

Only about 25 percent of them are literate. Less than a fourth of the children of school age are in school, and less than 3 percent ever complete secondary education. Pupil-teacher ratios of 100 to 1 are common, compared to about 25 to 1 in the developed countries.

To help meet this challenge, the United States, through the Agency for International Development has established cooperative educational programs in 58 nations. In each the goal is the same: To train people who in turn can train teachers, prepare suitable texts and teaching aids, and themselves develop a strong educational program in their respective countries. Assistance is provided for all levels of education—primary, secondary, and higher education; for all age groups and types of schools—vocational and technical as well as general education; and for construction and equipment as well as for technical assistance.

In 1962, AID obligated \$93 million in U.S. funds plus an additional \$98 million in U.S.-owned local currencies to assist the developing nations in meeting acute educational problems.

In Bolivia, AID projects are being carried out to improve commercial education. Libya, a program in vocational training for farmers, tradesmen, and handicraft artisans is in progress. In Iran, U.S. aid helped to establish an entire vocational education system for the Iranian armed forces.

In Pakistan, an AID team taught Pakistani railwaymen—few of whom spoke the same language or dialect—how to operate diesel locomotives.

With independence approaching in Kenya, an AID-assisted special project has begun to train 47 local government officials for positions of high responsibility in the government when independence is granted.

A fascinating example of an AID project covering several levels of education is the program in Nepal.

Nepal's first teacher-training center was established in 1954 under the direction of the University of Oregon. In 1956 mobile teaching teams were organized to carry teacher training to the remote provinces.

A college of education was established and a staff trained to educate up to 2,000 teachers a year. A bureau of textbook publication was established and several of its Nepalese staff members were sent to the United States for special training. The bureau printed 85 different titles and 225,000 pieces of educational literature in its first 5 years of operation.

More than 2,400 part-time teachers were trained for literacy education, and they in turn taught more than 1,000 adults to read and write in their first year in the field.

Nepal's first national university was established with colleges of liberal arts and sciences, agriculture and forestry, education, law, nursing, and medicine.

Before the AID program began, Nepal had no national university, no teacher-training institutions. Only 1 child in 200 was in school, and only 2 percent of the Nepalese people could read and write. At the end of the first 8 years of the

education project, more than 1,500 new primary classrooms had trained teachers, 200 new schools were receiving financial aid, and 20 new primary texts had been published. Nearly 200 secondary teachers had received bachelor of education degrees and 45 high school teachers had undergone a 1-year course for the improvement of English instruction. In addition, Nepal's entire secondary school curriculum had been revamped to include vocational instruction urgently required in agriculture, home economics, commercial education, and industrial arts.

A program similar to the one in Nepal is now being carried out in India with the assistance of U.S.-AID education teams from Ohio State University and the Teachers College of Columbia University.

In Cambodia a teacher-training program has been under way for 5 years. Prior to 1958 Cambodian students with a sixth-grade education were given a summer of training and then pressed into service as elementary school teachers. Under the AID contract Cambodia's first teacher preparation center was established and has already become the largest educational institution in the country. Each year the center trains 200 elementary school teachers. Another similar institution is now being established with AID assistance to train secondary school teachers.

Television represents a potentially valuable educational medium for the developing nations. In Nigeria, for example, AID has provided an experienced American educational television executive as an adviser to the Nigerian staff of a new educational television station. From 1960 to 1962 the station has telecast more than 700 different programs for a total of 350 hours of instruction to 100 village schools equipped with television sets supplied by the Nigerian Ministry of Education.

Not only teachers, but also classrooms are in short supply in most underdeveloped nations. AID has encouraged the building of new schools and classrooms in many countries by providing technical help and materials while local residents provide the construction labor on a volunteer basis.

The Guatemala Government launched a self-help school construction program in partnership with AID in 1960. AID and the Guatemalan Government agreed to share equally any costs not absorbed by the local communities. At the beginning of the project, it was expected that volunteer labor would cover about one-third of the cost of construction. In fact, it has accounted for nearly 44 percent of construction costs. During the 3 years since the pilot project began, self-help schools have been built and are now operating in every province of Guatemala. More than 1,100 classrooms in 300 schools have been completed. The enthusiastic turnout of villagers for each school dedication symbolizes the impact of such AID assisted projects on the lives of the people.

Self-help school construction programs like the one in Guatemala are now underway in Chile, Liberia, El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras.

Another serious educational problem facing many developing nations is that of adult literacy. In Turkey a unique approach to the problem has been instituted with U.S. aid. Literacy training has been given to more than 150,000 Turkish soldiers and an additional 120,000 are expected to complete training each year.

In addition, more than 3,000 primary school teachers have gained literacy teaching experience at the military centers. This group will form the teaching nucleus of a planned civilian literacy program. The goal is to reduce illiteracy in Turkey from 70 to 30 percent by 1975.

In the Turkish project, as in most literacy projects, U.S. experts help local educators prepare training materials, texts, and followup reading materials for use by the newly literate.

As of 1962, the Agency for International Development had undertaken projects to increase the supply and improve the quality of primary and secondary school teachers in 33 Latin American, African, and Asian nations. In Afghanistan, U.S. aid is the only bilateral assistance permitted by the Government in the sensitive area of education.

Because English has become the nearest thing to an international language in many underdeveloped nations, AID has been providing technical assistance for the teaching of English in 14 Asian and African countries.

Finally, 75 American universities and colleges are working under AID contracts in the establishment and improvement of facilities for higher education in more than 26 Asian, African, and South American countries.

Of the many needs of the developing countries none is more critical than the need for education, in the broadest sense of the word. And of the many parts of our foreign aid program none is more in keeping with American ideals, and the aspirations of Americans for their fellow men around the world, than educational assistance.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROYBAL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes, 10 minutes of which have already been consumed by the previous presentation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. I propose that the committee be constituted roughly along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and that it have its own funds and staff resources. I propose also that it make continuing studies in the whole area of

14266

our foreign information and intelligence programs.

In my remarks this afternoon, however, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to dwell at great length on the precise terms of this particular resolution. I think it is a good resolution but I am perfectly ready to be persuaded that a better one might be devised. The question of the exact structure and composition of this committee seems to me significantly less important than the more general questions of principle involved. I rise today, not to make propaganda on behalf of a particular proposal of mine, but rather to raise a matter which I think is in need of the widest possible and most intelligent public discussion.

As most Members are aware, the proposal of a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence is not a new one. In one form or another it has been introduced into this House in each of the last 10 sessions; in 1955 it was the subject of a 2-day hearing by the Rules Committee. In the Senate the Committee on Rules and Administration reported on it favorably in 1956, and for 2 days it was debated on the floor of that body. Nor is it partisan in nature. Back in 1959 resolutions similar to mine were sponsored in the House by eight Democrats and four Republicans. Earlier this year the matter was brought to our attention by a member of the other party, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS). Moreover, when Mr. MANSFIELD's resolution came to a vote in the Senate in 1956, the minority in favor included many Members on both sides of the aisle. On that occasion one of those who voted in favor was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, now the President of the United States.

If the proposal for a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence has come up so often and been supported by so many Members, why has it never been adopted? Frankly I do not find that question easy to answer, particularly since some of the arguments against it seem to me so feeble. Take, to begin with, the argument about secrecy. It is an argument that has been advanced every time the proposal has been discussed. During the Senate debate in 1956 the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL, went so far as to say that, rather than have a committee set up and information made available to Members of Congress, "it would be better to abolish the Central Intelligence Agency and, by doing so, to save the money appropriated and the lives of American citizens." A former Vice President, Mr. Barkley, took the same view in the same debate.

Now no one denies that CIA and other intelligence agencies must conduct a very high proportion of their operations in secret. Secrecy is of the essence of their work; without it they could not function, and the security of our country would be jeopardized. No one denies that. But what is true of the intelligence community is also true in many other areas of government: in the fields of atomic energy, weapons development, and foreign policy, for example. But does this mean that Congress is to have no effective au-

thority in these areas? Of course it does not. Congress has always asserted its right to concern itself with even the most sensitive areas of Government. And, where matters of the highest secrecy have been involved, Members of both Houses have shown themselves perfectly capable of exercising the utmost restraint. This was never more clearly demonstrated than by the experience of the Manhattan project during World War II, when members of the two appropriations committees were kept fully apprised of the progress of the project without on any occasion breaking security. And I am sure all Members of the House will agree that the record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in this connection has been impeccable.

As in the case of the Atomic Energy Committee, I take it for granted of course that much of the work of the new committee—perhaps almost all of it—would be conducted in private and that the results would be made public only after a close screening by the appropriate Government agencies. Nevertheless, I admit that particular concern might still be felt about CIA, since breaches of security involving CIA might endanger the lives of American operatives in other countries, and also the lives of agents of other nations working in cooperation with us. I think this is a legitimate concern, but I hope to show later in my speech that there are many important aspects of intelligence work which could usefully be studied without any need to inquire in detail into the activities of particular persons and units in the field.

So much for the moment for secrecy. I find myself in even less sympathy with another argument that has also been advanced frequently in discussions of this question—namely, that the intelligence community exists solely to serve the President and the National Security Council, and that therefore we in the Congress have no right to seek a jurisdictional position. This doctrine was stated in an extreme form in 1956 by Mr. HAYDEN in the Senate. He said at that time:

The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the President. Under the Constitution, I feel we have no right to attempt to regulate an agency which is designed solely to provide the President, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our foreign relations, with information to enable him to make decisions.

I, for one, cannot accept that doctrine. As every Member knows, these two branches of our Government, the executive and the legislative, are not watertight compartments separated by steel bulkheads; the material between them is flexible and porous. There are any number of congressional committees which keep a watch over the executive agencies. In this House we have, to name only two, the Foreign Affairs Committee which inquires constantly into the policies and actions of the President and his agents, and the Government Operations Committee which closely scrutinizes the entire organization of the executive branch. The Senate has a subcommittee whose area of operations borders on the very area I am discussing: the Subcom-

mittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

If we are going to refrain from looking into the affairs of executive agencies, even agencies which report directly to the President, than I fear we are going to have to disband a large number of our committees, or at least to curtail severely their activities. Of course we in the legislature cannot and should not intervene in areas beyond our competence. But in my view we have not only a right but a duty to maintain a general surveillance over agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency, which are established by statute and sustained by funds voted by the Members of these two Houses.

These arguments—concerning secrecy and the exclusively executive nature of the intelligence community—are at least consistent. But strangely enough those who oppose resolutions similar to this have often attempted to maintain, not that for these reasons Congress should abstain entirely from overseeing the intelligence community, but that on the contrary congressional oversight is already more than adequate. Senator RUSSELL made this claim in the debate already quoted, and it was reiterated by Mr. Allen Dulles, the former Director of Central Intelligence, in his recent article in Harper's magazine. What is in fact the extent of congressional surveillance at the moment?

In both the House and Senate the bodies responsible for overseeing the intelligence community are small subcommittees of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Neither the House Foreign Affairs Committee nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this area despite their obvious interest in intelligence matters. This might not matter were it not for the fact that the surveillance exercised by the four existing subcommittees is almost certainly both cursory and sporadic. For example, last year during a debate in the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, my friend, Mr. SALTONSTALL, was asked how much time the Armed Services Subcommittee devoted to the CIA affairs. Mr. SALTONSTALL was perfectly frank. He said:

I say on the floor of the Senate that we spend several hours and go into many details of operations, of expenses, of administration, and so on.

I ask Members to note the phrase "several hours"—not weeks or even days, but hours. The members of one of the most important committees in the other House devote only hours to the affairs of one of the most important agencies of our Government. The reasons for this are surely clear. The members of the four subcommittees lack any staff specialized in these matters; they themselves can have little time or thought to devote them. But even if these subcommittees do have more time for intelligence, nevertheless the disadvantages of having responsibility for the intelligence community divided up among four different subcommittees would, I think, be obvious to everyone. I maintain that congressional surveillance of the intelligence community is not now adequate,

1963

and cannot be adequate as long as it continues to be organized as it is at present.

A moment ago I referred to the Central Intelligence Agency as one of the most important agencies of our Government. What is true of CIA is, of course, even truer of the intelligence community as a whole. Yet from time to time those who maintain that intelligence operations fall exclusively within the executive sphere—those, in other words, who are opposed to the establishment of a joint congressional committee—try to persuade us, despite all we have heard and seen during the past few years, that nevertheless CIA is a purely advisory body, that that it is not directly concerned with the making of national policy. Mr. Allen Dulles himself remarked several years ago:

CIA is not a policymaking Agency; we furnish intelligence to assist in the formulation of policy.

Senator RUSSELL during a debate in the other body was even more blunt:

Some Senators who addressed themselves to the resolution on Monday last, seemed to hold the opinion that the CIA was a policymaking agency. That theme ran all through the remarks which were made in advocacy of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is far from being a policymaking agency. It makes no policy.

The distinguished Senator went on to say that CIA was merely a coordinating and information-gathering body whose function was simply to present its findings to the actual policymaking body, the National Security Council.

Senator RUSSELL said all this in 1956. In my view it was scarcely plausible even then. Now in 1963, after our experiences in Cuba, Laos and elsewhere, to say that CIA is in no sense a policymaking body is to say something that is palpably untrue. The National Security Act, under which CIA operates, does not, of course, formally assign it policymaking functions. But CIA is a policymaking body, and we all know it. The reasons have been well put by Prof. Harry Howe Ransom, our leading lay student of intelligence affairs. In his study "Central Intelligence and National Security," published as early as 1958, he has this to say:

Certainly the CIA has no policymaking responsibility. Yet policy making is not a simple static action. Rather it is a dynamic process. A key element in this process is the information available to policymakers. The man, or group, controlling the information available to policymakers does in fact play a major if indirect role in policymaking.

A few pages later Professor Ransom adds:

It would be unrealistic to suggest that the bright young men of CIA, by training, talent, and personality, do not hold strong views on controversial issues of national security policy. If it is granted that knowledge is indeed power, it will be recognized that in reality the CIA, through an increasing efficiency—and consequently rising credit with responsible decision makers—has come to play a major role in creating national security policy.

Surely those statements can no longer be regarded as anything but the simple truth. In fact even Senator RUSSELL appears to have come round. Last year, during the hearings on the confirmation of Mr. John McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence, Senator RUSSELL remarked:

In this period through which we are passing, this office is perhaps second only to the Presidency in its importance.

A few moments later he repeated the point. I am inclined to agree with Senator RUSSELL. And I submit to you that one does not describe a man as holding an office "second only to the Presidency in its importance" if the agency of which he is the head is not itself a policymaking agency of the very first order of importance.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I have been mainly concerned to clear the ground, as it were—to state as clearly as I could my objections to the arguments most commonly used by opponents of the proposal I am supporting. Only by implication have I suggested positive reasons why I think a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence should be established. I want now to address myself to the central questions: why do I think such a joint committee is necessary? and, equally important, what work do I think it might usefully undertake?

But first I have to make one further point. The Central Intelligence Agency, and indeed the entire intelligence community, is highly—and necessarily—secretive in its mode of operations. For this reason outsiders like myself have no alternative but to rely for their information on newspaper reports, on the occasional published hearings on House and Senate committees, on the work of scholars like Professor Ransom, and on a miscellaneous variety of other sources. In the very nature of things our comments and criticisms cannot be authoritative. We are working in the dark, or at least in the semitwilight. Nevertheless, I think we do know enough to have reasonable grounds for supposing that all is not well within the intelligence community. Even more important, I think we know enough to be certain that we need to know more—and by "we," of course, I mean not necessarily the general public nor even every Member of Congress, but those Members who would serve on the kind of committee I have in mind.

Why, then, do I think such a committee should be established?

I have two general reasons. The first concerns the extraordinary number of specific criticisms that have been leveled over the years against the Central Intelligence Agency and, by implication, against the intelligence community as a whole. Admittedly, as Mr. Allen Dulles recently pointed out:

You cannot tell of operations that go along well. Those that go badly generally speak for themselves.

And I would not want for a moment to deny that the Central Intelligence

Agency has scored a number of quite spectacular successes—the U-2 overflights, for example, and the overthrow of the Mossadegh regime in Iran. On balance it is almost certainly true to say that the intelligence community has served the Nation well. But the fact does remain that on occasion the community has blundered seriously, and that for its blunder the citizens of the United States have paid a heavy price.

Let me refer to just a few instances. Back in 1950, as Mr. Dulles himself has tacitly admitted, the intelligence community failed to anticipate the Chinese Communist intervention in Korea. We are still living with the consequences of that particular failure. A few years later an incident involving the CIA caused us serious embarrassment in the Middle East and may have contributed indirectly to the Suez affair. In July 1956 President Nasser of Egypt claimed in a speech at Alexandria that he had been strongly advised by a U.S. Government official to ignore an important message that he was about to receive from the State Department. It was subsequently confirmed that the official in question had been the regional representative of CIA.

More recently, of course, we had the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Chief responsibility for that lamentable affair must rest with the President of the United States. However, there can be no question but that the Central Intelligence Agency was deeply involved in the whole affair, and that its actions and advice had a decisive effect on the eventual outcome. Surely most Members of the House will agree that it would be in the national interest to know whether such incidents were merely particular aberrations or whether, in fact, they form a pattern that is likely to be repeated in the future.

My second general reason for pressing for the establishment of this committee I can state quite briefly. It is this. I abhor government by secrecy. I regard it as inimical to the effective functioning of our institutions. I regard it as alien to our American way of life. Above all, I regard it as a threat to our fundamental liberties. I fully realize, of course, it should be clear from what I have said already that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community.

But I fear that with respect to the intelligence community we are often the victims of secrecy for secrecy's sake. Things are done to us and in our name which we know nothing of. I do not wish to see the legitimate secrets of the intelligence community reported in the press and on the air. Of course I do not. But it does seem to me of enormous importance that a few selected representatives of the people, chosen by the two Houses of Congress, should be continuously aware of what the intelligence community is doing and of the way in which it is going about doing it. The American people have at stake, not merely their liberties but their lives.

Despite all I have said so far, there would, of course, be little point in establishing this joint committee unless we had some fairly clear idea of what we thought it should do, of what subjects we thought it should study. I propose, therefore, to continue by discussing four questions, all of high importance, which I think might usefully be investigated: first, the relations between the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, especially overseas; second, the relations between intelligence-gathering on the one hand and so-called special operations on the other; third, the selection and training of intelligence personnel; and fourth, the whole question of intelligence evaluation. I propose to deal briefly with the first three of these questions and to say rather more about the fourth.

First, the relations between CIA and the State Department.

The problem here has been posed succinctly by Henry Howe Ransom in the book I have already cited. On page 216 he writes:

The operation by the U.S. Government of a farflung secret apparatus for intelligence gathering and political action could have widespread diplomatic ramifications. There may be a basic incompatibility between the maintenance of accredited diplomatic missions in some 78 foreign posts (as of 1958)—

The number would be considerably greater now—

and the existence of American secret agents in most of these same foreign areas. Greatest care must be exercised in keeping U.S. diplomacy separated from spying and back-stage political maneuvering, at least on the surface, yet the diplomats probably should not be completely in the dark as to the activities of American secret agents.

The possibly disruptive effect of having, on the premises of American embassies abroad or in the field, agents who owe allegiance to someone other than the ambassador and to an organization other than the State Department and who may be engaging in activities running counter to expressed State Department policy, scarcely needs spelling out in detail.

Nor are these dangers merely speculative. It seems, for example, that toward the end of the Chinese civil war remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army moved into parts of northern Burma. These troops claimed to be eager to harass the Communists across the border, and CIA accordingly supplied them with large quantities of money and arms. But according to available reports the Chinese had long since tired of fighting. Instead of attacking the Communists, they proceeded to settle down, to occupy much of the best agricultural land in northern Burma, and to cultivate opium—all with the assistance of U.S. funds.

This would have been a melancholy episode in any case. But what made it worse was the fact that our Ambassador in Rangoon apparently had not the faintest idea of what CIA was doing. When the Burmese Government formally complained to the United States, the Ambassador issued a categorical denial; he said the United States had nothing

to do with the activities of the Nationalist Chinese. Our Ambassador of course believed he was telling the truth. But what he was saying was in fact not true, and naturally the Burmese were shocked by this apparent evidence of American duplicity. What was the upshot of this episode? The American Ambassador resigned, the U.S. Government was deeply embarrassed, and the Government of Burma threatened for a time to break off diplomatic relations.

Admittedly, this incident was particularly ludicrous. But it is not without parallel. Our policy in the early stages of the Laotian crisis appears to have been constantly bedeviled by a lack of effective coordination between the CIA and the State Department. Similarly with Cuba prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. Mr. Tad Szulc and Mr. Karl Meyer, in their able account of that affair, describe how, on its own initiative, CIA established close working relations with exiled supporters of the former dictator Batista. They add:

This decision marked the inauguration of what, in effect, became its independent foreign policy toward Cuba, in cavalier disregard of the thinking in the White House and the State Department.

Note that all this occurred despite the efforts of an earlier Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter, to regularize relations between the State Department and CIA. Since then the Herter-Allen Dulles agreement on the relations between Ambassadors and CIA personnel in the field has been reaffirmed by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McCone. And by now we have reason to hope that the responsible foreign policymakers—the President and the National Security Council—have reasserted their authority over the Central Intelligence Agency. I agree that to a considerable extent this is a problem of particular persons and particular situations. But it is also the case that, as long as both State Department and CIA personnel are working in the field, as long as both agencies are responsible for the collection of information, and—perhaps most important—as long as CIA continues to be responsible for special operations, the problem of integrating the Central Intelligence Agency into our general foreign policy apparatus will remain difficult and will remain worthy of close and continuous examination. The exercise of surveillance in this field I conceive to be one possible function of a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

A moment ago I alluded to the conduct by the CIA of so-called special operations; that is, the fomenting of opposition against hostile governments, the arming of insurgents, the provocation of enemy action, and so on. The question of housing these special operations—or additional services or other functions or whatever you want to call them—under the same roof as the CIA's purely intelligence-gathering operations has, of course, long been a matter of controversy, and it is this question that I suggest might usefully be the second of the new joint committee's areas of study.

I do not suppose we need to be reminded of the importance of this ques-

tion. The Bay of Pigs invasion was only the most spectacular and best publicized of CIA's special operations. There was the Iranian affair in 1953, and the following year the overthrow of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala. CIA also appears to have had a hand in the main risings in Eastern Europe, in East Berlin and Hungary. Operations of this sort, unless carefully supervised and controlled by responsible political officers, could unwittingly involve the United States in a major international crisis, possibly in war. If this was not clear before the Bay of Pigs, it ought to be clear now.

The institutional danger here is readily apparent and has often been stated. As Professor Ransom puts it:

To mix the two functions—

That is, of information gathering and special operations—

involves the danger that foreign agents collecting facts and trying at the same time to bolster or cause the overthrow of a foreign government in America's apparent interest may develop a less than objective sense for distinguishing between fact and aspiration.

Messrs. Szulc and Meyer make the same point apropos of Cuba:

The CIA men were not only shaping, in effect, foreign policy, but were exempt from any meaningful outside checks on their activities. Indeed, they were in the enviable position of both organizing a clandestine operation and preparing the intelligence data through which the validity of the venture could be judged.

The obvious solution to this problem would, of course, be to deprive CIA entirely of its special operations function. Unfortunately the people in the most favorable position to collect clandestine information are often also the people best placed to engage in subversive political activities. In addition, a total divorce between the two functions might lead, in Ransom's words, to "competition, duplication, and even outright conflict."

For a time the Maxwell Taylor Committee, appointed by the President to inquire into the Bay of Pigs affair, appears to have toyed, at least, with an alternative idea—the idea of transferring the bulk of CIA's special operations to the Defense Department. But this solution would have had the equally obvious disadvantage of ensuring that the uniformed military—and hence the credit and prestige of the U.S. Government—would become involved as soon as any paramilitary operation became a matter of public knowledge.

In the event, it seems that routine covert operations have been left in the hands of CIA, with control to be transferred to the Pentagon only if a particular project becomes so big as to warrant open military participation. Mr. Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times summed up the matter thus:

The general rule of thumb for the future is that the CIA will not handle any primarily military operations, or ones of such size that they cannot be kept secret. However, each case will apparently be judged on its merits; there is no hard-and-fast formula that will put one operation under the CIA and another under the Pentagon."

All of us, I think, will agree that this is an area in which hard-and-fast formulas are not appropriate and in which, in the nature of things, organizational gimmicks cannot solve the major difficulties. As in the case of relations between CIA and the State Department, much depends on particular people and particular situations. But largely because the problem is of this sort, because it is a problem which can never finally be solved, I feel very strongly that continuing congressional surveillance is urgently required. If a joint committee had been in existence in the early stages of the first Cuban crisis, and if it had had cognizance of this matter, would the Bay of Pigs fiasco have occurred? I think it is at least possible that it would not.

Discussion of the Bay of Pigs leads me naturally to the third of the questions I think a joint committee might investigate: the whole question of recruitment and personnel within the intelligence community. For it seems to me perfectly clear that one of the things that went wrong with the abortive Cuban invasion—not the only thing, but one of the things—was that much of the CIA personnel responsible for the operation consisted of the sort of people who could not distinguish between the reactionary and the democratic elements in the anti-Castro camp, between the opponents of Castro who were acceptable to the Cuban people and those who, as former supporters of Batista, were anathema to them.

Let me quote again from Szulc and Meyer. In their book, "The Cuban Invasion," they write:

Thus the CIA established contacts in Miami with pro-Batista organizations and with exile groups whose entire political philosophy was dedicated to the return to the pre-Castro status quo in Cuba. . . . These factions were placing themselves not only against Castro but against history; whether or not the CIA operatives were aware that total regression is impossible, the contacts with the rightist factions ran counter to official U.S. policy, aimed at encouraging social reform in Latin America."

A few pages later they remark that the activities of the CIA agents reflected a desire to promote anti-Castro groups which they could manipulate. They continue:

It also reflected an attitude of hostility to left-of-center exile groups by second-rate field operatives. This in turn affected the top level of the agency and resulted in a lack of understanding at the top. It is not clear to what extent the CIA attitude was ideologically motivated or was simply a response based on the agent's view of what was practical or realistic.

This tendency on the part of the CIA to seek out and support the most anti-Communist groups in the field, regardless of whether or not such groups are politically viable, has of course been manifested on a number of other occasions—in Laos as well as in Cuba, and apparently in Algeria and the Congo as well. It is a persistent tendency, and one that on occasion has had a damaging effect on our policy. I suspect it has something to do with the kinds of people the Central Intelligence Agency gets to work for it.

Is it wise, for example, to rely to the extent CIA seems to do on the services of retired service officers? One would suppose that retired service officers, though almost always men of great ability, would have an instinctive tendency to take a rather narrow, strictly "operational" view of the problems confronting them. Similarly, is it wise to rely too heavily on the services of political exiles and refugees? It seems reasonable, for example, to suppose that an exile from Ruritania, especially someone who has passionate convictions about what course events in his homeland ought to take, may not be the best person to assess what course events in his homeland actually are taking, especially if what is actually happening is not to his taste.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to impugn the enormous amount of valuable work being done by retired service officers and by exiles and refugees in the CIA. Without their help, the organization simply could not function. Altogether the Central Intelligence Agency undoubtedly commands some of the ablest minds in the U.S. Government. And of course I do not mean for a moment to suggest that CIA should be staffed with "soft-liners" or people who have had no personal experience of the countries in question. That would be absurd.

But what I do think is that we have to be sure that what we are getting are actually the facts, and not what we would like to be the facts. This is not a matter of personal preference one way or the other. It is a matter of finding out what is actually taking place—and personal preferences enter only as they may color one's judgment. I suspect that the judgment of the CIA is sometimes colored by the preference of its employees. I suspect that CIA ought to take special care to recruit and employ men and women of widely differing backgrounds, temperaments, and opinions. I suspect that in these kinds of situations one gets at the truth only when a wide variety of inclinations is brought to bear. But remember that these are my feelings only. I have little data at my command. All I am saying is that I have a hunch that CIA recruitment policy has had an effect on CIA's performance. I may be wrong, but I submit that the only way we in Congress can find out is by ourselves conducting an inquiry into the subject.

The whole question of personnel and recruitment is, then, the third of the areas I would like to see a joint committee study. I would only add that of course no investigation need inquire into the names and histories of particular individuals involved; there need be no breaches of security or secrecy. The matter we are concerned with is one of general policy.

Finally, I want to turn to what is perhaps the most difficult of the four questions I referred to earlier: the question of how best to organize the evaluation of the enormous amount of material collected every day by the various agencies of the intelligence community. Obviously evaluation of some sort takes place at every echelon within the community, but I am particularly concerned

with the top-level U.S. Intelligence Board and its auxiliary bodies.

Probably a few words are in order on how these agencies are organized. I think the following description is roughly accurate, though the Central Intelligence Agency refused to provide me with authoritative information so I have had to rely on data from published sources.

By the phrase "intelligence community" I mean the numerous agencies within the executive branch concerned with intelligence collection and evaluation: the CIA, the new Defense Intelligence Agency, the State Department, RAND, and so on. The community as a whole is responsible for producing the national estimates—described by Professor Ransom as "these vital building blocks of national security policy." With the exception of the ultrasecret net estimates which are produced by special machinery within the National Security Council, most estimates are prepared under the aegis of the so-called Board of National Estimates.

This Board consists of a small number of intelligence experts—soldiers, diplomats, and scholars—who, to quote Ransom again, "preside as a kind of planning general staff for the intelligence community." The Board can initiate the preparation of an estimate, though it usually does so only on request from the President, the Director of Central Intelligence, or some other member of the National Security Council. In all cases, the Board of National Estimates sets the terms of reference, breaks the problem up into feasible components, and assigns appropriate tasks to the various agencies. The resulting staff studies are collated by the small Office of National Estimates. The Board then drafts either a straight estimate—that is, one which attempts to assess a foreign nation's intentions or future policies with implicit assumptions as to future U.S. policy—or a general estimate—that is, one involving stated assumptions concerning possible changes in U.S. policy. After the draft estimate has been returned to the participating agencies for their comments and criticisms, it is submitted, possibly with dissents, to a committee which used to be known as the Intelligence Advisory Committee but is now named the U.S. Intelligence Board.

If the Board of Estimates is the planning board for the intelligence community, the Intelligence Board is its board of directors. As Ransom puts it, it is the "final forum for the professional intelligence community." It resolves jurisdictional disputes within the community and is finally responsible for forwarding the national estimates to the National Security Council. Invariably the attempt is made to produce agreed estimates, and usually the attempt is successful; but on occasion dissenting opinions will be submitted. The Intelligence Board meets usually once a week. It consists of the leading intelligence officials of the community and is chaired by the Director of Central Intelligence.

Two aspects of this process in particular are worth noting. The first is the central role of the Central Intelligence Agency. A high proportion of the intelligence community's fact gathering is done by CIA. The Board of National

Estimates functions as a part of CIA. The chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board is Director of CIA. And, of course, the intelligence community's spokesman on the National Security Council itself is also the CIA Director. The second thing worth noting, however, is the duality of CIA's role. Under the National Security Act the agency is not only one of the participants in the intelligence community, it is also the chief agency responsible for coordinating it. In other words, at many points in the process of evaluation, CIA is both player and umpire, both witness and judge. This ambiguity is implicit in the title of the Director who is formally not the "Director of the Central Intelligence Agency" but simply "Director of Central Intelligence."

Now the danger here is clear. It is that the Central Intelligence Agency will become—perhaps it has already become—not merely the chief intelligence agency but the dominant intelligence agency, and that it will develop persistent institutional tendencies, biases, and even policies. This type of problem is, of course, not peculiar to the American intelligence community but is characteristic of any complex administrative apparatus. That is the reason it has constantly to be guarded against.

Sherman Kent, a Yale professor and a World War II intelligence officer, put the point this way:

Almost any man or group of men confronted with the duty of getting something planned or getting something done will sooner or later hit upon what they consider a single most desirable course of action. Usually it is sooner; sometimes, under duress, it is a snap judgment of the top of the head. I cannot escape the belief that under the circumstances outlined, intelligence will find itself right in the middle of policy, and that upon occasions it will be the unabashed apologist for a given policy rather than its impartial and objective analyst.

Szule and Meyer, writing of the Bay of Pigs, conclude:

Yet CIA was not behaving idiotically; it was in many senses responding to the insulated rationalism that infects a sheltered bureaucracy. Indeed, if there is an institutional villain, it is bureaucracy itself—that hulking, stubborn giant that seemingly can only look where it has been and not whither it is tending.

Professor Ransom calls it simply the problem of "feedback."

Naturally in the early months of 1961 the administration addressed itself to this problem. After the Bay of Pigs it could scarcely do otherwise. In particular it reactivated a watchdog group set up by President Eisenhower in 1956, originally called the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities and now named the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. This Board, under the chairmanship of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, studied the question of evaluation and apparently forwarded one or more reports to the President in the course of the year.

These reports have not been made public, but I think it is possible to piece together from newspaper reports roughly what happened. It seems that the Killian

committee, or at least some of its members, were unhappy about the dual role being played by CIA. They proposed that in future the Director of CIA should be more of a technician, and that a new post should be created, probably attached to the White Houses, with some such title as "Coordinator of Intelligence," the new coordinator would be in a position to analyze and assess the results achieved by the intelligence community without having any bias in favor of CIA. Reports to this effect appeared frequently in the press in June and July 1961. In August Mr. Cabell Phillips of the New York Times stated that the new post had actually been offered to Mr. Fowler Hamilton.

Either these reports were inaccurate, or the administration changed its mind, or they could not find anyone to occupy the new post, because in September 1961 the President announced that Mr. John A. McCone had been named Director of Central Intelligence without any major change being made in the structure of the intelligence community. Subsequently, however, in January 1962 one such change was announced. Henceforth the Director of Central Intelligence was not to function both as Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board and also as CIA member of the Board. Instead, although the Director was to remain Chairman of the Board, his deputy was to act as representative of the CIA. In a letter to Mr. McCone, the President noted this change with approval. He added:

As head of the Central Intelligence Agency, while you will continue to have overall responsibility for the Agency, I shall expect you to delegate to your principal deputy, as you may deem necessary, so much of the direction of the detailed operation of the Agency as you may be required to permit you to carry out your primary task as Director of Central Intelligence.

Clearly there was a dilemma here. On the one hand, it was evident that CIA's intelligence gathering and operational functions could conflict with its coordinating function—and, of course, what was true of the Agency was also true of its Director. On the other hand, the President and his advisers were almost certainly aware that an independent coordinator, who was not himself the head of a major agency, might find himself weak, even powerless, in the face of the vast intelligence bureaucracies. Independence in theory might mean impotence in practice. So a compromise was struck, and the duties of the Director of Central Intelligence merely redefined.

How successful this compromise has been it is probably too early to say. But from all that I have said, it ought to be obvious that the problem of evaluation, like the other problems I have already mentioned, is a continuing one, and not one that can be spirited out of existence by merely institutional gimmickry. It is also obvious that the problem of evaluation is an enormously important problem, probably the most important confronting the intelligence community. For these reasons, I think that it, too, should be a continuing subject of scrutiny by a well-qualified and well-staffed committee of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House further. I have spoken at considerable length, yet I am only too well aware that I have only skimmed the surface of this extraordinarily complicated and difficult subject. There are any number of further questions that I might have posed—for example, concerning the apparently increasing concentration of authority within the intelligence community, or about the role of the U.S. Information Agency. And, of course, I must repeat that this has been essentially an outsider's analysis. I have been trying merely to suggest what kinds of inquiry a joint committee might undertake, not to anticipate what the results of those inquiries would be.

Nor as I remarked at the outset, do I wish to insist that the resolution I am introducing today provides the only possible way of proceeding. Perhaps the joint committee should be given rather different terms of reference. Or perhaps a body should be established comprising private citizens as well as Members of Congress. I do not want to be dogmatic about this. My purpose in speaking today has been to reopen public discussion of an issue that has too long been dormant, and moreover to reopen it at a time of relative tranquillity, when the intelligence community is not in the public spotlight, at a time therefore when these matters can be considered soberly and dispassionately.

But we in Congress should not be too timid about putting ourselves forward. I wonder how many Members of this House are aware of the enormous body of opinion in favor of the creation of a congressional joint committee. Both the Hoover Commission and its special intelligence task force favored congressional intervention. The New York Times has consistently supported the idea in its editorial columns. Two years ago the distinguished military analyst, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, stated that one of the lessons to be drawn from the Bay of Pigs was "the necessity of keeping all secret intelligence activities and operations under constant top-echelon surveillance and review." He noted that the machinery for achieving this would be greatly strengthened by the creation of a joint congressional watchdog committee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote just once more from the writings of Professor Harry Howe Ransom who, as I have already said, is our country's leading lay student of intelligence affairs. I think his comment deserves all the greater consideration because it comes from a member of the political science profession—a profession which, as we all know, has always had a strong bias in favor of the executive branch of government. On page 208 of "Central Intelligence and National Security" Professor Ransom remarks:

It is common experience for security policymakers, military and civilian, to find their fear of congressional interference changed into gratitude for congressional support, frequently more effective support than has been accorded on the executive side of Government. No executive agency today reveals everything to congressional committees with jurisdiction over its operations. Officials of central intelligence may be ex-

ported to reveal even less. But more advantages are to be gained than lost from establishing a more institutionalized system for congressional surveillance.

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that what I have said today will be given earnest and thoughtful attention by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for either 2 or 4 years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as you have made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Oregon and appreciate the contribution he has made. He knows where in he talks. He is an expert on the subject and is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and was a member of the subcommittee supervising the CIA—in theory—and what he says dovetails entirely and agrees with the experience, and the statements made in the other body as well.

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], on the step he has taken in introducing his resolution. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has taken the initiative in remedying a serious inadequacy in our foreign policy making process. His efforts merit our thoughtful attention and solid support.

I have joined the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in filing a companion resolution which, by establishing a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, would fill what is now a gaping hole in the congressional mechanism for the formulation of foreign policy. At present, intelligence matters are handled simultaneously by several committees on both sides of Capitol Hill. Not only confusion but omission as well result from this decentralization of supervision. Our proposals, which would apply to any intelligence or information agency, not only the CIA, would remedy this situation.

First, the proposed joint committee would give Congress the machinery it must have to exercise its responsibility for the oversight of the Nation's intelligence activities. The present lack of

congressional supervision in this area is itself a serious omission in view of the work required of the foreign policy committees of both Houses. A variety of congressional committees now handles the Nation's everwidening range of intelligence activities. Effective coordination of congressional supervision is impossible.

The proposed committee would have a comprehensive view of the intelligence and information aspects of foreign affairs. A single committee of this nature would provide the existing foreign policy committees with more direct and efficient service. The agencies under its supervision would benefit as well. A prime target of the joint committee's efforts would be the improvement of their operations and policies. Studies of the agencies' problems and programs would, of course, be considerably more extensive and complete when conducted by a committee with single responsibility of intelligence oversight.

Ultimately, I believe, both Houses of Congress would benefit from the establishment of the proposed joint committee. The Senate and House would be afforded a broader opportunity for careful consideration of foreign information and intelligence matters. The agencies involved would similarly benefit from the committee's studies and recommendations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House may act promptly on our proposal. It would fill a vital gap in our foreign policymaking process. It would streamline existing efforts in the areas of foreign information and intelligence. This is an area in which congressional responsibility is long overdue.

ESTABLISHING MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR OPERATION OF CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROYBAL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to deal with a most serious problem which will confront our Nation in the very near future. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, my legislation would establish certain limits of tolerance associated with the advent of the supersonic civil transport plane now being developed by aircraft manufacturers in France and England and being purchased by several American airlines. Similar efforts to develop a supersonic transport are now underway in the United States.

This is a problem which we no longer can ignore. I have introduced this legislation at this particular time, in order to give airplane manufacturers both in our own country and abroad ample opportunity to make sufficient changes in the design of their powerplants to avoid future distress to millions of Americans. The supersonic jet powerplant of the future must be developed and designed with appropriate consideration for noise abatement.

This is far-reaching legislation, But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we can no

longer ignore this problem. The United States and the entire world failed to properly plan ahead in the development of our present subsonic jet transports and, as a result, millions of people throughout the world have had their lives drastically changed by the unbearable noise which today's jet transports produce at airfields near large urban areas.

My own district lies just east of O'Hare Field, the world's busiest airport. It would be literally impossible for me to fully describe the deafening noise which thousands of my constituents suffer everyday from conventional subsonic jets either arriving or departing O'Hare Field. It cannot be said that these people shouldn't have built near the airport; these people were there before the airport was built.

I believe it is tragic that airplane manufacturers of the world did not take these consequences into consideration when they developed the subsonic jet transport during the past decade.

I was not a Member of Congress in those days, but I feel it is not only my duty but the duty of every Member of this Congress both in the House and in the Senate to recognize the fact that we cannot repeat this error on the threshold of the supersonic air transport era.

FAA

We must do everything possible to insure that this new type of supersonic aircraft—which is being developed from scratch—does not repeat the tragic mistake of its subsonic jet predecessor, FAA.

The legislation which I have introduced today would prohibit the operation of any civil supersonic aircraft in air transportation through the navigable airspace of the United States which would generate sonic boom overpressures exceeding 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.

This legislation would further make it unlawful to operate any civil supersonic aircraft into or out of U.S. airports unless it can be demonstrated that ground noise level generated by such civil supersonic aircraft is substantially lower than that generated by long range subsonic jet aircraft.

I am not at all persuaded by the argument that you cannot stop progress. Certainly we all are for progress. But we cannot blindly state that we are for progress when we know that such progress can seriously impair the health and emotional stability of great numbers of Americans. Nor can we say blindly we are for progress when we are faced with the prospect of seeing huge belts of destruction criss-crossing the United States from sonic booms generated by supersonic aircraft.

It is my belief, that unless Congress deals with this subject matter at this time, we may conceivably see such havoc wrought upon this country from sonic booms that millions of dollars in damage to property and a serious threat to the health of many of our people may ensue.

My bill limits sonic boom overpressures not to exceed 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.