Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Radio

would go directly into the hands of the aged, blind and disabled in the first full year.

TIGHT ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM INTEGRITY

Those who receive welfare, while they are the most visible victims, are not the only ones who suffer because of the myriad confusions and contradictions of the present welfare mess. The taxpayers are victims as well, for they are paying for a program that not only fails to accomplish its objectives, but is virtually impossible to administer.

Welfare administration is woefully outmoded in this country, with its 1,152 separate State and local welfare jurisdictions. Although virtually all have the same basic programs—Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Disabled, Aid to the Aged, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children—each operates with its own eligibility determination and administrative methods.

In the administrative area, especially, there is nearly an incomprehensible variety of management philosophies, operating policies and methods, and personnel arrangements. Only 20 percent of these jurisdictions have automated management techniques.

Under such conditions, it is not surprising that there are major management problems which exacerbate the skyrocketing costs and add to the growing public concern about welfare. Moreover, because of current open end financing arrangements, States and localities have what amounts to a blank check on the Federal treasury for this activity.

Thousands of dedicated people are doing their best to operate this ponderous machinery. But this system has been patched and repaired too many times. The frustration of current State program managers has resulted in very substantial support among Governors and State welfare administrators for Federal administration of the benefit payments function.

In recent months we have documented the failings of the current system, including the absence of cross-checks of records in adjacent areas, inadequate verification of income and benefits from a variety of benefit programs, and rapid turnover of personnel.

While decentralized management is highly desirable in many fields and is indeed central to my philosophy of government, I believe that many of these problems in welfare administration can best be solved by using a national automated payments system, which would produce economies and considerably increase both equity of treatment and tightened administration.

Such a unified system—partially modeled on the Social Security system—would reduce errors and provide greater controls for fraud and duplicate payments.

H.R. 1 would require each recipient to have a social security number for identification to prevent duplicate benefits and to facilitate the receiving of recipient income information from such sources as the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Veterans Administration, and other units.

National administration and standards would also ensure equitable treatment for individuals: they would no longer be subject to conflicting rules in different areas, to delays caused by back-ups, and to the confusing tangle of red tape.

Under such a system, States and counties would be freed to concentrate on social services to recipients, making use of their closer understanding of the needs of local residents.

AN INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE

Because we want a *better* system—not just a new one—welfare reform will cost more in the early years and cover more needy people.

Against the increased initial costs of my proposals in H.R. 1, however, we must weigh the unknown future costs—both human and fiscal—if the present chaotic system, with its present soaring growth rates, is continued. The new system contained in H.R. 1 would be far less costly in the long run—both in terms of dollars and in terms of people.

Historians of the future no doubt will focus on America's 200th birthday—and the years leading up to that significant anniversary—as one important point for measuring the progress of our Republic.

They will find, of course, that over 200 years America's mastery of the industrial revolution, its bountiful economic system, its military might and its technological triumphs helped to make it preeminent in the family of nations.

They will rightfully highlight our moon landings, our deep space probes, our satellite communications, our electronic innovations, and our extraordinary gross national product.

Penetrating observers, however, will also ask other questions:

What did all of this mean to the average American?

What was the quality of the daily life and the basic spirit of all the American people in the 1970's?

How, in particular, did our great Nation provide for those citizens who—through no fault of their own—were unable from time to time to provide for themselves and their families?

I believe that the program contained in H.R. 1 will stand us in good stead when such historical evaluations are considered, for this is a program which has grown out of a fundamental concern for our least fortunate citizens.

The enactment of H.R. 1 would demonstrate both our concern for what is responsible and our concern for what is compassionate.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 27, 1972.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today, are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9526) to authorize certain naval vessel loans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) to establish a Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1973.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 63, 92d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1973, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 18. An act to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty; and

S. 1975. An act to change the minimum age qualification for serving as a juror in Federal courts from 21 years of age to 18 years of age.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 24, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 678 and 679.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DELEGATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, H.R. 8787, to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a delegate to the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Radios

Times carried an editorial entitled "Illinois Just the Third; 19 Primaries Still To Go" which concisely indicates the major deficiencies of the present primary system. The American public are fed up with the length, the inanity, the frustration, and the waste of presidential primaries and campaigns. They are aghast at the pouring out of huge sums of money and the inability to focus on issues which affect the fate of our country. I know that my colleagues will read the editorial with interest:

ILLINOIS JUST THE THIRD; 19 PRIMARIES STILL TO GO

The long, wearying trek began in cold, snowy New Hampshire on March 7. It will end on a warm June day in New York State.

On that day, if not before, one of the Democratic aspirants for nomination for president should be clearly in the forefront.

Presidential primaries, 22 of them this year, can be wearisome affairs not only for the candidates, but for the electorate. Do we really need more than four months of campaigning to get to know the competitors and where they stand? Is it really necessary to spend millions of dollars on staff and on advertising and on travel expenses? Could there not be one national primary held on the same day in every state?

The answer is that yes, of course four months of campaigning is too long, the money expenditure is monstrous (Paul N. McCloskey of California and Fred Harris of Oklahoma have already dropped out of the race because of lack of money) and there could be (and probably some day will be) a national primary day.

But much as many people would like to see these reforms, there are those who find merits in our present scrambled system.

Arthur Schlesinger, former aide to President Kennedy, says the extended primary race gives a candidate an exceptional chance to get to know the country, its people, their problems and their moods.

Likewise, the long primary gives voters a chance to shop and compare, and make both factual and intuitive judgments on the men seeking their votes. (Senator Muskie, in a moment of emotion, sheds angry tears in Manchester, N.H., as a good many Americans watched via television. They are entitled to their own conclusions).

Mr. Schlesinger is also candid in describing the primaries as a device for Democrats to get their message before the people, offsetting the President's daily access to the news media.

But even Democrats wonder if it's worth while.

One of the most dogged advocates of campaign reform is Rep. John Monagan of Waterbury. He has long urged a time limit on election campaigns. This month he suggested a similar time limit on primary electioneering: A law requiring that no primary contest occur any earlier than one month before the nominating convention itself.

Were such a law in effect now, the weekly parade of state contests—Illinois today, Florida last week, New Hampshire the week before—wouldn't even have begun yet.

The Monagan proposal is less stringent than that offered by some—including John M. Bailey, Connecticut's Democratic chairman—for a single national primary day. A "primary month" would allow more local exposure for candidates, and more of the kind of give-and-take Schlesinger champions.

But the primaries would be neatly concentrated in June, and serious campaigning wouldn't really begin until May. Meantime, our political aspirants could concentrate on doing the job they were elected to do.

Congressman Monagan should keep plugging away. He makes sense.

LISTENING TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, just last week, after a prolonged deadlock, the two Houses of the Congress gave their approval to legislation which authorizes financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty through the end of the current fiscal year.

What will happen to these two stations after June 30 is anyone's guess. The House, on November 19 of last year, voted overwhelmingly—271 to 12—in favor of a study proposal which I advanced and which could have provided the Congress with reliable, indepth information on which to base its decision regarding the future of these broadcasting operations.

The Senate conferees, however, would not accept this proposal.

While the issue is still before us, therefore, I thought that many of my colleagues would be interested to read an article by Mr. Henry Kamm which appeared in the March 26 issue of the New York Times Magazine.

One passage in the article struck me as being particularly pertinent to the debate which has engaged the Congress in recent months. It reads:

Despite its cold-war origins and CIA sponsorship, Radio Free Europe's listeners consider it not a propaganda station, but the anti-propaganda station that adjusts the one-sided view of the world laid down for all domestic media by the information department of the central committee of each /Eastern European/ country's Communist party. The people of Eastern Europe are sophisticated enough to know that Radio Free Europe is interested in influencing their minds, but they seem to feel that its methods do less violence to their intelligence than do those of the state media.

Mr. Kamm's article follows:

LISTENING IN ON RADIO FREE EUROPE—THE STATION THAT FULBRIGHT WANTS TO SHUT DOWN

(By Henry Kamm)

MUNICH.—*"Mr. President, I submit that these radios should be given an opportunity to take their rightful place in the graveyard of cold-war relics."*—Senator J. W. Fulbright, speaking in the Senate on Feb. 17, 1972.

"It happens quite often that I am unable to hear your station because of the jamming. At such moments I feel like smashing the radio, as if the wooden box were to blame, and I almost cry in helpless rage. It seems to me that somebody wants to tear me away by force from my good friends. Be with us, as we remain with you—"Your Listener From Chrudim," writing to the Czechoslovak Department of Radio Free Europe on Sept. 27, 1971.

No doubt the Senator from Arkansas is right. Radio Free Europe began broadcasting to five countries of Eastern and Central Europe at the height of the cold war, not to mention a hotter one raging in Korea, on July 4, 1950. But just as surely, the lady from Chrudim is right. She is just one of millions in her own country, Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria who believe that their own newspapers, television and radio tell them lies, that nothing available to them is quite so reliable as Radio Free Europe.

As Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Fulbright prevented all Congressional attempts to renew funding for Radio Free Europe and its sister station, Radio Liberty, which broadcasts to the Soviet Union, before their last appropriation expired Feb. 22. Despite a House bill providing new funds through June 30, 1973, and a Senate measure guaranteeing funds through next June 30, Fulbright has kept the stations living on borrowed time by blocking any compromise bill. The House will no doubt accept the Senate version (which the Administration has reluctantly backed) to keep the stations from dying before June 30, but there is still permission here about its prospects. At a time when President Nixon will be preparing to visit Moscow, the pessimists ask, what chance is there for the passage of a measure to continue a service that has been a thorn in the Soviet side for many years?

The disclosure that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operated on funds secretly supplied by the Central Intelligence Agency set off in the United States a heated debate on the propriety of continuing to pretend that they were private institutions supported by charitable contributions, and that debate ultimately led to Fulbright's stand. But the disclosures and the debate caused no concern among the stations' listeners. They continue to tune in with as much faith as an American might bring to a newspaper that has a decent record for factual reporting and an editorial policy with which he agrees more often than not. Their devotion is almost unmatched in countries that offer more than one credible source of news.

It takes a while for a newcomer to the countries of the East to stop being surprised when a Polish or Rumanian friend says, "I heard on the radio last night . . ." and relays a bit of news that the Polish or Rumanian radio would announce only if its management, the Government, were to repudiate everything it stands for. "The radio" means Radio Free Europe; the Warsaw or Bucharest stations are more likely to be discussed as "they."

Despite its cold-war origins and C.I.A. sponsorship, Radio Free Europe's listeners consider it not a propaganda station, but the antipropaganda station that adjusts the one-sided view of the world laid down for all domestic media by the information department of the central committee of each country's Communist party. The people of Eastern Europe are sophisticated enough to know that Radio Free Europe is interested in influencing their minds, but they seem to feel that its methods do less violence to their intelligence than do those of the state media.

"We don't project one point of view, but the diversity of freedom," said Jan Nowak, the head of Radio Free Europe's Polish service.

Although it is an American station, recognized by its audience as such despite its neutral name, its programs do not reflect a specifically American point of view. The bulk of its news report is drawn from four news agencies, of which only one, United Press International, is American. The others are Reuters, of Britain; Agence France-Presse, and Deutsche Presse Agentur. More European newspapers of all political persuasions than American are cited in the press reviews that form an essential part of the programing.

Unlike the three other foreign broadcasters with large audiences in Eastern Europe—the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Voice of America and the West German Deutsche Welle—Radio Free Europe is not regarded as an official station pushing a government point of view. In countries in which only government views are broadcast and there is a deep audience skepticism toward all official views, Radio Free Europe's quasi-private sponsorship gives it a great credibility edge.

"The programs of the B.B.C. or the Voice

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

of America are welcome, but they bear an official stamp," said Karel Jezdinsky, one of the most popular and politically influential commentators of Radio Prague when that station found its long-muffled voice for a few glorious months in 1968. "Their news programs are limited to news from a national point of view. The rest are nonpolitical programs of no basic interest to the listener. They can get some nonpolitical news on life in England or America even in their own press. The achievements of American science, for instance, are discussed even on the Czech radio.

"Radio Free Europe is unique in broadcasting Western ideas as such," said the bearded, 32-year-old commentator. "You can't tell what country they come from." Jezdinsky's listening experience goes back to his school days. He recalls a period in the early nineteen-fifties when Czechoslovak school children were warned by their teachers to pay no attention to the Radio Free Europe leaflets being dropped from balloons over that country as well as Poland and Hungary. "My teacher would say to the class, 'Don't read them, just bring them to school,' but privately he would ask me whether I'd read one and what it said."

In 1969 Jezdinsky, then the Prague radio correspondent in Belgrade, held a news conference to announce that he could no longer work for a station that collaborated with the forces occupying his country. He intended to accept a post with the B.B.C. "But then I thought that I would have more freedom here to comment in the way I was used to . . . . I would not be just a translator of an Englishman's commentary."

Since then, Jezdinsky says, he has been broadcasting his own views without interference or suggestion from any quarter. Listener mail encourages him and Slava Volny, another popular broadcaster of the Prague Spring who joined R.F.E., to believe that they made the right choice.

Radio Free Europe's balloon-launching days are long over. Flamboyant gestures are eschewed, as are excited words. The American front office and the five broadcasting departments, each headed by a former national of the country it serves, are kept aware of the charges to which the station laid itself open after the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

After the collapse of the revolution, the station was accused of having incited rebellion and having promised the rebels foreign assistance. Independent investigations failed to bear out the charges, but a subsequent reappraisal of the station's functions and performance introduced an attitude of prudence and restraint that prevails to this day.

While station officials contend that there was never any organized campaign to fan the flames of revoluation in Budapest, they concede that a number of broadcasts indicated strongly, even after resistance was doomed, that if the rebels held out a few more days help would arrive. "There was an absence of control during the critical four days," said James F. Brown, a soft-spoken, scholarly Briton who heads Radio Free Europe's research department.

In what Brown called an "agonizing reappraisal' 'after the revolution, a number of heads rolled. Some of those who had been writing political commentaries or directing that work found themselves reporting on sports or other less sensitive matters. A new feeling pervaded the sprawling building in Munich's English Garden, a feeling that a station like Radio Free Europe had a potential for provoking violence and that it must not use the potential—but must expect to be accused of doing so.

"As a radio man, I am against any supposition that one can from afar influence policy on such important matters directly," said Jezdinsky, who holds a doctorate in sociology and mas media. "You can inform and educate and give ideas, but I don't think any action committed in Czechoslovakia in the last 20 years was incited by R.F.E. As a listener, I never heard any appeal to tell me what I should do or should not do."

While there is no doubt that the tone of the broadcasts softened progressively after 1956, most officials here contend that this was caused more by the softening of the East European governments after Nikita S. Khrushchev's repudiation of Stalinism than by the Hungarian catastrophe. Thinking back again on his days as a listener, Jezdinsky said:

"Sure, the tone was rough in condemning the terroristic system that objectively existed and was called Stalinism. The tone was justified, because life then was horrible. We used the same tone when we were able to broadcast from Radio Prague about that period in 1968. Journalists too young to have listened to R.F.E. in those days "discovered" the same facts independently and spoke about them on the air from Prague just as harshly as R.F.E. did."

Harsh speech is rare these days on Radio Free Europe. The harshest denunications of the Soviet Union and its allied parties and governments that are broadcast are the condemnations issued by dissidents from within the Soviet Union and by critics in Western Communist parties.

In its own commentaries, Radio Free Europe tries hard to encourage reforming trends in the countries to which it broadcasts. But it avoided strong criticism of Wladyslaw Gomulka, who was carried to power by liberal Communist forces in Poland in 1956, long after he had repudiated his original supporters. And it is sparing now in criticizing his sucessor, Edward Gierek, because it fears that the alternatives are worse.

Istvan Bede, Hungary's first postwar Ambassador to Britain and since 1957 the head of the Hungarian service of Radio Free Europe, remembers a joke that circulated in Budapest after the party's First Secretary, Janos Kadar, introduced in the later nineteen-sixties economic reforms that were unpopular because a number of consumer prices rose. "The joke," says Bede, "was that the only ones who were for the reforms were Kadar and Radio Free Europe. We supported the reforms because we think they are sound and good for the people."

Like other department chiefs, Bede comes down hard against any intention to "liberate" his former homeland or to "roll back" Communism. "I wouldn't even say we are an opposition party," he remarks. "Opposition parties sometimes go to extremes, and we must always be restrained. We are not asking the Communists to give up Communism. Friends who have been to Hungary tell me they believe Socialism is now generally accepted in the country. I don't wish it, but one must accept reality. I am not entitled by the Hungarian people to represent or lead them. I have no mandate from anybody. I am not the voice of Free Hungary or the Hungarian conscience. We don't broadcast the views of Hungarian émigré politicians because they live in the past. We have to be realistic. We would like a beautiful Communism or, as Khrushchev said, goulash Communism."

The Czechoslovak service, broadcasting to a country in which unhappiness with the Communist leadership is greatest and the wounds are still fresh, in which the political arrests continue and the gulf between those who govern and those who are governed is widest, is doing its utmost to discourage either rage or unwarranted hope. To Rozina Jadrna, a disk jockey with a large following, the job is mainly one of binding wounds. In reply to many despairing letters from young people, she occasionally plays a record called "Desiderata," on which a singer named Les Crane recites against a musical background a bit of prose containing these lines:

"Go placidly amid the noise and haste and remember what peace there may be in silence. As far as possible without surrender be on god terms with all persons. Speak your truth quitely and clearly and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they, too, have their story. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world. Be careful, strive to be happy."

Miss Jadrna played that record on Jan. 19, the third anniversary of the death of Jan Palach, the Prague youth who set himself aflame and became a symbol of his country's martyrdom. She also played a song by Leonard Cohen, the American pop poet and singer, about Joan of Arc at the stake. She made no comment, but she received a letter thanking her for remembering Palach on his anniversary.

In these days when opponents of Soviet-imposed "normalization" are regularly arrested, Radio Free Europe employs a caution that some consider to be excessive. The temporary detention of Jiri Dienstbier, a liberal former radio commentator, had not yet been broadcast several days after his release because only one newspaper had published a report of his arrest, and Radio Free Europe rules require a second corroborating source before an item is put on the air.

Even the strongest personalities on the staff express a sense of the limitations their role imposes on them. Jan Nowak, who left Poland as a courier to London during the Warsaw uprising of 1944 (carrying the archives of the Resistance in bandages on an arm that had been broken in a parachute drop), customarily answers questions about when he left Poland with, "I have never left Poland." The director of the Polish service, which he runs with an iron hand, he has more independent political support in the United States than anyone else at Radio Free Europe because of the political strength of the Polish-American community.

But the 57-year-old Nowak says he recognized, for instance, that on a cardinal question for Poland on which he saw eye-to-eye with the Communist Government he could never broadcast any commentary. The question was that of Poland's western frontier on the Oder-Neisse Line. Because Radio Free Europe broadcasts from West Germany, which did not recognize the loss of German territories behind the line, the Polish service could not comment on the issue until Chancellor Willy Brandt accepted Poland's borders.

Nowak rejects allegations that Radio Free Europe represents the thinking of those who want to restore the prewar right-wing rule over Poland. "I don't believe for a moment that Poland can be capitalist or should be capitalist. My own dream is that the system should be more pragmatic, more human and more free. That is all we want, and it can happen. Policy is the art of the possible, and socialism has many meanings. I would be most happy if Poland had social democracy. I don't see any other practical solution."

Asked to apply the sensitive barometer of anti-Semitism, usually a reliable measure of how right-wing a Polish organization may be, Nowak reluctantly—because, he said, he did not like this way of looking at people—noted that there were a number of Jews among his closest associates. During the anti-Semitic purge of 1968, Radio Free Europe was habitually branded by the Government as a key part of the "Zionist conspiracy" against Poland.

"I wouldn't take any other job," Nowak said. "It is not a sacrifice but a privilege. Our voices are in every Polish home. We defend intellectuals, repressed Communists, the church, Jews and peasants. We defend with equal zeal Kolakowski and Wyszynski." Leszek Kolakowski, a philosopher driven out of the Communist party and now in emigration, and Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, represent the opposite ends of their nation's political spectrum.

Perhaps Nowalk was exaggerating when he said R.F.E. was in every Polish home, but

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

there is no doubt that it is very popular, the most trusted source of news and the most keenly resented opposition medium in Poland. Poles call it Warsaw West, to contrast with the official Warsaw station. Dinner-table conversation often assumes that all present have been listening to the station, and foreign correspondents called on the carpet for dispatches that the Foreign Ministry's press officials find objectionable have noted that the officials' displeasure seems to be in direct proportion to the use Radio Free Europe has made of the offending article.

The station's audience-research projects, conducted in seven West European countries among tourists from the five nations to which it broadcasts, consistently put Poland at the top of the list. In 1971, 60 per cent of Poles over 14 years of age listened to the station often. In Rumania, it was 57 per cent; in Hungary, 53 per cent; in Bulgaria, 46, and in Czechoslovakia, 45. Jamming is heaviest in the last two countries, widespread in Poland, weak in Hungary and nonexistent in Rumania.

It is doubtful that Radio Free Europe has ever broadcast a prepared commentary that conflicted directly with a clearly defined United States foreign-policy position. "We operate under a generally understood frame of reference in this building," said Ralph E. Walter, the 47-year-old Minnesotan who has been director of the station since 1968 and has never worked for anyone else. ("I am not a C.I.A. man," he says. "I have never been a C.I.A. man.")

But there is enormous freedom within the frame of reference Walter describes. The restriction applies only to commentaries by staff members; the full range of the world press is available for broadcast. American opposition to the war in Vietnam has been expressed in many excerpts from hostile newspaper editorials and columns that must have made some listeners wonder whether they had turned on their national stations by mistake. The controversy over the Pentagon Papers published by The New York Times last year received more coverage than a European audience—even in the West—could have found interesting.

But imagine what a Rumanian listener, accustomed by his press and radio to a solidly one-sided news presentation, must have thought of a "propaganda" station that wound up a review of American, British, French, West German and Swedish comment on the Pentagon Papers with an editorial from the Swiss newspaper Neue Zuercher Zeitung. "Europeans, having read Thucydides, may find [the Pentagon Papers] naive and ask again if a country where these things occur can be a leading power," it said of the country that paid to have the remark broadcast to a hostile nation.

"On foreign affairs I say what I want," contends Noel Bernard, the head of the Rumanian service, who speaks in the clipped English he learned in Palestine and perfected at the B.B.C. "I don't know another radio station that has as much freedom as this station. It's been quite uncanny."

Bernard, who left Rumania in 1940, said there was no pro-American bias. "I have difficulty making my six people in New York be more objective in reporting from America. They are much too kind, probably because they are new immigrants and very pro-American. They are so grateful."

Walter, the director, believes that Radio Free Europe's autonomy is the *sine quo non* of its operation. "We don't sit here and take orders from the State Department, the C.I.A. or anybody," he said. "If it has been effective—and I think it has been—it is because of the way it has been allowed to operate."

Policy direction from the front office is loose. The practice of issuing guidance summaries daily was abandoned more than 10 years ago, and they now appear only occasionally (there were 40 in 17971 and two in the first two months of this year). The summaries are windy accounts of publicly available information on such complex problems as Chinese-American or Soviet-Rumanian relations and end with the instruction that broadcasters will report "along the above lines." They provide a lot of leeway and little guidance.

The American hand is felt strongest in the area of news. In the central newsroom, Nathan Kingsley, a former national editor of The New York Herald-Tribune and editor of its Paris edition, applies rigorous standards of objectivity that are straight out of American journalism textbooks. Nothing that has not been put on the internal wire from the news room to each broadcasting service may be used in the 10-minute hourly newscasts prepared separately by each service. Kingsley's staff, an English-language rock in the currents of East European languages swirling around it, is made up of American and Commonwealth newsmen.

They work like any large news organization, relying on a variety of commercial sources. In addition to the four news agencies to which it subscribes, Radio Free Europe receives the reports of all the official press agencies of the Communist world. The station has correspondents the major capitals of Western Europe, as well as in New York and Washington. The news staff also scours the major newspapers of the West.

President Nixon's China trip, to take one example, was passed off with a minimum of highly editorialized coverage by the East European media while Radio Free Europe's New York office monitored all American television broadcasts from China and sent second-hand "live" coverage to Munich to enliven the official statements, toasts and speeches with a sense of presence at the event.

Eastern and Western official and press reaction to the Presidential trip, rather than the station's comments, made up most of the coverage after Nixon's return. In addition to news, commentaries and press reviews, the bulk of Radio Free Europe's programing is devoted to discussions under such specific headings as "economics," "labor," "agriculture," "literary life" or "problems of youth." There are readings from books that circulate secretly in their countries of origin but are published openly in the West. A Sunday religious service is broadcast in each of the languages, and disk jockey shows present the most popular Western commodity in the East, pop music.

There are 1,140 Radio Free Europe employes here, 344 at its transmitters in Portugal and 96 at its New York offices. They broadcast 20 hours daily to Czechoslovakia, 19 each to Poland and Hungary, 12 to Rumania and 7½ to Bulgaria. "What nobody else has ever in history done, the Americans have done here," said Bede, the Hungarian service chief. "They have brought five nations who have forever detested each other together under one roof and there have never been disputes between us." He says American sponsorship of the station comes close to "pure idealism," and he expresses a feeling that is widespread in the warren of offices and studios:

"Not for a moment do I have the feeling that R.F.E. is American and receives American money and therefore I have to serve American interests. This would be possible only under the Americans because Americans are most liberal in accepting others as full-fledged partners. The British would also let you do it your way, but if once it came out in a way they didn't like you'd be out. If you worked for French money, it would have to show in what you did. The Americans have a tolerance that no Europeans have."

Senator Fulbright's onslaught, which has left the station's staff feeling that it is living on borrowed time, has brought out the sardonic humor that is native to Central and Eastern Europeans in times of political stress. Over an unending flow of coffee in the basement cafeteria, the former Bulgarians, Poles, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks and Rumanians, most of whom are now stateless or American, puzzle over the paradox: A man who gained an international reputation for librealism by sponsoring an unprecedentedly large program of educational exchanges now, in the name of the same liberalism, wants to cut off the principal source of news from the citizens of the Soviet Union and its dependencies. Since Radio Free Europe's building was designed to be usable as a hospital when the station is closed, a statue of the Senator is being proposed for the entrance hall with the inscription, "To the man who made this hospital possible."

Jezdinsky, the Czechoslovak commentator, says it is all very familiar to him—he attended the demise of Radio Free Prague. Fulbright's contention that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are roadblocks on the way to Soviet-American *détente* has a familiar ring to Czechs, Jezdinsky said. "Chamberlain and Daladier once came to this city to arrange a *modus vivendi* with Hitler. And to the Czechs who said that the price for the arrangement was very heavy for them, they said, 'You bloody Central Europeans are just an irritant here.' "

To the R.F.E. staff, this is the heart of the issue. Even many here who agree with Fulbright on his opposition to the war in Indochina and who, like him, think Congress should not have been deceived about the funding of the stations are hurt by being written off as rusty knights riding off to a superannuated cold war.

"Every Eastern European statement I read about peaceful coexistence—and I read at least three a week—," says Bernard, the chief of the Rumanian service, "they're all in favor of it, but there must never be peaceful coexistence in the realm of ideas. So why should we capitulate? The time to close this is when there will be a reasonably free press in Eastern Europe."

There is general agreement here that Fulbright is right in saying that the nations of Western Europe should participate in the financing of the stations. But they have been getting it for nothing, the view here goes, and it is even more difficult to persuade a government to start paying for something it already gets free than to create something new at its own expense. European support in the latest crisis has been expressed by most of the major newspapers of the Continent and Britain and by the many scholars of Soviet and Eastern European affairs who depend on research material provided by the stations.

"Send Senator Fulbright to Poland for a little," said Krystyna Milotworska, who came to Radio Free Europe in 1968 straight from Sztandar Mlodych, the Communist youth daily, "to write what they wouldn't let me write there."

"It depends on how you understand *détente*," said another staff member, Lucjan Perzanowski, who left the Polish Weekly Forum in 1967. "If you mean a better relationship between governments while borders remain practically closed, censorship fully in effect and contacts between people unfree, then Senator Fulbright's criticism has some justification. But I understand *détente* as a long-range process, involving the people at large. If nothing is done to keep the Western side alive, then this real *détente* will die. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are factors keeping real *détente* alive."

Beneath the sarcasm and the optimism, one senses at Radio Free Europe a feeling of deep concern that a cause in which people believe—far beyond their concern for their jobs—is in danger of dying, that Senator Fulbright may succeed in doing what only Alexander Dubcek has come close to accomplishing. In 1968, when the Czechoslovak press and radio were free, serious thought was given to closing the Czechoslovak service.

That Prague spring did not last. The winter, the coldest war against the truth, that

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5

has been restored throughout the Soviet empire will be colder yet if the two major voices of uncensored news are stilled.

ADDRESS BY H. E. JOAO AUGUSTO DE ARAUJO CASTRO, AMBASSADOR OF BRAZIL TO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of February, 1972, His Excellency H. E. Joao Augusto De Araujo Castro, Ambassador of Brazil to the United States, delivered a very able address before the University of California at Los Angeles Symposium on the "Semana De Arte Moderna" entitled "Brazil and the Community of Nations." The Ambassador of Brazil to the United States is one of the most learned men of our hemisphere. He is a scholar, a man of letters, a statesman, and a great spokesman for his country, indeed for the Western Hemisphere. When so great a country speaks through so distinguished a spokesman her message is a meaningful expression.

It is with particular pleasure, as an admirer of His Excellency the Ambassador and of his country, that I commend the Ambassador's outstanding address upon the part of his country in the Community of Nations, delivered on this significant occasion, to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen.

I therefore insert the Ambassador's address immediately following my remarks in the RECORD.

BRAZIL AND THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to extend to you and the other Members of the Organizing Committee of the UCLA Semana de Arte Moderna Symposium my heartiest appreciation for your kind invitation to address you today and to participate in the commemorations of two anniversaries, of two events, which are one hundred years apart in time, but which reflect, within the pattern of the history of Brazil, the same desire for independence, for authenticity and for the creation and preservation of a national identity. For better and for worse, we have decided in 1822—and we have reiterated this decision in 1922—to remain Brazilians; and we still insist on being Brazilians, even before we insist on being nationalist. Art and culture cannot be dissociated from life. They are not the outward trappings of a civilization. They are part of its spirit and of its very soul. It is thus only proper and fitting that chronological fortuitousness permit us to hold today a joint celebration. The Modern Art Week was a manifestation of youth at the respectable age of 100, decades before the rather recent assertion of the promises and wonders of geriatrics, which is the youngest of sciences still in the throes of immaturity. It was an effort towards endowing art and literature with a richer social and national significance. It was, as I have indicated, an effort towards authenticity and towards identity, not an effort towards narrow nationalism or isolation. We believe in Brazil as part and parcel of the community of nations and, likewise, we believe in Brazilian culture as part and parcel of the culture of Man.

ON BEING HUMAN

Out of step with what is happening elsewhere, we are still absorbed by and obsessed with the problems of Man and the problems of the Earth. This explains why the cultural events of 1922 were both earthly and human. Brazil is a land of many races and many cultures, of unity and diversity, a melting-pot of ideas and conceptions, philosophies and prejudices, dogmas and heresies. Brazil grew and asserted itself as a nation, in spite of the gloomy prophecies and predictions of scholars and social scientists. Its economy developed in direct and open defiance of the accepted tenets of economic orthodoxy. It is a chapter by itself and, yet, it is a chapter of humanity. It is a land where you can still locate a fast disappearing species; the human being, with all his shortcomings and possibilities, his contradictions and his qualities, his liabilities and his assets. But of course you may enquire whether there is much to be said on behalf of the human being or on the merits of being human and this would necessarily reopen the whole question. This debate could carry us too far and it is safer to leave it at this point, for the sake of brevity and for the sake of prudence. My only purpose was to stress the basic humanism, for all it is worth, which permeates and helps to explain the history of Brazil. This accounts for 1822 and for 1922. And this accounts for today.

SUDDENLY, LAST SUMMER . . .

Before dealing specifically with the theme "Brazil and the Community of Nations", it might perhaps be helpful to try to characterize certain trends in today's international pattern. We have recently said that the Washington summer of 1971 might still be recorded in History as the Summer of Transition, inasmuch as it was a Summer in which many dogmas were broken or were altogether dispelled. Political dogmas, diplomatic dogmas, financial dogmas, monetary dogmas. July and August may have been little more than adjustments to realities, and it is only proper that we should strive towards defining, identifying and characterizing the realities of our present situation, the realities we are called to live in. The reasonings and assumptions of only six or seven months ago are no longer valid and no longer do they prevail; they have been superseded by the logic, the impact or the forcefulness of events. The new policies announced in July and August will determine not only political and economic consequences of far-reaching portent. They will precipitate—and have already precipitated—tremendous psychological changes, attitudes, postures and patterns of international behaviour. Dogmas have been broken and until new dogmas are erected—they eventually will—there prevails the impression that anything goes, that all is prmissible and admissible in this age of transition. The world and the dollar will never be quite the same again.

THE END OF THE POST-WAR

This may well be the end of a post-war period which had been protracted beyond measure, beyond expectation and even beyond reason, and the re-emergence of Japan and Germany as Major Nations, although not so in a strictly military sense, may well symbolize the end of this post-war period. We may well be going through the birthpangs of a new world and we wish to make it a world of Hope. We may well be at a new pre-Dumbarton Oaks and at a new pre-Bretton Woods stage. Power is fluid and volatile by nature and Power is still the measuring-rod and the yardstick against which people are gauging the acts of men and the acts that will bear a close resemblance to the of nations. We may be entering a period of 1945–1948, which laid the basis for the post-war period we are just quitting.

THE NEW PENTARCHY

Suddenly, last Summer, we were launched into a new cycle of History, perhaps into a cycle of Pragmaticism, which is a recurring human fantasy. Adam Smith and John Foster Dulles appear to have been relegated to to the past. China was again called to play a major role in world affairs and it might even be said that some consideration is now being given to the concept of a new Pentarchy of Power, which would no longer coincide with the present five Permanent Members of the Security Council. It even appears that some Professors think of a world concert, which could, on a world scale, follow the general pattern and fit into the broad mould of the old and outmoded European concert. We appear to be reviving and resuscitating theories and doctrines which have been proved illusory and self-defeating in the past, theories of Balance of Power which constitute the negation of the very Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE FREEZING OF THE STRUCTURE OF POWER

On many occasions, in the United Nations and in other international bodies, Brazil has consistently stressed the dangers inherent to this new cult of Power, which appears to inspire some of the basic documents of our age, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This Treaty institutionalizes the inequality of nations and establishes different categories of States: one category of adult and therefore responsible States and one category of non-adulty and therefore non-responsible States. The over-heralded Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is interpreted as a complement of the Charter of the United Nations in the process of the Freezing of the Structure of World Power, is in direct violation, however, of several of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, inasmuch as it accepts the premise that the strong countries will become ever stronger and the weak one will become ever weak. On the other hand, the Non-Proliferation Treaty extends to the fields of Science and Technology privileges and prerogatives which the Charter of the United Nations had conferred on the five Permanent Members of the Security Council in the exclusive domain of the maintenance of world Peace and Security. The Treaty is the most flagrant example of the whole process of the Freezing of the Structure of World Power. And when we say Power, we do not mean Military power alone. We are referring to economic, financial, scientific and technological power. Not only does the Treaty adhere to the philosophy that only five nations, which by the way include Red China, are adult and responsible enough to be granted licenses to carry certain weapons, but it appears inspired by the nation that access to knowledge and research, science and technology, should be controlled by a dependable Board of Nuclear Trustees, which may not be guided by educational and character-building criteria alone.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD

The same purpose of stabilization and maintenance of Power have led the Great Powers to oppose tenaciously the efforts of the developing countries towards modifying the norms that still govern international trade. It is clear that some evolution has occurred in the attitude of the industrialized countries since March 1964, the date of the installation of the UNCTAD I. It happens, however, that the specific problems of the developing countries have bacome aggravated at a much faster tempo than that of the changes in question, and in consequence the problem of underdevelopment has never presented more somber and discouraging aspects.

It suffices to consider the following: the entire development program of the United Nations (UNDP) has at its disposal yearly a maximum of two hundred and thirty million dollars, representing one tenth of one percent of merely the world's yearly military expenditures. At one of the General Assemblies of the UN, Brazil advocated that a quantitative fund corresponding to one percent of such expenditures be allocated for the tasks of development, which would permit a tenfold

Approved For Release 2006/08/21 : CIA-RDP79-00927A004700130013-5