunities for providing Academy training to foreign nationals, toward exploring the unlimited and exciting possibilities for private sector participation in the global conflict, or even toward providing true professional training for its own people in the new forms of struggle. State does not even seem to understand why the training it is providing at the Foreign Service Institute is grossly inadequate. Unfortunately, the State Department's attitude has permeated the administration, and as long as this attitude and lack of interest prevails, it would likely be reflected in appointments to the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. The Freedom Academy cannot succeed unless there is appreciation of the nature of the research and training gap and a driving desire to close it.

Third, the State Department has put out grossly inaccurate interpretations of the Freedom Academy bill well calculated to mislead the Congress and public. Certain officers at State have even suggested the Freedom Academy is the product of the far right-wing. This is most discouraging to the Orlando committee which has been carefully bipartisan and has enlisted the support of outstanding liberals, moderates, and conservatives. It has made it difficult to debate the bill on its merits.

Fourth, although the Orlando committee has made available extensive briefing material spelling out the cold war research and training gap and explaining the bill, few have studied this. Until more people do their homework, there can be no adequate debate on the merits, and the Congress and the country cannot be alerted to the research and training gap which is undermining our entire effort in the global struggle.

Finally, the 13-year effort to establish the Freedom Academy has exhausted the personal finances of key members of the Orlando committee, and it is now mandatory they return full time to their professions and businesses.

The committee believes the need for the Freedom Academy is more urgent than ever. We do not believe the United States can either contain or defeat the Communist drive for world dominion, much less achieve other objectives, unless we systematically develop our full national capacity to compete in the new forms of struggle along the lines suggested in the "Green Book."

Our committee believes it has done about all it can. The bill is now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is now up to these committees and the House Foreign Affairs Committee to determine what type of bill, if any, is reported out.

What is really needed, however, is a major policy change by this administration. As long as our leadership is satisfied to leave the Communists uncontested on much of the political, ideological, and organizational battlegrounds, as long as they are content to pursue our global objectives, using only a small percentage of the instruments potentially available to us, as long as they persist in responding to the Soviet challenge on a piecemeal, ad hoc basis, as long as they are satisfied to oppose professional conflict managers with untrained and often unmotivated amateurs, as long as they persist in unilateral disengagement in the nonmilitary conflict to mollify our enemies, then there can be no Freedom Academy.

Someday this Nation will recognize that global nonmilitary conflict must be pursued with the same intensity and preparation as global military conflict. With that realization, the Freedom Academy may come into being. We can only hope it is not too late.

The committee wishes to emphasize that the administration's bill to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs is most inadequate and in no way should be considered a substitute for the Freedom Academy. The committee has outlined its objections to this bill at the Senate hearings and in supplement-No. 1 to the green book. The committee wishes to thank the House and Senate sponsors and in particular Senators MUNDT, DODD, and DOUGLAS who carried the load in the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, and SYD HERLONG and Walter Judd, who introduced the original bill in the House in February 1959. We also wish to thank the many newspapers and organizations who endorsed the bill and the editors of Life, the Reader's Digest, and Saturday Evening Post, who gave editorial support, and Roscoe Drummond, for a series of fine columns. Our thanks also to the Senate Judiciary Committee for its report of June 1960, calling the Freedom Academy bill "one of the most important bills ever introduced in the Congress."

Locally, we wish to thank the many individuals and organizations who contributed time, money, and moral support.

THE ORLANDO COMMITTEE FOR THE
FREEDOM ACADEMY.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this discussion of the future of the foreign aid program, the administration and the State Department are forced to meet the moment of truth. Finally they have found out that while they have been able to dissuade those of us who through the years have been trying to establish an efficient and sufficient training academy, while they have been able to resist efforts of fine, independent groups, like the Orlando committee, various posts of the American Legion, and many other organizations and groups who have been urging Congress to do something toward the establishment of the Freedom Academy, and while they have been able to stop anything from developing, they now confront the ugly fact that Americans are losing confidence in the whole foreign aid concept.

Their bill has hit a roadblock for the first time in the Senate. Senators who unthinkingly went along year after year, Senators who complainingly went along, feeling that they owed it to the State Department, and that they should do it as a matter of party loyalty, are now in open rebellion against the kind of program that they have been asked to support and espouse in recent years.

Finally, the country as a whole, and Members of Congress realize the futility of adding additional billions to what we have already spent. Everyone knows that we cannot win a war with amateurs against professionals. Still, the State Department lamely continues its opposition and refuses to do anything substantial in the direction of equipping and adequately training Americans who serve the Government overseas, at least with a modicum of the kind of training that is given extensively to the Communist opponents whom they must confront and whom it is their job to try effectively to resist.

First it was the country that rose up in arms against trying to win a decision with dollars alone, when we did not have the trained personnel to spend the money wisely. Then it was the House of Representatives, where, surprisingly, and gratifyingly, some substantial cuts were made in the foreign aid authorization bill. Now the bill is before the Senate.

The pushover Senate is not to be pushed over any more. We, too, are accountable to the public. We, too, have seen the evidence. We, too, know that we will not win unless we try, and that the first step in trying is to have our personnel carefully, completely, and specifically trained to bring about victory.

It seems to me that it is increasingly observed that there are, very possibly, evil consequences to be suffered by this country and its interests by reason of our continuing to add more money to be spent for some undesirable things to be done in the same ineffective way, and by the same people with the same lack of background training, from which they have already suffered for too long.

It is highly desirable in the Senate action on the pending bill that the foreign aid authorization be sharply curtailed, to show the State Department that the Senate recognizes the fact that the unplanned programs of economic aid and the cold war contest being conducted by untrained personnel have already been demonstrated to be futile.

Even the report from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which rather unenthusiastically urges the Senate to approve its recommendations, points out that the committee also believes that the program should be curtailed and changed, and perhaps eliminated by the end of the next fiscal year, and that something should be evolved in its place. Therefore Congress should reduce the appropriations.

I join those who say that we need to write into the bill a terminal date for foreign aid in order to open the entire question, so that next year there will be before Congress the product of studies which should begin now, to determine how best to exercise our leadership and meet our responsibilities in world affairs.

We all recognize that we cannot pull out of the world. The neutrals and our friends need our support and assistance overseas. Many need our guidance. We must continue our efforts to curtail the aggressive acts of international communism and restore freedom to the areas which it has already enslaved.

The world and the American taxpayer both deserve a program which is effective, which is implemented by personnel who are trained and competent. They need a program which is planned and implemented by professionals, and not merely proposed and promoted by enthusiastic, well-intentioned but inadequately trained amateurs.

The only course to follow in communicating with this see-no-evil, hear-no-evil, feel-no-evil State Department group charged with the implementation of our foreign policy, whose only solution is always, "Give us money, give us billions, and our amateurs will do the job,"

is to bring the present program to a halt, to stop it; and, having stopped it, to write a new type of program, which will encourage countries to help themselves by utilizing the techniques and talents made available to them, to learn to do for themselves by doing, instead of continuing a program under which we try to do things for them, the doing of which in many cases is not prudent or proper, and frequently not even necessary.

Above all, we need the type of trained American personnel operating abroad that the operation of an American Freedom Academy can provide.

As we evolve a new program which can work, we shall be training the workers who can make it succeed, we shall be substituting manpower for money, we shall be substituting professionals for amateurs, and we shall be looking to the development of victory, instead of the perpetuation of defeat.

We should reduce appropriations sharply, so that the voice of Congress can finally be heard at the other end of the avenue. We should write in a terminal date, which will make the administration come forth with something better—not a terminal date to try to shoulder off our responsibility of world leadership, but one which will put us into the cold war contest with trained personnel and with a program which makes sense, which concentrates on the target, which ceases to waste the public funds, and which will begin to win victories around the world.

One reason why I voted for the recommitment of the bill a week ago today, and why I shall continue both in the authorization bill and in the appropriation bill, where, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I anticipate even more gratifying results, to press for reductions in the excessive expenditures provided by the foreign aid bill, is to help to improve our program, which is deteriorating before our eyes, for reasons that are so apparent that we could discover them at midnight, in the basement of a house, with the lights turned out. We know the evidence; we know the reasons; and so does the country generally.

We are only continuing, as we have done in the past, a program which constitutes a complete violation of our responsibility in the Senate and a confession of our failure to meet the needs of our time. Our constituents have a right to expect from us something more consistent, something more constructive, than the perpetuation of a failure and the provision of additional funds for those who have demonstrated their inability to spend the previous hundred billion dollars wisely—not with bad intentions, but because they have not been sufficiently and specifically trained for the job because our Government has completely failed to provide something like a Freedom Academy to train them. The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations itself recognizes the failure of the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in

the RECORD excerpts from pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (Rept. No. 588) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the past the committee has been disappointed by certain aspects of a foreign aid program. There have been instances of failure and inefficiency in the field, administrative and organizational shortcomings, imbalance in the kinds and amounts of aid expended to certain countries, overgenerosity to some recipients and the neglect of other, more deserving recipients, the proliferation of aid programs—especially military aid programs—to an ever-growing number of countries, and inexplicable delays in terminating assistance to countries which no longer need it or which have failed to make productive use of it.

The committee is less impressed with the case made by the executive branch for the maintenance of U.S. aid programs, even on a small scale, in virtually every underdeveloped country in the free world and in a few developed or relatively developed countries. The committee sees little merit in aid programs whose sole or major justification is the maintenance of a U.S. "presence" or the demonstration of U.S. "interest." It is equally unenthusiastic about aid programs, both military and economic, whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the committee report concludes that our best step from here is to continue to proceed to finance existing failures while trying to continue to improve the program. I disagree with the language of the report and the opinion of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who approve it. I believe we serve America poorly and jeopardize our leadership around the world by following the counsel of those who say, "Although the program is failing, let us give it additional billions of dollars so that the failures can be more widely heralded and the program can fail more emphatically."

The State Department ought to be working with Congress to evolve a training system and to develop training facilities so that there will be at least the possibility of success.

No other measure is awaiting immediate consideration on the Senate floor. I serve on the Committee on Appropriations. The Senate has thus far passed five appropriation bills. All the appropriation bills should have been approved by July 1, which is the beginning of the fiscal year. Eight appropriation bills remain to be passed. No one has put pressure upon me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to hurry and mark up bills or to attend conferences between members of the two Houses. Time rolls along.

As a Member of the Senate who feels that already too much money is being spent, and spent too rapidly, I am perfectly content to let the appropriation bills wait until next March.

I am the author of language in our Appropriations Committee report which provides that some economy is being involuntarily effectuated every day we wait, because the increases cannot be spent except on the basis of the time remaining in the fiscal year. So if no one in the administration is in a hurry to

have appropriation bills passed—and no one appears to be—it is not necessary to worry about spending a little extra time debating what to do about foreign aid. Surely, our legislative calendar is far from crowded.

Peace is our most cherished goal. The hazards of failure in the cold war are our most significant problem. I am glad we are working at this task on the Senate floor and are taking sufficient time to do it.

It seems to me that we should take steps on the Senate floor, even at this late date, to make certain that the program is turned in the right direction and that it is hereafter designed to reach the targets expected of it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Real Red Threat," written by Drew Middleton, and published in the New York Times of November 8, 1963. The article emphasizes the fact that if we are to win the cold war—which we must win if we are not to fight a hot one—we will win it because of the political successes which we have overseas, the economic successes, and our victories in the cold war, rather than by merely providing a constantly increasing number of armaments to rival countries so that they can shoot it out with one another in little, localized wars, which ultimately we will be called upon to settle either with our manpower and military might or by our counsel and our guidance.

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

THE REAL RED THREAT—SOME IN EUROPE SEE IT AS POLITICAL AND SAY THE UNITED STATES OVEREMPHASIZES ARMS

(By Drew Middleton)

PARIS, November 7.—Which face of communism is the bigger threat to the West? The Soviet general with his finger near the "go" button or the party agitator with a pocketful of plans for economic revolution? A dispute over whether the military or the political danger is the graver has arisen at the meeting of members of parliaments of countries in the North Atlantic Alliance. The difference of opinion seems to be more than a squabble over East-West trade, or whether there should be an Atlantic Assembly. The latter, an American proposal, would organize the present group of parliament members into a representative body for the North American Alliance.

Much of the criticism of U.S. willingness to discuss outstanding military issues with the Soviet Union, and even of the nuclear test ban treaty arises from this difference over which aspect of communism is the true and immediate danger to Europe.

Washington is criticized for being too interested in the military side of the Communist problem. Such criticism includes the administration's readiness to discuss with Moscow such issues as the prevention of surprise attack and a nonaggression agreement between the Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Pact Powers of the Soviet bloc.

One legislator said the United States was obsessed with the question of troop strength in Europe.

ITALIAN AND FRENCH PROBLEMS

The critics come mainly from countries such as Italy, which has a Communist political problem, or France, where there is danger of a re-creation of a popular front representing the Communist and Socialist movements.

Acute apprehension is shown by Mediterranean members of the alliance over the trend in Greece. The feeling is that communism may have spent its political force in the United States, Britain, Canada, West Germany, Norway and Denmark, but that it is alive and kicking—and dangerous—in the Mediterranean.

The United States, it is said, takes the political health of Europe for granted.

Washington tends to think, the critics say, that in prosperous Europe the Communists represent parties of protest rather than of revolution. In their view this is exactly what the Communists want the United States to believe.

"But let a Communist Party gain power, or even share power in a coalition," said one member of a parliament, "and you Americans will be quickly reminded of the true aims of communism. All the divisions or Polaris submarines in Europe won't prevent the Communists from taking that country out of NATO."

CONTRIBUTIONS CITED

Some may suggest that putting forward this emphasis on communism's political potential is a way of avoiding fulfillment of military commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

But Italy is participating in talks on formation of a mixed-manned force.

Greece, which is sitting in on these talks, makes a contribution to the treaty organization's conventional forces is straining her resources.

Those who criticize American policy are not seeking relaxation of the defense effort in Europe. What they want is recognition by Washington that discussions with Moscow on easing military tension are likely to strengthen the Communist parties where those parties are a conceivable alternative to present governments.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I join the Senator from South Dakota in the views he has expressed concerning the Freedom Academy, particularly.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado. I have the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I beg the Senator's pardon; I appreciate his courtesy.

This phase of our foreign policy has been neglected for so long that it seems to me to be imperative that we give it serious consideration if we are to get back on the right track in our overall war on communism and do something toward establishing a Freedom Academy.

In the 3 years that I have been a Member of Congress, I have been a supporter of a foreign service academy designed to enable the State Department and all other branches of the Government which have oversea operations to obtain qualified personnel, capable of handling the work to which they are assigned, whether it happens to be in the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Commerce, or any other branch of the Government. The theory is that people so trained, particularly when they are on a borderline, close to the Communist conspiracy, are just as much subject to Communist problems as they would be in the State Department, in the foreign aid program, or any other field.

I testified before the subcommittee on behalf of the bill which was considered

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20415

and revised, the so-called Kennedy expansion of the Foreign Service Institute. At that time, the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, indicated that he also felt that the Freedom Academy and the Foreign Service Academy were institutions which ought to be considered by the Senate, but that because of opposition from the Department of State and the administration, he was required by party loyalty to use only the recommendations that were made through the State Department. It seems to me that that is ardent nonsense, so far as the State Department is concerned. We are trying to improve the quality of the personnel who will be called upon to handle these programs, rather than to diminish it. We are trying to enhance the prestige of the State Department, throughout the country, which prestige, frankly, in my opinion, could not be any lower than it is now. We must take some steps to establish a Freedom Academy; and if there is anything I can do to support the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I appreciate even more his assurances of support, because I know that his support on any project or program is something of real substance and significance.

I recall the Senator's brilliant testimony before the committee. We were dealing with the general subject of improving personnel and providing expanded training facilities for those who serve this country overseas.

I share with the Senator from Colorado the regret that nothing along that line has occurred. It is much more important that we convince the State Department that it cannot win the cold war without such trained personnel, whether we appropriate \$3 billion or \$30 billion, more or less, in the foreign aid program for the future.

As I said earlier, I speak as one who has voted for far more foreign aid than I have opposed, starting with the point IV program. But I shall vote against the current authorization bill, when the final rollcall vote is taken. I shall vote against it because I know of no other way in which I can express an effective and clearcut opposition to continuing a program of spending billions of dollars overseas for programs which have not been synthesized or targeted together or coordinated, and for the administration of which we have entirely failed to meet the challenge of providing an updated, coordinated, completely adequate training facility so those who serve us overseas can be equipped with the proper tools and skills.

I may vote in favor of the foreign aid appropriation bill, when it comes before the Senate, for I am not opposed to the foreign aid concept, if by that time we can get from the State Department instead of having it sulk in its marble tepee—an understandable and acceptable king-sized training program. In that case, I may vote, and may try to influence other Senators on our Appropriations Committee to vote, in favor of appropriate foreign aid funds.

But I shall vote against the pending

authorization bill, because I know of no other way by which to demonstrate my determination not to have the United States continue to throw away such large sums of the money of the American people, particularly when that program frequently renders us a disservice, rather than a service.

Mr. President, let me make my position crystal clear. What this country badly needs is a Freedom Academy in which our overseas Government personnel, private citizens, and, on occasion, freedom-supporting people from other lands can be trained in depth and in detail about the whole concept of cold war strategy and how to defeat communism by means short of war.

Communist Russia operates six well-established training institutes to train its own nationals and many visitors from other lands in the techniques the Communists employ in undermining and in weakening freedom wherever it prevails. Here in the United States we have totally failed to develop and utilize a single institute or training facility to provide those on our side of this cold war with equal competence and know-how and with compensatory training in the best techniques for defeating the Communist thrusts against freedom and in making some positive moves of our own.

We have our splendid service academies for the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. Surely nobody advocates closing up the training facilities provided at West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs. We have our War College to train and equip our military leaders and to keep them current on the needed know-how. But in our effort to win the cold war, I repeat Mr. President, we have failed completely to tool up our training facilities to meet the modern, peacetime challenges of communism.

We need such a training facility as the Freedom Academy. We have needed it for years. We desperately need it now. We cannot win our cold war against communism with dollars alone. This Senate and this Congress should insist that the State Department and the White House recognize the realities of the world in which we live and help develop the training facilities which we so badly need.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I point out that a recent item on the news ticker states that the Secretary of State has severely criticized the Senate for its action in connection with the foreign aid authorization bill, particularly for the restrictions it has placed on aid to Indonesia and Yugoslavia.

The question is, What will the Senate do to determine the kind of foreign policy the United States should have? It seems to me there could not be a better forum than this in which to express the irritation of the Senate and of the American people in general about giving U.S. aid to countries which in many cases are not in favor of the United States and are in favor of our enemy. I believe this is the best place in which to express our opinion on that score.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am much interested in that news ticker item, because it is clear evidence that the State Department is now forewarned of our intent.

I recall sitting as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee—whether in open session or in executive session makes no difference, in this respect—at a time when I said to Secretary Rusk, "You had better get busy training some personnel and leadership and establishing an overall training organization in depth or you will have trouble when the bill comes up on the floor of the Senate." I remember that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Missouri said the same thing. However, the State Department officials decided to "bull it through"; their attitude was, "Why change? We have spent \$100 billion of the money of the American people, up to now; and surely we can get another \$3 or \$4 billion at this time." But, Mr. President, they cannot do it that easily any more. Congress is beginning to live up to its responsibility.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In connection with the comment about criticism by Secretary Rusk, he does not realize that before the Marshall plan was established, it was understood that the function of the Senate in connection with foreign affairs was merely to give its advice and consent to treaties and to the nominations of Foreign Service personnel, and nothing else; but today Congress also has a definite responsibility to decide how the foreign aid funds are to be spent. It is both our legislative duty and our constitutional obligation to debate these matters, and the Secretary of State should realize that.

Therefore, I think the action taken yesterday by the Senate, although it was overdue and was taken belatedly, was very necessary; and I hope we continue to watch where such large amounts of the taxpayers' money go, in connection with our foreign aid program.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe the personnel in our Foreign Service are untrained. The Foreign Service personnel I have met are exceedingly well trained, better trained than some of their critics. I do not believe we shall provide for a better Foreign Service by establishing a Foreign Service Academy.

I have long protested, in connection with the Foreign Service, what we call the Ivy League clique. It seems to me it would be a good idea to have in the Foreign Service people from all parts of the country who have a genuine appreciation of American life and its many facets and different cultures.

For example, I believe that the American University, in the Nation's Capital, with its school of international relations, prepares people very well for the Foreign Service. Likewise, I do not believe that all the good generals grad-

uated from West Point. Many of them came from VMI or Texas A. & M. or from colleges with ROTC units. I believe that the Georgetown University Foreign Service School is one of the great foreign service schools in the world; and I believe that Leland Stanford University graduates some fine people who are trained for the field of foreign service.

So I do not believe we do our country any service by alleging that those who work in the State Department are incompetent and incapable of doing their jobs. They are extremely competent. Some of them may not be as competent as we would like them to be, but certainly the same may be said of any office which any one of us manages or of any business in which any of us may be engaged.

I would support a program for the establishment of an academy for training in Foreign Service. I have said so many times. But I do not believe it would answer all our problems—not by a long shot.

Furthermore, I do not believe that in connection with requesting the establishment of an academy for training in Foreign Service, Senators needs to "downgrade" those who are now in the Foreign Service. There are many good people in our Foreign Service, and I do not believe it is a good idea to spread across the world statements to the effect that the State Department wastes billions of dollars because of incompetent personnel.

In the Foreign Service there are men who have given their lives and also the lives of their families to their country. In fact, when the Government hires a Foreign Service officer, it generally gets two for one—both the Foreign Service officer and his wife; and the wives of our Foreign Service officers lead voluntary organizations and do excellent jobs in carrying the philosophy of this country to many parts of the world.

I know what is happening to the foreign aid authorization bill. We can cut it or we can defeat it; and apparently there is among the Members of this body a passion to do something to the foreign aid authorization bill to change it drastically. Some think the foreign aid program should not even be permitted to continue.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, I do not believe that in the process of amending the bill we are required to "run down" the Foreign Service public servants. If I were a Foreign Service officer, I would deeply resent such an attack. Some of the Foreign Service officers go to parts of the world where a Senator would not be willing to go, even if he were paid 10 times his present salary. The Foreign Service officers go to their posts like soldiers; and I am not going to remain silent when attempts are made to rip the Foreign Service to pieces—to downgrade and attack and criticize it unfairly.

I want Senators who criticize it to name the Foreign Service officer who is charged with wasting money. I ask the Senator from South Dakota to give me a bill of particulars. What Foreign Service officer is wasting money? Is the Senator from South Dakota talking about Secretary of State Acheson or

Secretary of State Dulles or Secretary of State Herter or Secretary of State Rusk? About whom is the Senator from South Dakota talking? What Foreign Service officer does he mean?

If a Senator is going to criticize, instead of criticizing a whole class of Government employees, he should name the ones to whom he refers. However, I do not think Senators can name very many responsible Foreign Service officers who have "sold out" this country or have been guilty of mismanagement or misconduct or are incompetent.

In the last few years we have done a great deal to elevate the Foreign Service and to improve and raise the standards.

I have a son who hopes to enter the Foreign Service. At this time he is studying for the Foreign Service; and I resent having the Foreign Service criticized in such fashion. I do not believe that is the way to recruit good people for the Foreign Service. I do not want my son to read, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, charges that the Foreign Service is incompetent and wastes millions of dollars.

I demand a bill of particulars. When the Senator can show me the names of the individuals, and show me the people who have been guilty of the colossal waste charged because they were incompetent or stupid or untrained, I shall be willing to buy the argument. Until then I resent it. I think it is an unfair argument.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Alaska has been offered and stated, and is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield further to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. I hope his remarks will be brief.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. By what right does the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. By unanimous consent I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Alaska yielding further to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the objection comes about an hour too late. By unanimous consent the Senate has already agreed that the Senator from

Alaska would yield to me so that I could present my position, and after I had concluded, the floor was to revert to the Senator from Alaska. I have not concluded because I wish to respond to the Senator from Minnesota. The objection of the Senator from Arkansas would have been highly appropriate an hour ago, but not now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian has advised the Chair that the Senator from Alaska has the floor. Unanimous consent is required to enable him to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from Arkansas has objected to the request by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to know by what parliamentary device the Senator from South Dakota's original understanding with the Senator from Alaska has been vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian has advised the Chair that the Senator from Alaska reasserted his right to the floor when the Senator from South Dakota had concluded his remarks. He now has the floor. Unanimous consent is required for the Senator from Alaska to yield to any other Senator the privilege of the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is my amendment No. 232.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that later he will have any time he desires.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate that very much. I merely wished to say to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that I welcome him in the ranks of those who support the Freedom Academy approach, even though he damned it with faint praise, and even though understandably he opposes some of the arguments which I have presented.

I regret that the Senator from Minnesota was not present during the entire discourse I made on the subject. Quite obviously he has based some of his observations on a misapprehension. First, I have never said that the State Department people are not trained. They are not trained in the appropriate tactics and techniques of the cold war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who has the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Alaska has not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be back.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRUENING. Is there a rule that prohibits a Senator from yielding the floor to another Senator without his giving up his right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a Senator calls for the regular order, the Senator may yield only for a question.