

S 7006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

It is probable that among Otepka's countless thousands of supporters across the country there were some members of the John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby, who supported him because they considered him an anti-Communist.

But this is a problem that exists for liberals and pacifists as well as for those who take a strong stand against Communism.

It is, for example, a matter of record that the Communist Party and its publications in this country strongly oppose our Vietnam commitment.

It is also demonstrable that the Communist Party has participated and has urged its members to participate in and contribute to the various major anti-Vietnam demonstrations that have taken place.

But it would clearly be ridiculous to argue or imply that because all Communists oppose our Vietnam commitment or because identified Communists have played key roles in the anti-Vietnam movement, all those who oppose our Vietnam commitment are Communists or pro-Communists.

The fact is that those who are anti-Communist, whether their domestic views are liberal or conservative, will frequently attract the support of elements with whom they have no association and for whom they have no esteem.

Similarly, the fact is that those who oppose our Vietnam commitment or oppose the ABM, whether their domestic views are liberal or conservative, will frequently find their views enthusiastically supported by the Moscow Communists and the Peking Communists and all the various New Left organizations.

WHO SUPPORTS OTEPKA?

To the extent that Otepka had serious political support, it was based primarily on reputable organizations, like the American Legion which passed resolutions on his behalf at two national conventions; the Young Republican organization; the League of Republican Women; and, on the issue of procedure, by the American Civil Liberties Union which issued a statement protesting the State Department's refusal to grant him an open hearing.

Otepka has been supported, as well, by numerous Senators and Congressmen of both parties.

Finally, his cause has been championed by editorialists, columnists, and commentators of various political views; Clark Mollenhoff of Cowles Publications; Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune; commentator Ron David of station WTOP; columnist Holmes Alexander; and numerous editors, including the editors of the New York Daily News; Charleston, S.C., News & Courier; Buffalo, N.Y., News; St. Petersburg, Fla., Times; Omaha, Nebr., World Herald; Los Angeles Times; Phoenix, Ariz., Republic; and St. Louis Globe Democrat.

It is patently ridiculous to charge, in the light of this record, that Otto Otepka has derived his chief support, or any significant portion of this support, from the Liberty Lobby and the John Birch Society.

THE CONFIRMATION OF OTTO OTEPKA

Mr. President, the bureaucratic procedures of the Department of State have wrought a terrible injustice in the case of Otto Otepka.

The State Department bureaucracy cannot go back on itself, because such a reversal would run counter to the nature of bureaucracy.

But the Congress of the United States does not have to be guided by bureaucratic considerations or by the past mistakes of the State Department.

The President has done the right thing in nominating Otto Otepka for the Subversive Activities Control Board, first, because it was clear that his reinstatement in the Department of State was a bureaucratic impossibility; second, because it was clear that an injustice had been done and that vindication was called for; and third, because Otepka was highly qualified for the post.

The newly manufactured charges that have been brought against Otepka by Drew Pearson and others are even more baseless than the original charges brought against Otepka by the Department of State. Even to call them "charges" dignifies them, for they are blatant examples of the technique of the big lie and of guilt by association.

Otto Otepka has for several decades served his Government with distinction in a series of important positions.

The post for which he has been recommended is a highly responsible one.

It calls for a broad knowledge of the problems posed by subversive activities and by the requirements of security.

But most important, it calls for integrity, fairness, and a capacity for balanced judgment.

All of these qualifications Otto Otepka possesses in exceptional degree.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the Senate will vote overwhelmingly to approve the confirmation of Otto Otepka as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak further on the Otepka case, and furnish documentation on the facts.

The Otepka case began in 1961. Up to that time Otto Otepka had been considered an outstanding professional security officer. He had come to the State Department in 1953 as a personnel security evaluator. In 1958 he had received a meritorious award signed by Secretary of State Dulles. In 1960 his State Department efficiency report noted:

Long experience with and extremely broad knowledge of laws, regulations . . . in the field of personnel security. He is knowledgeable of communism and its subversive efforts in the United States. To this he adds perspective, balance and good judgement.

Mr. President this was the record of Otto Otepka, valued career officer in the State Department before the time he was asked to see that certain individuals be allowed to obtain important jobs without proper security clearance. By early 1962 there were 152 security "waivers" granted to high-ranking Department personnel. Under the previous 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, only five such waivers had been granted.

In January 1962, Otepka was downgraded from Deputy Director of the Office of Security to Chief of the Evaluation Division. On June 27, 1963, he was locked out of his office, denied access to his files and placed in isolation. He also learned that his telephone had been tapped. Three of the officials who denied knowledge of this tape later reversed themselves before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press story appearing in the New York Times on January 10, 1968, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FANNIN. This story, Mr. President, notes the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has accused the State Department of dealing mildly with these three officials: John Reilly, former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security; Elmer D. Hill, former head of the Division of Technical Services in Mr. Reilly's office; and David I. Belisle, then Mr. Reilly's Special Assistant.

It should be noted, Mr. President, that initially the State Department leveled 13 charges against Mr. Otepka. By the time of the Department hearings, 10 of the 13 charges had been dropped. By taking this action, the Department managed to prevent a probe of several prominent figures, including those who may have played a significant role in trying to force Otepka out of his job.

What was Otepka's crime, Mr. President? After more than 1,000 pages of testimony, Mr. Otepka was found guilty of "delivering two memorandums and an investigative report to a person outside of the Department of State and in violation of the Presidential directive of March 1948."

This conclusion was reached, Mr. President, without noting that these items were delivered to a duly authorized congressional committee for the purpose of proving that he had not lied in disputing the statements made by his superiors.

Mr. Otepka's "crime," Mr. President, is that he refused to rubberstamp security clearances requested by the administration in power at that time. Clearly a full investigation of the whole handling of the Otepka affair would have proved embarrassing in the extreme for many highly placed personalities. Even now, were all the facts brought to light, there would be political repercussions of considerable significance and magnitude.

Mr. President, I suggest that the opposition to the current nomination of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board is, for the most part, a fabrication of innuendoes and unproven statements pushed forward by those who are either willingly or unconsciously unaware of the real issues in this case.

The Otto Otepka case, Mr. President is more than the trials of one man. It is a question of whether a dedicated career civil servant is free to do his job relating to the security and well-being of our Nation; it stands as a symbol to other dedicated men and women in the service of