

February 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000200830003-9

[Mr. ASHBROOK] served as a member. I include in the body of today's RECORD an article by Jack Steele in the Columbus Citizen-Journal, on Monday, February 27, 1967:

POWELL CASE: ASHBROOK CALLED TURN IN 1963

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON.—If the House had paid attention to Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-O.) back in 1963, it might have avoided the present hassle over seating Adam Clayton Powell.

Ashbrook, in a House speech on March 12, 1963, accused Powell of falsifying an official expense report he had filed with the House on a 1962 junket to Europe.

This was Powell's notorious six-week jaunt to London, Paris, Venice, Rome, Athens, Delhi and other watering places with two women members of his staff, beauty-queen Corrine Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall.

The three had luxuriated at London theaters, Paris nightclubs and at a beachhouse in Greece.

Ashbrook charged that Powell had drawn far more in foreign currencies from the State Department to finance the junket than he had reported spending to the House.

Powell ignored his charges.

The State Department refused to divulge how much it had turned over to Powell and his companions in foreign currencies—most of it counterpart funds generated by the foreign aid program.

The House Administration Committee, which now aspires to serve as the guardian of congressmen's ethics, disclaimed any responsibility for checking up on Powell's travel expenses.

The House collectively yawned.

Now—nearly four years later—the special House committee which investigated Powell's fitness to be seated finally has confirmed that Ashbrook's charges were correct.

The committee's report disclosed that Powell and his two fellow travelers collected \$10,607 in foreign currencies from the State Department for their 1962 European junket.

But they reported to the House that they had spent less than half this on the trip—\$4938. The report does not say what happened to the rest of the money.

The committee dug into Powell's foreign trips because one of its members, Rep. Vernon W. Thomson (R-Wis.) remembered Ashbrook's charges and demanded that State Department records be subpoenaed, if necessary, to check on them.

The records show that in the years 1961 through 1964 Powell drew \$13,614 in foreign currencies for his own trips abroad and listed only \$6902 in expenses in his reports to the House.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXIV: THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

(Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at the House Armed Services Committee hearings last June, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York

[Mr. PIKE], asked General Hershey if the percentage of qualified Negroes drafted was higher than that of qualified non-Negroes. The Director of the Selective Service responded:

No; I don't think so, because in the first place the population is somewhere around 11 or 12 percent, so that leaves in all other groups about 88 percent and I doubt very seriously that the 88 percent isn't furnishing a higher percentage, relatively, than the 12 percent.

The results of a study of the draft figures for 1965, however, dispute General Hershey's thoughts on this matter: 1,037,788 whites were given preinduction examinations; 630,592 were found acceptable—60.7 percent of those examined; 194,696 were drafted—30.8 percent of those found acceptable; 163,425 nonwhites were given preinduction examinations; 47,792 were found acceptable—29.2 percent of those examined; 29,608 were drafted—61.9 percent of those found acceptable.

While it is convenient to cite the fact that the percentage of nonwhites who are conscripted, and this essentially means the Negro, at times may approximate the percentage of Negroes in our population, the significant fact is that a smaller proportion of Negroes meet the physical and mental standards for induction, and of these, a larger proportion are drafted.

Statistically, then, the Negro qualified for induction stands twice as great a chance of being drafted as does the white who is qualified for military service.

SOUTH AFRICA MUST RE-EXAMINE ITS RACIAL POLICIES

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the strict segregation of the races that is attempted by the Government of South Africa is bringing it more problems every day.

The Christian Science Monitor for February 17 points out that South Africa must "find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life."

I commend this editorial to the attention of other Members of the House.

NEW DILEMMA IN SOUTH AFRICA

A dispatch to this newspaper from Cape Town recently revealed another of the serious difficulties facing the Republic of South Africa. In its efforts to increase the white percentage of the population, the government has been encouraging European immigration. Now, however, there is a rising demand from within the Afrikaans-speaking community that such immigration be halted. And the reason? Because most of the newcomers were found to be joining the English-speaking sector, arousing fear among the Afrikaners that their present firm grip on the government might some day be swept away.

Thus the government finds itself in a cleft stick. On the one hand the white population (both Afrikaans- and English-speaking) came to less than one in every five South Africans in the 1960 census. Furthermore, the nonwhite majority (black Africans, Cape

Coloureds, and Indians) has a far higher birthrate than the whites. Therefore, if there is no immigration, the whites will become a smaller and smaller minority year by year.

On the other hand, the Nationalist government has clearly found it impossible to find adequate sources of immigration (the most likely being German and Dutch Protestants) who can be expected to meld with the Afrikaner portion of the white population. Thus any other kind of white inflow raises its own threat to Nationalist sway—that of seeing English-speaking whitedom take over the running of the country.

This dilemma is but one of the forces which will inevitably force the Republic of South Africa into a thoroughgoing reexamination of its basic racial policies. It becomes increasingly apparent that the fundamental need is for that land to find the will and the means to bring all of its inhabitants, regardless of color, into a fuller participation in all aspects of national life. This is an inescapable obligation, as the increasing contradictions of any other course of action show.

THE ROLE OF THE CIA

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure of the secret relationship between the CIA and several private organizations and of certain USIA activities has prompted considerable public discussion as to the proper role of these two groups.

Edward P. Morgan, news commentator for ABC, has expressed some penetrating observations on the dangers he sees in allowing these types of activities to continue.

I have unanimous consent to have these comments printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1967.

According to the late George Orwell, the brilliant and iconoclastic British writer, Big Brother was not supposed to take over until 1984. But thanks to the assiduous stupidity of the Central Intelligence Agency and the well- if covertly-budgeted activities of other do-gooder bureaucracies within the U.S. government, the realization of that happy day of total domination of a citizen's life by higher authority may be hastened by a full 10 years if, indeed, it is not already upon us. This may come as a surprise to the Kremlin which had been under the impression that it was unchallenged in totalitarian pursuits. The jarring realization that the Americans are not only in the running but could conceivably claim the laurels is almost enough to blight the 50th anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik revolution which the Russians are now preparing for October. But after all, that's the risk the Marxists run in trying to compete with a free society which has a budget so big that it can afford to produce, not only color television sets but campus scholarships, in effect, for training in the arts of subversion and espionage, without really knowing what it is doing.

Ah, there's the rub—without really knowing what it is doing. No master demon is actually sitting in Washington conspiring to brainwash the American people and rob them of their rights. Nevertheless, this insidious operation is underway before our very eyes and we hardly know it is happening. It is not too late to understand what is going on and reverse it. But this involves a reevaluation of what well-intentioned officials can

do, are doing and have done, with budgets that have become bigger than the average mind can comprehend, and with the unquestioned purpose of furthering the national interest. But who defines the national interest these days?

The Defense Department has asked for 73 billion dollars to protect it. Inevitably, in spending that much money the Pentagon puts its own interpretation on the national interest, which bidders for defense contracts are not likely to challenge too sharply. The CIA's budget is chicken feed by comparison. It is secret but the New York Times in a revealing series on the agency last year estimated it as upward of half a billion. Even at current prices, that will feed a lot of chickens.

The trouble is now another CIA turkey has come home to roost. Eclipsing its exposure last spring of how a Michigan State University project for training Vietnamese police had become a front for the agency, an irreverent monthly magazine called Ramparts now reveals this: The CIA for about 15 years has been subsidizing the international staff of the biggest, most moderate and most "respectable" campus organization in the country, NSA, the National Student Association. How patriotic, how appropriate, how economical! Teach red-blooded young Americans how to spot a revolutionary at a World Youth Congress, then let these budding James Bonds come back and report. There is, in fact, great merit in briefing youth on the sinister facts—and they can be sinister—of international political life. But the place for this is not in some secret school for Junior G-men but openly, in public and private education.

The ghastly trouble now is that the public doesn't really know whether some university training project is being secretly financed. Just as the Michigan State-CIA liaison was being revealed, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with reluctance and embarrassment, publicly severed its ties with the agency which had helped establish, with a \$300,000 grant, MIT's Center of International Studies in 1951. With six million dollars to spend, the U.S. Army hired a special task force from American University in Washington to conduct a secret study of revolutionary situations in Latin America in 1965. Fortunately it was exposed and blew up before it did much diplomatic damage. Even earlier educators were debating the dubious merits of disguised federal support for special "education" projects. How can you fertilize academic freedom if the administration is not free to say why or whence the cash is coming?

The New York Times revealed two Sundays ago that ROTC cadets in seven western states have been given "confidential instruction that association with certain political organizations could endanger their being granted a commission." An interesting military invasion of a civilian province which the Defense Department confirms. The U.S. Information Agency in the past has secretly contracted with authors to write books, whose federal sponsorship was not known. The USIA has lamely complained that only a "few" such instances were involved.

Why don't the master minds in the CIA, the Pentagon, the USIA and elsewhere in government stop to think sometimes what their pretty plans are likely to do to the very free institutions they are supposed to be helping protect? The CIA found the virginal Peace Corps almost irresistible but President Kennedy extracted Director Allen Dulles' solemn pledge its honor would not be violated with spies. Presumably it remains pure as the driven snow but the CIA seduction of the NSA now unfairly raises insidious doubts.

In George Orwell's book "1984" Big Brother's one-party system has three slogans: "War is Peace," "Freedom is Slavery," and

"Ignorance is Strength." They'd sound pretty good, wouldn't they, under government subsidy?

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

THE TRICK IS PEOPLE

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a penetrating analysis of the process necessary for modernizing society in the developing nations was presented last weekend by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

His emphasis on the strategy and techniques for involving people in running their own affairs deserves careful reading by all Members as a basis for shaping foreign aid legislation for fiscal 1968.

The remarks follow:

THE TRICK IS PEOPLE

(Remarks of Congressman F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts, before the conference on "Societal Change in Developing Countries: Alternatives to Revolution" Institute of International Relations, Stanford University, February 24-26, 1967)

It is most impolite for a guest to criticize the topic of his host's conference. Nevertheless, I feel I must take issues with the "Alternatives to Revolution" portion of the conference theme, for I am convinced that there is no alternative to revolution. The problem for the developed and the developing society alike is to encourage that revolution to be a quantitative increase in political effectiveness rather than a cycle of violence, coup and instability.

The deficit in our thinking about development has been that we have concerned ourselves principally with but one aspect; economics. Increasingly we are discovering that this is inadequate. It is not enough merely to provide more economic resources. This must be done, of course, but more money, more dams, more transportation networks will not in themselves bring about the broad-gauge development that is necessary to put the developing societies into the 20th century as effective nations.

We must give equal attention to the development of human resources. In short, with political development. Because as John Plank of the Brookings Institution has put it, "political development in the last analysis is something that occurs in individuals."

It is time to stand some of the traditional theories about development on their heads. One need look only at Germany of the 1930's and South Africa today to demonstrate that economic progress does not necessarily lead to political enlightenment. Fortunately, there is evidence, of which this conference is a leading example, of a new interest and attention to the political dimension of development.

Another evidence is the enactment of a new Title IX in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. The text of Title IX is short and simple. It provides that "emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation through the encouragement of private voluntary organizations and strengthened local government institutions." Both elements are virtually unknown in much of the developing world.

The co-author of Title IX, Congressman Donald Fraser of Minnesota, has stated the thrust of the legislation this way: "The Problem of the developing nation requires attention to the social and political structures. These must be changed to release the en-

ergies—where they exist—of individual men and women who want to improve their lot. This will lead to economic progress." I would argue that we can even go beyond this to help create energies for development. We can help instill the idea in individual men and women that their action, especially when combined with that of their neighbors, can bring change for the better.

I want to make it clear that by turning our attention to political development, we should in no way insist upon any particular political system, nor attempt to impose any particular political institutions. The encouragement of involvement, of popular participation, is the key. Nor do I suggest that we fight the cold war between free and communist societies in the developing world. To be sure, this is still a significant concern as the famous country/city conflict formulation of Lin Piao demonstrates. It has always been a problem for Americans to understand why, despite generous outpourings of money and material goods, the developing nations are not more stable, their people not more committed to the "democratic way of life", and the appeal of communism is still so great.

Part of the problem is inherent in the moderation and pluralism of the democratic approach. Part lies in the relative stages of historical development. C. E. Black has put the contrast well:

"The societies that modernized relatively early were able to adopt a pragmatic approach to their problems and did not bother to think in general terms about what they were doing. When it comes to presenting a succinct statement of their experience and its relevance to other societies, they are at something of a disadvantage as compared with a communist leadership that has gone to great trouble to conceptualize and rationalize its program. In many instances where rapid modernization is taking place with the methods and assistance of the advanced societies, the indigenous political and intellectual leaders are lacking in ideological goals and incentives."

What is the framework in which we will be operating in any effort to contribute to the political maturity of developing nations? Many of our historians and political analysts have listed the characteristics of the modernizing society. They include: consolidation of local authorities, creation of a relatively large and effective bureaucracy, increase in citizen participation in government, increased use of a common language, heightened nationalism, urbanization, leveling of income education and social differences, growth of mass media, mechanization of agriculture and industrial activities, higher standards of health, disintegration of traditional family and tribal units, increased application of violence, and atomization of the individual from his traditional sources of security.

These characteristics are found in varying degrees and in varying combinations, but to a large extent they reflect the pattern of development of the western societies more nearly than the patterns we have seen far in the developing world. The nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia have experienced more of the negative than the positive factors of development thus far. The disintegrative factors have outpaced the integrative ones. And the job of achieving broad economic and social progress is proving far more difficult than imagination or expectation are prepared to accept. It makes political development all the more necessary and urgent. As one scholar has said, "It is the past and prospective inequity of economic and social progress that argues strongly for more direct action develop political systems than can ensnare developing societies to contain and manage the explosive tensions being generated continuing and inevitable economic social frustrations."