

fu

Vol. 4

The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the
Committee on Armed Services and

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

STATEMENT BY VICE ADMIRAL H. G. RICKOVER,
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, REACTOR DEVELOPMENT
(NAVAL REACTORS) ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
AND ASSISTANT CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SHIPS
FOR NUCLEAR PROPULSION, NAVY DEPARTMENT

Statement given in
Executive Session

RELEASED 8 Feb. 1960

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL

1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

NATIONAL 8-4266
8-4267
8-4268

3 February 1960
Senate Preparedness Investigating Sub-
committee of Armed Services and Committee
on Aeronautical and Space Sciences
Rickover testimony

dm

C O N T E N T S

TESTIMONY OF:

PAGE

Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover,
Assistant Director, Reactor
Development (Naval Reactors),
Atomic Energy Commission and
Assistant Chief of Bureau of
Ships for Nuclear Propulsion,
Navy Department

429

dm 1

STATEMENT BY VICE ADMIRAL H. G. RICKOVER,
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, REACTOR DEVELOPMENT
(NAVAL REACTORS) ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
AND ASSISTANT CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SHIPS
FOR NUCLEAR PROPULSION, NAVY DEPARTMENT

- - -

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

United States Senate,
Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of
the Committee on Armed Services, and the
Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee and Subcommittee met, pursuant to recess,
at 4:30 p.m., in Room 235, Old Senate Office Building, Senator
John C. Stennis presiding.

Present: Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:
Senator Stennis (presiding).

Present: Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:
Senator Stennis (presiding), Young, Cannon,
Wiley, and Case (New Jersey).

Also present: Senators Jackson and Bush.

Edwin L. Weisl, Special Counsel; Cyrus R. Vance, Associate
Counsel; Kenneth E. BeLieu, Staff Director of Space Committee
and Preparedness Subcommittee.

Staff Members, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:
Stuart French, Associate Counsel; and Robert M. Neal,
Attorney.

dm 2

Staff Members, Committee on Aeronautical and Space
Sciences:

Max Lehrer, Assistant Staff Director; Everard H. Smith,
Jr., Counsel; William J. Deachman, Assistant Counsel; Dr. Glen
P. Wilson, Chief Clerk; and Dr. Earl W. Lindvelt, Assistant
Chief Clerk.

Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Assistant to Senator Symington.

- - -

Senator Stennis. Admiral Rickover, we are very glad to
have you here, sir. It is always a privilege to obtain the
benefit of your views.

In keeping with the custom of the Committee, please
stand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that your testimony here before
this Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
but the truth, so help you God?

Admiral Rickover. I do, sir.

Senator Stennis. Have a seat, sir. We are very glad
to have you here, sir.

I don't know whether you had in mind making a prepared
statement before counsel proceeds. If you do not have a
prepared statement, counsel will proceed with his questioning
for forty-five minutes, after which each Senator will have
ten minutes.

dm 3

TESTIMONY OF VICE ADMIRAL H. G. RICKOVER,
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, REACTOR DEVELOPMENT
(NAVAL REACTORS), ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION;
ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT PANOFF AND THEODORE
ROCKWELL

Admiral Rickover. I have no statement, Senator Stennis.

Mr. Weisl. Admiral Rickover, will you briefly tell the Committee just what you are doing at the present time?

Admiral Rickover. I am in charge of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program for the Navy Department and the Atomic Energy Commission. This is a joint effort of the two agencies.

I am also in charge for the Atomic Energy Commission of the Shippingport, Pennsylvania Atomic Power Plant, the first large scale Central Station Atomic Plant.

Mr. Weisl. You spent some time recently in Russia, did you not?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir. I was there with the Vice President.

Mr. Weisl. And on that occasion you had an opportunity to talk with some of the leading figures of the Soviet Union and inspect some of their places?

Admiral Rickover. I did.

Mr. Weisl. Who were some of the leading figures of the Soviet Union that you had occasion to talk to?

Admiral Rickover. Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Mikoyan, Mr. Koslov, and other members of the Presidium; also with top

dm4

people in industry, in science, and in education, the same people Vice President Nixon talked with.

I also talked at length alone with Mr. Koslov when he was in this country.

Mr. Weisl. You also had an opportunity to inspect the Soviet atomic icebreaker, did you not?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir, the Lenin.

Mr. Weisl. You also, I understand, have done considerable reading and studying of the Soviet capabilities?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir, I have.

Mr. Weisl. Would you please tell this Committee how, in your opinion, the technological race between the United States and the Soviet Union is going at the present time?

Admiral Rickover. I think unquestionably we are ahead of the Russians right now. I also firmly believe that as far as rate of technological progress is concerned, they are ahead.

Senator Wiley. A little louder, please.

Admiral Rickover. I said, sir, I believe we are ahead of them now technologically, but as far as rate of progress is concerned, they are definitely ahead of us.

One of the most significant phenomena that has occurred in the last 40 years or so is that a very backward country could, in so short a time, attain such high technological and educational levels.

dm 5

If we say this is due entirely to their totalitarian system, we concede that totalitarianism is a better system than democracy. We cannot admit this, nor is it true.

That is, if we say their totalitarian methods are responsible for getting them ahead faster than our democratic methods do, then we are admitting that our system is not as good as theirs. I am sure no one in this room believes that.

Therefore, we must look for other reasons for their getting ahead so fast. I believe their progress is not peculiar to their particular form of government.

Mr. Weisl. Will you please elaborate on that, Admiral Rickover?

Admiral Rickover. In essence the contest is really between two different systems of administration, between two different bureaucracies. If we place the issue on that basis, if we stop talking about a contest between democracy and totalitarianism, we can get at the root of the problem and find out why their rate of progress is greater than ours, why they are getting ahead of us.

In Russia only the most determined and most competent people can get the best jobs. If they don't do a good job, if they botch a job, they are fired. And if they are fired, they don't have a private company to go to for a job. The Russians don't exercise too much favoritism, either.

One of Khrushchev's closest friends was recently removed

dm6 from the Presidium because he hadn't done a good job. He didn't even get a letter from Khrushchev saying how much he regretted his leaving. He was just told to go.

Now there is another interesting fact that may surprise most Americans, that today there is a greater proportion of college graduates in Russian industry than there is in our industry. This is a very surprising fact. This certainly was not true 20 years ago, or even 10 years ago but it is true today.

In the year 1957 the Russian 10-year schools graduated at age 17 about 1,600,000 students as compared with 1,458,000 who graduated from our high schools. But the Russian 17 year olds had to pass examinations which are roughly comparable to what students in this country could pass only after two years of college.

These examinations were not in ideological subjects. They were in subjects such as algebra, geometry, chemistry, physics, geography, foreign languages, history. There are no ideological connotations to these examinations, except in history.

Now, of these 1,600,000 students, about 30 per cent were permitted to go on to university, so you can see what a tough competition there is. At university all tuition is free, and about 84 per cent are paid their living expenses. The higher their marks, the more they are paid.

dm 7

In order to be paid while attending university, the students must obtain the equivalent of the Dean's list in the United States.

This gives you a pretty good comparison of how tough their educational system is and why they are advancing so rapidly. You listen to people tell you that we are now able to anticipate a missile by 15 minutes, and I suppose you would be willing to appropriate several billion dollars if we could significantly extend that time. Yet our country has been warned for more than six years about what is going on in Russia, particularly in education, and has not acted on this information.

For example, this year the Russians are graduating two and a half times as many engineers as we. We have been warned about this for six years, but we do little about it. We will not remain ahead of the Russians in military matters, in scientific and technical matters, in art, in music, in literature, unless we heed that warning. Today education is indispensable for survival and progress.

Mr. Weisl. Do you believe that the Russians are bent and dedicated to world domination?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir. It is hard for us to believe anything like that, just as it was hard for us to believe when we read "Mein Kampf" that Hitler meant what he said. The Soviet leaders have consistently stated what their

dm8 program is. They have never deviated from that program. Their program is world domination, and no Russian Communist leader has ever deviated from that principle. Our main enemy is wishful thinking. Only those who learn nothing and forget everything refuse to look at the record.

Senator Wiley. What do you mean by "they"?

Mr. Weisl. The Russians.

Senator Wiley. Does he mean the ruling class, 6 million, or the 200 million?

Admiral Rickover. The Russian Government, sir. The great mistake we make is to believe we are in competition with the Russian people. We are not in competition with the Russian people. We, the American people, are in competition with the Russian Government.

Russia is ruled, as you know, by about 4 per cent of their people, the members of the Communist Party. Now how do they choose members of the Communist Party?

When the young people graduate from university, they must go to work in a factory. In Russia no young college graduate starts to work in a government agency as a management expert. He must work several years in a factory. They are observed carefully, to see who does a good job, who are the potential leaders. These are selected to become members of the Communist Party.

Once he becomes a member of the Communist Party, he must

dm9

work hard and he is watched all the time.

Take Khrushchev, for example. He did not get his start as a government bureaucrat. He had to do all kinds of practical work, before he could get a position in the bureaucracy. He finally got in, but only after many years of experience, of proving his ability. This is the route for preferment in Russia. It is through practical experience, through demonstrated success. It is not by an inexperienced man getting into a government agency and starting in to administrate without really knowing and feeling what he is administering; and this, gentlemen, is one of the reasons why they are getting ahead of us in administration. This is one problem we must face.

Mr. Weisl. We have been told repeatedly, Admiral, that the Soviet Union has a gross national product of only one-half of ours. How is it that they are beating us in the missile race and in the space race?

Admiral Rickover. They have the advantage of speed in decision-making, the ability to concentrate on a few definite national objectives to which they apply the necessary energy and resources. They decide what is important technically and industrially, what is important for the political and military power of the State. These items they give national priority. They place a man in charge of a project, they hold him responsible and they let him alone.

dm 10

If he fails, they get rid of him. They don't hound him day after day and literally prevent him from doing his work, which is the way we treat the men in charge of our large-scale governmental projects. This way of doing business we can no longer afford.

Mr. Weisl. Let me be a little more specific, Admiral.

You are the man who was able, against heavy odds, to bring about the nuclear submarine, which is about the only new military weapons system that we are ahead of the Russians. You did this and, as I understand, the cost of accomplishing this great feat was less than we have spent on the attempt to get a nuclear airplane, and we are still years away from developing a nuclear airplane.

Now please tell the Committee how you were able to do this.

Admiral Rickover. I was not able to do the job all by myself. I have a group of devoted and dedicated men and women working with me, people who could get much higher pay in industry than they get by working for the government.

Nor could I have done the job without the help of Congress, particularly the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and Senator Anderson, the Chairman, and of Senator Jackson, both of whom have always helped me. I would like to pay tribute to Senator Anderson and his Committee. I am indeed very grateful to Congress.

dm 11

The only chance of salvation I have in my program, and others in their programs, rests with the Congress, because no one else is sufficiently willing to help. Whether you can do what is necessary, I do not know. I am aware of the limitations of the Legislative Branch. I know you can exhort and urge the Executive Branch, but you can only go so far.

But the crisis we are in today is great. This was borne out by my observations in Russia.

If there ever was a time when factionalism -- political, industrial or military -- should stop, this is the time. If we don't stop factionalism right now, I am afraid for our country.

I am frightened by what appears to be a tendency in some quarters to prefer letting this country sink into second place, if the alternative means uncongenial effort, goes counter to deep-seated convictions as to the proper place of government in a democracy, or requires financial sacrifices.

We cannot afford to be second in anything that affects our security. We must lead, or we must have parity as a minimum. If we don't have parity we will inevitably lose our freedom. We must never forget that their objective is conquest -- by peaceful means if possible, but conquest just the same. Our objective is peace.

To conquer the world they do not have to excel in everything. They need only excel us in one thing, for

dm 12

example, missiles.

We must not delude ourselves they share our horror of modern war. Their people fear it, but not their leaders. They are not bound by any legal or moral principles to desist from war. Look what they did to Poland; look what they did to the Baltic States. They had non-aggression treaties with them. Look what they did to them.

They do not fear atomic war as much as we do, for the simple reason that they are using their people. Our Government serves our people. Their people serve their government.

We should bear in mind the statement China's Mao made when the question of nuclear war was raised he said, "China does not fear atomic war, if she won it was worth losing many people. If she lost she would have a greatly diminished population, thus solving her population problem." That is what he said publicly.

We, of course, can't take an attitude like that. Therefore, if we are to persevere in a situation of this kind, we must face up to reality. We must realize we have an under-educated population which does not understand history and its lessons. It is one of the great faults of our educational system that we are not adequately aware of historical processes. We believe that democracy is self-executory. We believe we can have democracy without taking the necessary measures, and without the sacrifices to make it work.

dm 13

Senator Bush. Isn't the question one more of discipline than facilities, Admiral?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir.

Senator Bush. Expand that, will you? What should we do to create this discipline? I have been reading your speeches for two or three years, and have been particularly interested in those you have made since you have been back from Russia. Now, talk about that.

Admiral Rickover. I can suggest certain things. Some you may not find pleasant, so I am not going to tell you.

Senator Bush. I wish you would. How are we going to meet the problem if we don't face up to it?

Admiral Rickover. I have said them many times. If I get off the subject, please stop me.

Senator Stennis. All right, proceed.

Admiral Rickover. I consider education to be the most important problem that faces us, because unless we solve our educational problem, we will not be able to solve any of our other national problems.

You will remember Aristotle said that the primary duty of any legislature is to take care of the education and training of its youth. We certainly are not doing that adequately.

We have permitted our children to be trained in life adjustment, where the primary purpose is having a good time. The reason that we can afford to let our children think

dm 14

mostly about having a good time is because our country is so rich. We don't realize that this wealth may be transitory. It may not last. We are not using our children's teenhood as a period of education and training for adulthood; many of our children remain permanent adolescents, unaware of the deep responsibilities of adulthood and of citizenship in a democracy. For this I must blame the parents who by their own lazy habits and non-intellectual life set a bad example for their children.

Now that is not the case in Russia. Some day, should they achieve the affluence we have, they may have the same problem; but they certainly don't have it today, nor do I believe their leaders are going to let their people get to that point. They realize if their people start having it too good, if they get too many ideas about freedom, their system will break down. For this reason they cannot tolerate freedom anywhere in the world. There must be no freedom anywhere, because as long as freedom exists, no matter where, and with rapid means of communications with other countries, there is the ever-present danger their own people will rebel.

So they carry friendship with us up to a certain point, and they will throttle it should it appear that their people are getting out of hand.

It is quite significant that a few days ago the Presidium urged all the party leaders to insist on greater party

d

dm 15

party discipline.

We must not place too much faith in the smiles of their visitors. If we give them anything, it must be quid pro quo. None of us in this country must be so soft-headed as not to realize that everything they do and say is in furtherance of a long-range objective to conquer, to dominate the world.

Now what can we do? I have said that education has first priority. And what must we do to improve education? I have frequently proposed a simple first step.

Senator Stennis. Give it again. Give it to us now.

Admiral Rickover. All right, I will give it to you.

Congress should set up a permissive standard to define what a student should know when he finishes high school.

In every country of the West it has been found there is no other fast way to improve the educational system, until and unless they set up standards.

Now as an engineer, I certainly can talk about standards. I know that we cannot make progress in atomic power plants, or in missiles, or in space, unless we have standards. The setting of educational standards is the most urgent thing Congress can do, and it is a very simple thing. It doesn't cost anything. It doesn't make anyone angry, either.

You may know that I was on "Meet the Press" ten days ago. Mr. Lawrence Spivak told me he has received more mail and requests for transcripts of that program, which

dm 16

discussed education, than he has ever had on any "Meet the Press" program. "Meet the Press" as you know started in 1945. The mail was overwhelmingly in favor of what I said about improving our school system. And you Senators, who are used to opinion polls, know what that means. It is evident our people are quite concerned about the poor education their children are getting.

Mr. Weisl. Do you think, Admiral, that Mr. Khrushchev would give greater priority to achieving the Seven Year Plan than to building up his military striking power?

Admiral Rickover. He definitely would give priority to building up his military striking power in selected areas. The promises in the Seven Year Plan are the same as our political party platforms. People read them and forget them quickly.

Mr. Weisl. Admiral, getting back to your particular field of atomic propulsion, what have you been doing in the last two or three months?

Admiral Rickover. During the last two or three months I have been writing reports, I have been defending my program. Not only myself but all of my leading people have become involved in this.

Mr. Weisl. Why is it necessary for a man who has accomplished what you have accomplished to spend so much time away from your technological duties writing reports and defending your program? Let's get to the nub of that.

dm 17

Admiral Rickover. Well, I don't want to be parochial or personal in this matter. I would prefer to talk about it in a general way. I can be more helpful that way, I believe.

We have too many administrators and staff people in the Executive Branch of our government. I am not saying this in a manner "let's clean house," or anything such as that.

But it is a fact that when there are too many people, work stops. Parkinson's Law takes over. It is as simple as that.

These people are smart. They have administrative jobs to do and in so doing they take up the time of the very few people who do the real productive work.

Over the last ten years there has been a constant increase in difficulty in getting a job done in government. In fact it has gotten to the point now where it is almost impossible to do a good job.

It isn't money. You don't get jobs done with money alone. In fact, you can slow jobs with too much money, because it takes time to spend money. Also it takes lots of people to spend lots of money.

The situation is comparable to a fire department with one first station and many fire alarms. We have only the one fire station but we keep on adding more fire alarms, and more people are ringing alarms; the fire station can't take care of all the demands being made on it.

dm 18

Similarly the few people doing the actual technical work are being overburdened by constant requests for information, justification, rejustification, and so on.

It is not only me. I am not talking about myself alone. I am talking about our whole government. What I have said is one of the basic reasons we are falling behind, and why we are going to continue to fall behind until and unless the Executive Branch of the Government realizes it has this problem and takes steps to free the working people from domination by the non-productive members of Government.

What you can do I don't know. I don't know what you can do in the Legislative Branch. I have thought about this problem for a long time and I can give you no panaceas.

But I do believe if there is anything that you can do to protect the few people who are really doing a job, that will be well worth while.

For example, why don't we judge people by results? A man who is truly dedicated to a job will not want to take on work he doesn't believe in. If he doesn't believe in a job, he just won't do it.

Another thing, I have been urged numerous times to take on additional projects. I won't take them on because I don't believe they are worthwhile or will interfere with what I am already doing.

I consider if I or somebody else has produced results,

dm 19

he certainly should be let alone to devote his time to his job.

There are many groups in Russia such as mine. They are not bothered. They are permitted to make some mistakes, but they are judged by results. They are not judged by the number or thickness of their reports, or by their methods.

Many things cannot be justified, in detail, particularly in research and development. Day after day people ask abstruse questions: Why did you use this physics formula, why did you do that thing; you can't explain those things. All you can do in scientific or technical matters just as in politics, is to judge people and results. It is the only thing you can do. There is nothing else. In final analysis you must judge people.

Let me recapitulate: If a man is doing a job, for God's sake, let him along. This is not the case in our Government. That is the real issue; that is our real problem.

Many people who are competent initially and who would keep on doing a job finally succumb to the pressure of the system, and they become hacks. The tendency of any bureaucracy is to force people into its system. This is inevitable. The bureaucrats say: "We like what you have done but we don't like your methods," whereas the fact is the job could not have been done without those outworn methods.

dm 20

Instead of saying " Here is something new," perhaps there is a categorical imperative in the new methods, perhaps we can learn, perhaps we can improve our own work by these new methods. They don't look at it that way. They say, "You are using the wrong methods." This goes on day after day, year after year. One must have great fortitude and love of country to keep on under these circumstances. It is almost impossible.

Mr. Weisl. Admiral, it is very disturbing I am sure to the Committee as it was to me when I visited your place, to find that with the great problems you still have in connection with atomic propulsion and atomic energy, that you have been unable to devote your great skills or the skills of your great dedicated staff to your work, and have been swamped with tremendous non-technical overhead.

I think the Committee would be interested in trying to find out how such a situation can be alleviated, because that applies to all our defense technological progress.

Admiral Rickover. Mr. Weisl, I don't think we can easily eliminate it in this country. It has become a way of life in this conduct of our business. We are not trying to become more efficient because I believe we have gotten used to the idea that we are a strong powerful nation; that because a man is born an American he is inherently better than anyone else; that the Lord has given every American a patent of

dm 21

superior ability.

No one has ever defeated us, because in every war we have fought, every external war, we knew we would ultimately win because the other side was inferior to us from a geographical standpoint or from an industrial or material standpoint. We have never gotten used to the idea that we might be defeated; that as a great nation we can be subjected to the same international trials all other great nations have been subjected to, that so far in our national life we have been protected by friendly oceans and allies. We conceive of our contest with Russia as a contest limited contest in time. We do not realize that it is a contest between totalitarianism and freedom; that this contest has been going on from the very beginning of civilization. Our progressive educationists have neglected to teach history to our children so we lack a strong sense of history.

We don't realize, for example, that Byzantium was at war with barbarians for 900 years; that Christianity and Islam fought intermittent hot and cold wars for 900 years with one side ahead now, the other ahead then; that it was only in 1536 when Francis I of France signed a treaty with Suleiman, the Regime of the Capitulations, he took the first step toward peaceful coexistence of Christian and Moslem.

We also believe that freedom is growing throughout the world. It is not. Freedom started growing with the

dm22

Renaissance and with the Reformation, and kept growing for 400 years. But it is now decreasing and rapidly. 20 years ago the Communists controlled one-sixth of the world. Today they control one-third. They are the ones that are winning. We are not the ones that are winning.

Mr. Weisl. Well, what should we do about it, Admiral? What can Congress do about it specifically?

Admiral Rickover. You are asking me to give an answer to a problem which the collective ability of 100 eminent Americans -- the U. S. Senate -- has not been able to solve. I can only give you some thoughts to consider.

Mr. Weisl. You are the man, Admiral Rickover, who gave us the atomic submarine and that is the one major weapons system in which we apparently lead the Russians. Would you tell us how you were able to do that and how perhaps we can get other departments to do that and keep these administrative types off the back of dedicated people like you and your organization.

Admiral Rickover. I don't think I could do the Nautilus again in the present atmosphere.

Mr. Weisl. Sir?

Admiral Rickover. I don't think with the present climate, the way it has changed in the last ten to twelve years, I could develop the Nautilus again. Now that is a statement for you to ponder.

dm 23

You asked what we have gotten for the money spent in the naval program. For about 850 million dollars we got all of our laboratories; we got five land prototypes of atomic power plants that are now operating; we got all of the research and development over this entire period of time; and we also got the atomic power plants for the Nautilus and the Sea Wolf. We got all of this for less than one billion dollars.

Mr. Weisl. And how much have we spent already on the atomic airplane, which we haven't got?

Admiral Rickover. I don't know the exact amount, but I believe it is more than I have spent.

Mr. Weisl. Based on your experience, what can Congress do to help this country's military research and development program, which is so important?

Admiral Rickover. You have me at a loss.

Mr. Weisl. Certainly we can't have technical men like you writing reports and a staff of dedicated technologists and scientists spending their time largely writing reports.

Admiral Rickover. The fault is not that of the Legislative Branch. I am sure you know I will not say nice things simply because I am in this room. In previous testimony before congressional committees, I have not always said nice things.

In the broad sense it is not the Legislative Branch

dm24

that is responsible for our shortcomings; it is the Executive Branch. The Executive Branch must see to it that the senior administrative people in the technical departments really understand the jobs they are supervising. Perhaps the Senate should more thoroughly investigate before it confirms appointees to certain important jobs to assure that they are really qualified.

Mr. Weisl. Are there still many problems connected with nuclear propulsion plants?

Admiral Rickover. There are many problems, and we are not doing as much as we could or should. I finally got to the point of no return about two weeks ago. At 11:00 o'clock one night a serious technical problem arose. For the first time in my 12 years in charge of our project there were no technical people in my organization available to handle the job. The technical people were all off writing reports at 11:00 o'clock that night.

Now that is a fine way to use the rare technical talent we have in this country -- to waste their time on non-productive work. Whom are we fighting anyway? Are we fighting ourselves?

Mr. Weisl. Do you believe what is happening to you may be happening in other technical areas?

Admiral Rickover. I have no doubt it is.

Mr. Weisl. Isn't that one of the reasons that our lead

dm 25

time in this country for developing new weapons is about twice or three times as long as it is in Russia, or even in Western Europe?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir, our lead-times are increasing; theirs are decreasing.

Yes, our lead times are getting longer and they are going to get still longer. Instead of resolving our management and administrative problems, we follow the easier path of going to Congress and asking for more money. "The Russians have launched another space vehicle. Give us more money."

As if more money alone would solve our problems! That will not do it, sir.

Mr. Weisl. How do you educate or train your staff?

Admiral Rickover. I have testified previously, but it may bear repeating, that everybody says: "Get good men." But good men aren't available; good men already have good jobs. All you can do is recruit potentially good youngsters and spend a great deal of time and effort educating and training them.

This is what I did. I recruit the 2 to 3 per cent of the best youngsters from the best schools in this country. I train them. I have them work in an atmosphere where they are surrounded by other people who are dedicated. It is the most gratifying thing to see how these youngsters become devoted to their jobs, how they work day and night, how they forget

dm26

about their pay and simply do the job.

There are many youngsters in this country who would thrive in that sort of an environment, if given a chance.

But what happens? In most of the agencies the young men are set to doing routine administrative paper work, to writing reports, to justifying, and they soon become hacks.

Senator Stennis. They become what?

Admiral Rickover. Hacks.

Mr. Weisl. Admiral, I met a man, I think his name was Leighton, a Commander, a graduate of Annapolis, a highly skilled technical man, and I notice he isn't with you any more. Where is he now?

Admiral Rickover. He is now working at one of our Navy yards. Due to the Navy rotation system I cannot keep an officer too long at one job, no matter how valuable he is or how much the job will suffer if he leaves. If I don't transfer the man regularly it will hurt his chances for promotion.

Mr. Weisl. Wouldn't you have been better off keeping him here?

Admiral Rickover. I have no choice. If I don't transfer him, he will not be promoted. I cannot, in all conscience do an officer such an injustice, so I let the job suffer. Some day perhaps technical specialists will be recognized as such. Just imagine if every good surgeon had

dm 27

to be transferred every few years to other duties. And yet this is the way we run our 40 billion dollar a year national insurance company.

Mr. Weisl. Isn't it a fact though that when you have certain Navy officers working for you, they can't be promoted?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, that is correct. The fact that they work for me militates against their promotion.

Mr. Weisl. Why is that?

Admiral Rickover. Well, they are not liked. You asked the question. You have your answer.

Mr. Weisl. Is it because you do things differently than anybody else?

Admiral Rickover. Yes. They rub people the wrong way. They are not courteous in situations that demand discourtesy. They are more interested in getting the job done than in apple polishing, and the routine people whose toes are stepped on take it out on them.

As a result we now get very few applications from technical officers. The word has gotten around that to do nuclear technical work will not get ahead. "Stay away from that game. It's poison." And yet this is the field on which the future of our Navy depends.

Mr. Weisl. Can Congress do something about that?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir. That is where Congress can help.

dm 28

Senator Stennis. Admiral, I have been agreeing with your testimony here a thousand per cent on that one.

Mr. Weisl. I am sure that this Committee would like to be of help to prevent men like you and your staff from getting so discouraged that eventually you just throw in the sponge. Each of you could go into private industry and make four to five times what you are now making.

Admiral Rickover. But we don't want to, Mr. Weisl. We are not interested in making money.

If we were interested in making money, we would have quit many years ago when we were offered these lucrative jobs. Our job is to do everything we can to convert the Navy to atomic power. It will take many more years to finish the job, to assure that our country is strong.

You might ask why do we keep on. I will tell you why. The Lord has never given any man a certificate saying "If you fight you are bound to win the battle."

No one who is truly a man will give up the fight, even when he knows he faces certain defeat. This is the only way he can fulfill himself as a man. Even though he loses he will inspire others to fight. Throughout history, many men have had to make sacrifices. So what else can we do?

Mr. Weisl. I think you testified that if it were not for Congress, you would not have been able to build the atomic submarine.

dm 29

Admiral Rickover. Without the backing we have always received from Congress we could not get our job done. Time and again Congress has interceded to help us with the Executive Branch. The case would be hopeless without my being able to go to Congress.

This should not be necessary, but it is.

We are subject to daily and constant petty harassments. You might ask me to give examples. Individually they are not significant; collectively they waste much of our time. It is these petty actions by petty minds who are placed in positions of authority.

A military organization is not geared to do research and development. It is an operating type of organization. Officers who have had command of ships and of fleets and have done a fine job come to Washington and are given authority over technical people. Those in line authority are frequently not competent to make the technical decisions, but they make them anyway.

Now that wouldn't be so bad if they stayed around long enough to learn their jobs. I will quote a few figures to illustrate the point.

During the time I have had my present job there have been seven Secretaries of Defense, seven Secretaries of the Navy, six Chiefs of Naval Operations, nine Directors of Atomic Energy in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, six

dm 30

Chiefs of the Bureau of Ships, four Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission, six General Managers of the Atomic Energy Commission and three Directors of the Reactor Development Division.

Senator Stennis. What years now is that?

Admiral Rickover. From about 1948, to the present time.

Look at the situation we face. Every one of these individuals and their multitude of subordinates -- and these likewise rotate rapidly -- exercise authority over us. Now ultimately you get to the point, what with explaining what you are doing to many people, to satisfying Executive Branch committees, to "educating" the many people who come and go as on an assembly line, and to writing reports, that little time is left to get any constructive work done.

This is the dilemma. They will not judge us by results. Since they have no technical basis for judgment they can only judge methods. For example, officers are used to running ships and operating fleets on a basis of a rule book, a set of regulations. This they understand. Now the Captain of a ship is precluded from placing undue demands on his people, because his crew is limited in number and the ship will quickly be unable to perform its proper functions. Furthermore, if he does anything wrong, this is quickly detected by his superiors who are at least as expert as he is in the functions of the ship. But when this same officer arrives at

dm 31

the Pentagon there are no checks on him. He has authority and he exercises it. He exercises his authority in a vast, loosely coordinated activity where there are many people and where the consequences of his actions are not immediately apparent.

That the work suffers, costs more, or is delayed may not come to light for a long time, sometimes years. Frequently, I marvel that we get as much done as we do.

After two or three years the officer leaves and a new officer takes his place. The officer is never around long enough to start the job and fight it through to completion. If the job fails, he is not responsible. There are few in the Defense Establishment who are responsible for anything at any time. You know that as well as I do. When you can't point your finger at a man when something goes wrong and say "You are responsible," then there is no real responsibility. And that is the dilemma: that people who are not responsible, who do not have technical ability, are judging and running the technical people.

Mr. Weisl. Can you tell us anything in connection with your visit to Russia which would be helpful to the Committee in evaluating our military posture?

Admiral Rickover. I did not see any military items, sir. I saw atomic energy installations but not military.

What I did get out of it was this. They do have the

dn. 32

ability to make decisions quickly. For example, this one thing I would like to leave off the record if I may.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator Stennis. Back on the record, Mr. Reporter.

Mr. Weisl. What impression did you get of the intent of the Soviet leaders?

Admiral Rickover. The intent of the Soviet leaders is to dominate.

In one factory I asked the manager "Who will be ahead seven years from now, the United States or Russia?" He knew the "correct" answer: "Russia, of course."

Next I asked him, "Who will ultimately be ahead, China or the United States." He knew the "correct" answer: "China."

But when I asked the next question it was evident he had not done his home work. He didn't remember the party line. I said, "Who will be ahead, China or Russia." He thought and thought for a long time and finally said "Russia." The party line answer and the one he should have given was that there can never be any contest between two Communist countries. He did have the "correct" answer when I asked him if there had ever been any strikes in his factory. He replied that this was a foolish question because the workers were always satisfied, they were working for themselves, so why should they go on strike. The question of

dm33

a strike had never occurred to anyone in that factory, he said.

Mr. Weisl. A great many people in this country feel that we don't have to worry because China and Russia will be fighting it out between themselves. Do you share that view?

Admiral Rickover. That is wishful thinking. It relieves us of our problems and shoves them on to the Chinese. No, sir, I do not share that view.

This is the same as saying we are in mortal danger from Russia, but let's not worry about it, they themselves are soon going to be in mortal danger from China. Such wishful thinking is an unwillingness to face up to reality.

Mr. Weisl. Couldn't this Committee, this Congress or somebody do something to get these administrators off your backs, so that you can do your work and not have to write all these burdensome reports?

Admiral Rickover. It is not entirely an administrative problem, Mr. Weisl. It is inherent in the system we are using. This is why it is so difficult to advise you what to do. I don't know how to give you any concrete advice.

I can only suggest that wherever you have people who are doing a job, somehow see to it that they are let alone and judge them by results, not by their methods.

Mr. Weisl. How will you get your work done?

Admiral Rickover. Well, I will somehow get my work done.

dm 34

I will keep on. We won't do anywhere near as much as we could do or should do, but we will get some of it done.

Mr. Weisl. That is about all I have to ask. How is your staff reacting to this report-writing and harassment?

Admiral Rickover. They are not reacting very well, sir. They are disgusted.

I don't have a staff of public relations people, ghost writers or such. I only have technical people. Therefore when these issues come up, the only people I can use are the senior technical people.

So while they are engaged in report writing, the technical decisions are being made by the inexperienced youngsters. There is no one else to do it. This is the horrible part of my situation.

If I had a public relations staff as many agencies do -- the Space Agency I understand has 28 public relations people -- correct me if I am wrong, but I read that in the newspaper -- if I had such a staff of 28 people, I could get along very well, because actually the reports we write as you know, are never read by anyone except the stenographers. You just have to keep on turning out reports, but I don't have the people to do this.

Senator Bush. Admiral, could I just ask a question going back to your comment about permissive standards for the high schools. Now that is a concrete recommendation.

dm 35

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir.

Senator Bush. But here is the thing. What authority can the Federal Government use to do that?

Admiral Rickover. What authority?

Senator Bush. We don't have any authority over the high schools.

Admiral Rickover. You don't have to exercise authority. If Congress declares "This is what we think would be good for a high school boy" --

Senator Bush. In other words, it would be a statement of opinion.

Admiral Rickover. Look, you regulate the colors of lipstick, don't you? By what authority do you do that?

Senator Bush. By law, if it is done. You have me there because I am not a lipstick man.

Admiral Rickover. No, sir, there is nothing in the Constitution that says the Federal Government can regulate airplane or train travel, because there were no airplanes or trains in 1789, but you are regulating airplanes and trains anyway.

Senator Bush. Yes, we are regulating them because it is interstate commerce, and we can regulate and do regulate interstate commerce, but education is an entirely different thing.

Admiral Rickover. We do have a U. S. Office of

dm 36

Education.

Senator Bush. Yes, we do.

Admiral Rickover. We have appropriated money for education. Why can't the U. S. Office of Education or Congress say "This is what we think boys and girls ought to know." You are not making them follow the standard. It is not compulsory.

Senator Bush. It is a statement of opinion.

Admiral Rickover. It is a statement of principle. You could set up a council of scholars to devise it for you. Now in doing that be sure you keep progressive education people out of it. You can very easily find out what is being done in Western Europe and in Russia, this will help you. A standard could be derived from the standards established in those countries.

You might take the Russian standard as a lower level, because the children in Western Europe are about one to two years ahead of those in Russia. The children in Russia are one or two years ahead of ours.

Our children should know at least as much as those in Russia. But the educationists will say, "They will have to work too hard. It will be bad for their health."

Yet the records show that there is a smaller percentage of rejections for physical unfitness for military service in Western Europe and in Russia than there is in the United

dm 37

States. So that argument won't hold water.

Senator Bush. They have a tighter discipline right in the schools, don't they?

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir.

Senator Bush. Not only in Russia but also in Western European countries.

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir, and they go to school longer too. For example, our children go to school five hours a day, five days a week for only 180 days a year. Their school day is six hours, with no study period, six days a week. In Denmark they go to school 280 days a year. So they do in nine years what we do in 14. The average in Western Europe and in Russia is about 240 days a year.

I can assure you the parents are all for improving our school system. The vast majority of our people in this country have children in school; just think how politically attractive it will be for anyone who advocates better schools.

When you get thousands of letters overwhelmingly in favor of improving our public school system, in response to a TV program, that is a pretty meaningful poll.

Senator Bush. That is right. I have observed where your theories have been tried out at the local level, as for instance in Glastonbury, Connecticut. They lengthened the hours in school, tightened up on the discipline, and the parents have gone for it.

dm 38

Admiral Rickover. The parents are all for it.

Senator Bush. And the students accept it.

Admiral Rickover. But once we set up a standard, the parents can judge for themselves whether the schools are doing a good job, whether the teachers are competent. They can learn where the deficiencies are. They can then take care of getting better teachers or of getting the teachers to improve themselves.

But we will never be able to solve this problem until we first set a standard. We have 50,000 individual school boards in the United States. We can't expect 50,000 individual school boards to set up adequate educational standards.

Senator Young. Counsel, may I ask a question on another subject. Admiral, should we assume that the Soviets do not have atomic submarine? What about that?

(Discussion off the record.)

Admiral Rickover. We must maintain our lead in atomic submarines and nuclear propulsion.

If we don't, we will give up ten years advantage, and this is what I am afraid of is going to happen to us, because of the vast amount of interference to which my organization is subjected. I am worried. I am worried we will lose our lead to the Russians in nuclear submarines. There is so much we must do to keep ahead.

dm 39

Let me tell you some of the things we are doing. We are presently designing nuclear cores that will last much longer. We can accomplish this if we are let alone to do our work. Such nuclear cores will last an entire war. Just think what that would mean if we get into a real devastating war where our bases may be destroyed, that we have ships that are self-sufficient from a fuel standpoint.

We are increasing the life of our nuclear cores and the cost is being greatly reduced. That is what we can do. We will save large sums of money, if we are just permitted to go on and do our work.

That is all we ask. All of my people and I have given up practically every bit of our personal lives.

Senator Stennis. Given up what?

Admiral Rickover. Every bit of our personal lives. We don't have any. We have given it up.

Mr. Weisi. You are harassed all the time?

Admiral Rickover. We would work just as hard one way or the other, but it is much better that we be permitted to work on strengthening our country. That is all we ask. We don't want more pay. We just want to be permitted to do our work.

That may be an unusual request in this day and age, but there are still people in this country who are willing to do that.

dm 40

Senator Stennis. Admiral, may I ask a question right there?

Isn't there someone that you could request protection of, particularly in the matter of your highly critical category? Isn't there someone that you could request protection in that very field that you are talking about and get it?

Admiral Rickover. Let's take Congress. Can I go to Congress every time I have a problem?

Senator Stennis. I mean within your organization.

Admiral Rickover. No, sir. The top people are generally with me, but they have large numbers of subordinates whom they do not control.

The Pentagon today is a big jungle, as you well know. No one could possibly control that outfit with its large number of people.

In fact, the Pentagon is the "fifth service." There are the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. These are the four services. So the Pentagon has become the "fifth service."

The top people can no longer control adequately the situation. They are busy with their own problems; some of their subordinates in their small, petty ways are constantly interfering with us.

Believe me if I knew how to stop it, I would do so, but I can't go around and bother the top people every day.

There might be a declaration of policy by Congress for certain

dm 41 selected objectives. You could say: "Don't harass these people," something of that sort.

I don't believe Congress can go beyond that. Nor can any man request or insist that his work not be judged. Mind you, sir, I am not requesting that. I am not saying that my work should not be subject to Budget review, to review by congressional committees, or by anyone else who has a legitimate need.

But when many people have the right to stop you for questioning, that is a real problem. Nearly everybody in the Pentagon has the right to question me, but with no obligation and no responsibility to see that my job gets done. And every year the number of people with this right is increasing. This is why it would help to arbitrarily reduce the number of people in the Pentagon by 20 or 30 per cent. This could be one of the most significant steps that has ever been taken to improve efficiency. It is significant that one of the first steps Mr. Khrushchev took when he became Premier was to reduce the Moscow bureaucracy by more than 100,000.

Senator Stennis. You can be frank with us. Do we call you to the Hill too often?

Admiral Rickover. No, sir.

Senator Stennis. Or take too much of your time there, or for reports?

Admiral Rickover. No, sir, that is not my problem. I

dm 42

don't mind coming up to the Hill. I don't mind getting a chance to talk with congressional committees because I think I do some good.

I have never been unduly bothered by Congress or by requests from Congress.

A lot of people complain about Congress, that Congress asks for too much. Maybe they are asking too much of Congress. Maybe that is why Congress is questioning them so much. They may not be completely straightforward with Congress.

I have no complaint whatsoever so far as Congress is concerned. I would like to wash that one up. My problems are in the Executive Branch.

Mr. Weisl. I think you made the statement if it hadn't been for certain members of Congress, you never would have built the atomic submarine.

Admiral Rickover. That is right. Senator Stennis, do you believe if I thought that Congress was holding me back I would not tell you this?

Senator Stennis. I think you would. That is why I asked you the question. I know that you speak your mind.

Senator Wiley, do you have some questions for the Admiral?

Senator Wiley. I think I have a few. First I want to compliment you, sir, for a very challenging statement.

dm 43

I would like to have a copy, if it were possible, of what took place on this Spivak television program.

Senator Young. I will give you 10 cents and you can get it.

Senator Jackson. Alex, I am going to put it in the record.

Senator Wiley. Then you have it.

Then I have this question: I think your remarks in relation to education are very challenging. We have got an education bill up now. But if in this Spivak meeting that you speak of, did you outline the particular tests that are necessary for the youngsters or anything of that kind?

Admiral Rickover. No, sir, but they are available in other things I have written.

Senator Wiley. I would like to get a copy of them.

Admiral Rickover. All right, sir.

Senator Wiley. Let me say that one of our problems today is that, as someone has said, at least they said it years ago when I was in college, a fellow came down from Northern Michigan, looked around, and he said, "I thought all the smart boys went to college, but I think they stayed home."

So the question is, whether we are spending a lot of unnecessary money in what you might call the superficial

dm 44

in education.

Admiral Rickover. We are, sir. There have been estimates made that about 200 to 300 thousand people in the public school system are engaged in things that are not essential for the educational process, such as amateur psychologists, amateur sociologists, administrators, public relations people, and so on.

Those functions should be performed by the church or the home; they do not belong in tax-supported schools. This, of course, takes up the time of the students in school and keeps them from learning the things they should.

Senator Wiley. I wanted to get your reaction on one other subject, because we have got now laws against youngsters working, you know, if they are under 18 in certain places, or 16, and in other places everybody that is up to 18 is entitled to an education.

The result is we have a lot of waste energy, and we have a lot of expense. We are talking about billions now for increased buildings and the whole thing amounts to whether or not it is a good investment.

If it is a good investment, that is one thing; if, on the other hand, there is an element of waste, we are not fair to the youngsters, we make loafers out of them.

I would like to get your reaction on that picture, because to me it is a very challenging thing.

dm 45

Admiral Rickover. I have given this subject a great deal of thought.

The problem is not so much with lack of opportunity for education. It is with the fact that the home does not encourage youngsters to stay on at school and get an adequate education.

I think we put the cart before the horse. In England a Central Advisory Council for Education has just finished a report entitled "15 to 18." Some of the best brains in England have been working on this project for more than three years.

This report proposes a national standard of requiring youngsters to stay in school at least until 16. It will cost them 200 to 250 million pounds extra per year, but they think it is worth while and essential for the welfare of their country. Interesting studies have been made, Senator Wiley, in Russia, in England, in France, in Western Europe, in the United States on the effect of home environment on desire and aptitude for education. These studies invariably show that the motivation received in the home is one of the most important factors in education.

That is, if a child listens to adult intellectual conversation he is helped to develop. If he listens to inane trivia from his parents, from TV or radio, he is harmed. The home is the greatest influence in

dm 46

keeping the children in school longer. In fact without this home influence many children want to leave school as early as possible so they can start earning money. This places a great responsibility on parents.

This shows up even in Russia where most children come from proletarian families, those children whose parents are in the civil service or white collar class stay longer at school than those whose parents are manual workers.

So the problem really is to keep the children at school longer.

I personally would not keep children in school after 16 if there were definite indications they had no aptitude for further academic work. But I certainly would do much more to give academic work to all our children than our schools presently attempt.

Now I am going to say something, Senator Stennis, that I know will interest you. The United States Office of Education issued in 1951 a bulletin entitled "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth." It is one of the most anti-intellectual documents I have ever read.

According to this pamphlet, 60 per cent of the boys and girls in the United States are incapable of mastering an academic education. The level of education in our schools has been lowered to take care of this supposed incapable majority.

dm 47

I maintain that far more than 40 per cent of our children are capable of mastering an academic education which would fit them to go to college, if the high schools knocked off the frills, and if they taught academic subjects. This is where we are shortchanging our children. We give up too quickly and too easily in attempting to educate all our children.

So the question is really the opposite of what you stated.

I think 16 is about the limit where children should stay in school if they have given definite indications they are not capable of further academic education. But up to 16 we should force the children as much as possible to develop their intellects and not devote their time to learning how to operate a lathe, and so on. They can learn that much quicker and better in a factory. Our schools give up too soon on our children. It is easier for the school administrators, of course.

And how easy it is to take this easy course if we don't have standards. It is easy for the teachers too, because no one can judge them.

Senator Stennis. May I interrupt you just a minute, gentlemen?

Senator Jackson is going to have to leave. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the situation,

dm 48

Senator Jackson was on the Armed Services Committee when the matter first came up about Admiral Rickover being retained in the service. Senator Jackson was very well informed about Admiral Rickover's outstanding work and was very helpful to the Committee, indeed, in its determination to keep Admiral Rickover in the Navy and keep the nuclear submarine program going. The Navy finally saw the light and promoted Admiral Rickover and the Nation has continued to receive the benefits of his very great abilities.

May we recognize Senator Jackson out of order, Senator Wiley, for anything that he wishes to say or comment on what the Admiral said?

Senator Wiley. That young man is never out of order.

Senator Jackson. Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to break in here. I am sorry I was tied up in another meeting. I merely wanted to say that I was sorry that I missed the main remarks of Admiral Rickover, but I will read this entire record with great interest.

I do want to say that when we get into some of these organizational problems at the appropriate time, I think we could profit by Admiral Rickover's return to the Committee.

I want to say to my colleagues that when I was in the House on the Atomic Energy Committee eleven years ago, Admiral Rickover at that time was coming up to brief us on the atomic submarine program. He stood alone in his determination,

dm 49

pretty much alone, I would say, in his determination to see that program through. I do think that in considering critical projects that need to be pushed with vigor and vitality and sensibility, I think that the lesson of how the atomic submarine came into being under his leadership would be a helpful guide in connection with some of our critical projects today, and with that I yield.

Admiral Rickover. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator Stennis. You will be interested to know, I am sure, Senator, that the Admiral has testified that the word has gotten around that it is not too healthy a thing to join his staff if an officer is interested in his promotional chances.

Senator Jackson. I think that this is something that our Committee, the Armed Services Committee, should look into. I am concerned about it, and I am glad that it was brought out here.

I don't think that it is advisable, at a time when our security depends on scientific achievement, to play down and to degrade those officers who go into the kind of career that can add immeasurably to our security through scientific achievement.

Senator Stennis. This is the one time, since I have served on the Armed Services Committee, that the Committee directly intervened, you might say, in connection with the

dm 50

promotion list, and saw to it that it was changed to include Admiral Rickover. What has happened since shows that this was a wise move that has benefited the Nation.

Senator Cannon?

Senator Cannon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Jackson. Thank you, Senator Cannon, for yielding to me. I appreciate your kindness.

Senator Cannon. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions for the Admiral, but I have enjoyed very much his discussion here. It seems to me that what he has said is very important information and should be made available to the public.

I wonder if we could ask the Admiral to go through this record after it is transcribed, and indicate what is classified, because we are in a closed hearing. It seems to me that the bulk of this information would not and should not be classified, and I think it is something that should be called to the attention of the public.

Admiral Rickover. There is hardly any part of my testimony that is classified. I will certainly check it for classification.

Senator Stennis. I think that is a fine suggestion.

I want to say this to you. I am convinced, with the greatest deference to our people and our nation, that we are going soft. This is not a new thought for me, for I have been making speeches in Mississippi and elsewhere about

dm 51

austerity year after year.

We have to tighten up our belts some and get some more steel in our backbones and train it into our youth. I have been surprised, Admiral Rickover, at the response that you get from thinking people. They seem to be hungry to hear something besides the soft line, so to speak.

Admiral Rickover. I know that, sir. I have experienced this everywhere I have spoken.

Senator Stennis. I made the statement many times, I said we were robbing our youth.

Admiral Rickover. That is right, sir.

Senator Stennis. We are robbing them of the personal satisfaction, as well as the opportunity to improve themselves in the future, by not teaching them more the lesson that real personal advancement and satisfaction comes only from individual effort and training and doing the hard thing.

Then I said that the movement must originate in the living rooms rather than depend on the church and the schools, and there has been a terrific response and cheering from various types of audiences on that very point.

I am not pointing to my speech or my thought as anything that is unusual, but, because of the way it was received as evidence, showing that the American people realize and sense that we have got to have somewhat of a changed attitude.

dm 52

Admiral Rickover. I have had the same experience, sir, everywhere.

Senator Stennis. You said that you got all these overwhelmingly favorable replies to your remarks on "Meet the Press." I watched that very closely, and I wrote you a letter asking you for a transcript.

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir.

Senator Stennis. I know we have all been interested and moved by your remarks today. As Senator Jackson said, there are other times too when your testimony would be very valuable, particularly on those subjects we have not covered today.

Admiral, you referred to me awhile ago when you were discussing the problems of rotation and promotion for technically trained officers. For the information of those that would not know, you were referring to the fact that I had served part-time as Chairman of the Subcommittee of Armed Services on Personnel.

Admiral Rickover. Yes, sir.

Senator Stennis. I haven't exhaustively investigated that problem, but I think that that would be a very fertile field and that something could be done about it. I wanted to say that for the record so it would be clear.

Now I want to ask you this specific question. You referred to your own group that you are working with and your own staff. How much help do you get from outside your own

dm 53

organization, Admiral, in the problems that confront you?

Do you get any help outside of your own group?

Admiral Rickover. Little, sir.

Senator Stennis. I commend you very highly for what you have done for the Navy and for the country. I think that appreciation is reflected by the public in response to your television interview, as well as other things that you have been recognized for.

Now this matter of the Armed Services Committee going into the matter of who will be promoted and who will not, and who will be retired and who will not, that is a very delicate matter and I don't like to go into it.

I don't think the Committee ought to go into it very often. In fact, your case is the only one that I think we have ever gone into. But I certainly had my eyes opened in that matter, and I want to pledge you my continuing support as long as your record is like it is. I think you now have, and will continue to have, the support of the entire Committee on any set of facts where merit is on your side and you need help.

I, for one, hope that you don't stop the efforts that you are carrying on. I am not on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, so I don't have too much personal knowledge of the details of what you are doing, but I know you are getting results, and I don't know where we would have been if you

dm 54

hadn't stuck it out, contributing what you have, you and your staff. We know from what you have said that many of them are entitled to great credit.

I don't look on this as any reflection on the President or anything of that kind at all. It is a matter of the organization giving a man that can deliver a chance to do so without being harassed or overburdened with inconsequential administrative chores. We admire you for your fighting spirit as well as for your great ability and you may be sure that the Congress will continue to give you the support you need to continue your efforts in the national interest.

Is there anything further? Senator Wiley, do you have anything further?

Senator Wiley. Nothing further except to say that I have listened with profit to the discussion by the distinguished Admiral, and I trust that he realizes and will realize how much we hold him in esteem, how much we think of him. Because he is no different from the rest of us, I am sure he appreciates appreciation, and we all appreciate you, sir.

Admiral Rickover. Thank you, sir.

Senator Stennis. We certainly are glad that we were able to hear you this afternoon.

We are very glad to have had you with us, sir, and congratulations again, and convey our regards to your staff too. I know you have a fine group there with you.

dm 55

(Whereupon, at 6:15 o'clock p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:00 a. m., Thursday, February 4, 1960.)

- - -