

threat to the scenery across the Potomac from Mount Vernon should be regarded as a threat to the historic home of George Washington himself.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended \$2,000,000 for the acquisition of land on the Potomac shore across from Mount Vernon. I hope the Senate will approve this recommendation and that the full amount recommended by the Senate committee will be held in conference. This appropriation, even though it is less than the Interior Department requested, should enable the Federal Government to proceed with its land acquisition program, and thereby keep faith with the private individuals and foundations who have offered donations of land and scenic easements to add to the Federal park.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE VIEW FROM MOUNT VERNON

If George Washington's home were in danger of being turned into a pizza parlor or torn down for a high-rise apartment, every patriotic organization in the country and every member of Congress would be thundering in protest. Yet as everyone knows who has visited Mount Vernon, much of its charm and one of the principal reasons that Washington loved it is its serene view across the Potomac River toward the green, rolling fields of Maryland.

What most tourists do not know and what the House of Representatives knew but chose to ignore is that most of the land on the Maryland side is in private hands. Only the farsightedness of the two private foundations and the unselfishness of private owners have prevented the desecration of the view from Mount Vernon. But every year those flashing neon lights and those hamburger "palaces" creep a little closer.

In 1961 Congress authorized the purchase of private land which together with lands and scenic easements donated by private individuals would protect the area forever. However, Piscataway Park, as the area is called in memory of an Indian tribe that lived there in colonial times, is not yet a reality. The House Appropriations Committee sliced away the \$2.7 million necessary to complete the Federal purchase. If the Government does not acquire the land by August, the matching gifts of land and scenic easements will revert to the donors. With development pressures steadily intensifying, the present agreement among all parties may break down.

Since the members of the House apparently do not have the backbone to overrule the petty tyrants on their Appropriations Committee even when George Washington is involved, it is up to the Senate Appropriations Committee to put a stop to this purblind, penny-pinching foolishness.

While the Senate Committee is at it, it should restore the funds for the acquisition of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Congress authorized the park in 1966 after years of bitter controversy, but the enemies of this project never give up. With land prices escalating, delay in purchasing the land would be a costly mistake.

#### LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE FAVORABLE REPORTS OUT AMENDMENTS TO COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Labor and Public Welfare Commit-

tee this morning favorably reported out, by unanimous vote, amendments to the cold war GI bill, as contained in bill S. 9. Since over 50 of my colleagues in the Senate have cosponsored these amendments, I am sure that they will be interested to know that the bill has now been reported out of committee.

Basically, the bill does two things: First, the scope of training has been increased to include on-the-job training, on-the-farm training, and flight training. Secondly, the basic allowance rates have been increased to \$130 for a single veteran, \$155 for a married veteran, and \$180 for a veteran with two or more dependents—all increases of \$30 a month over present allowances. An additional \$10 a month is provided for each dependent over two.

The need for these amendments is self-evident. Our hearings have proved the need for expanding the scope of benefits to include on-the-job training, on-the-farm training, and flight training—all of which were in the Korean GI bill. The need for expanded benefits is also obvious, as testimony conclusively showed the expanded costs of education. Yet, even these amendments merely bring the levels of allowances up to the Korean GI bill level.

The bill which this body passed during the 89th Congress included almost all of these provisions, but many were cut back when practicality forced to yield to the reduced House version or have nothing for these deserving veterans. Justice, as it comes in this bill, is a year late if judged by what this body was willing to do last year. I urge prompt consideration of these amendments to show these veterans our support for adequate educational benefits.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—S. 1160—to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe that on this 17th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1967, we have reached a significant moment in the history of the Senate and in the history of our Nation.

In my opinion, the bill before the Senate today, S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is one of the most important bills to be considered in Congress this year.

In the public hearings on this bill before the Subcommittee on Communications, which I had the privilege to chair, I believe there has been developed a record which fully explores and discusses the issues presented by this legislation. Repeatedly, dramatically and forcefully, reflecting many diverse viewpoints of American society, its record emphasizes this country's present and growing needs for a system of noncommercial broadcasting.

Enough progress has been made in the field of noncommercial broadcasting over a relatively short span of time to reveal the promise of its potential. But the fulfillment of that promise has been seriously impeded by chronic underfinancing, understaffing, and underprogramming.

The beginnings which have been made in Federal support of these activities, while modest, are also encouraging. The gains we have made in the past 4 years in the establishment and strengthening of educational television broadcast stations under the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962 have been gratifying indeed. The present bill would extend the effectiveness of that program, and make possible a full noncommercial broadcast service to all U.S. families.

But hardware is not enough. The extension of coverage through support of new and existing facilities is not enough. In the face of mounting evidence that television commands a great deal of public attention, the time has come to take steps to help create higher quality and more diverse programs. Approximately one and a half billion man-hours per week are spent with these media by the people of this country. Television viewing alone occupies nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American. We must help to provide the means by which noncommercial educational broadcasting can realize President Johnson's conviction, expressed in his message to Congress of February 28, "that a vital and self-sufficient noncommercial television system will not only instruct, but inspire and uplift our people."

Briefly summarized, this bill has three parts. Title I has to do with increasing the coverage of noncommercial educational broadcasting by extending Federal support for construction of facilities.

Title II is a proposal to establish a nonprofit, private corporation to improve the quality of educational and cultural programs and make them available to local stations.

Title III would authorize a study of instructional television and other communications technology in relation to the broad needs of formal education.

Mr. President, I shall describe these various titles but I would prefer to do it when more of my colleagues are in the Chamber, in the event they wish to ask me questions.

Mr. President, we have had extensive hearings on this bill. We listened to about 80 witnesses. We sat in the hearing room from 10 o'clock in the morning until about 5:30 in the afternoon, under glaring lights of television, where one could not move or go out. We explored in every possible detail the bill that was presented to the committee. We listened attentively to all witnesses. We took note of the suggestions that were made. We accepted those suggestions that were constructive; we rejected those suggestions which were not so constructive or objectionable. We reported a bill, I dare say, Mr. President, that is a model bill. There was not a dissenting vote on the entire committee.

#### TITLE I

Under the provisions of title I, this bill will extend and improve the provisions of the Educational Television Facilities Act, due to expire at the end of this fiscal year.

This measure, in less than 5 years has proved its worth. Where there were but 80 educational TV stations in operation or under construction when the act became effective, today there are 130 on the air, 46 under construction, and 25 more represented by requests for grants.

The principal provisions of title I of S. 1160 will extend the ETV Facilities Act for 5 years through fiscal 1972. It will replace the \$1,000,000-per-State limit with an annual State limit of 12½ percent of the total appropriation for a given fiscal year. It will increase the maximum allowable Federal share in project costs from 50 percent to 75 percent.

For the first time, it will authorize grants to be made for construction of noncommercial radio broadcast facilities. The testimony in the record shows emphatically that in many ways, noncommercial radio has made educational achievements fully as significant as those in television. Especially when our needs are increasing beyond the ability of the TV broadcast spectrum to accommodate them, we must provide for effective use of all the broadcast channels available to us.

#### TITLE II

Title II of S. 1160 authorizes the establishment of a nongovernmental, nonprofit, private corporation. I believe this imaginative proposal will lead not only to an uplifting of noncommercial broadcast programming, but will also have a salutary effect on the programs of commercial broadcasters.

Among its functions, the corporation will provide operational and program support, through grants and contracts, to improve and strengthen local stations and to encourage diverse and high quality programming of regional and national interest. Although it could neither own nor operate transmission or program production facilities, the corporation would be empowered to provide for interconnection among stations. This would allow noncommercial stations to share in the advantages of networking;

would enable stations to receive and store programs for future use at the stations' discretion.

The bill will authorize the amount of \$9,000,000 to the corporation for fiscal 1968, and such amounts as may be necessary for the next fiscal year. In consideration of the variety of methods which have been proposed to supply a steady flow of Federal funds into the corporation, the President has indicated that following careful study and review he will make further proposals next year for the continued financing of the corporation. We will await those proposals with keen interest, and in the meantime concur in the interim technique of direct appropriation. It should also be pointed out that the legislation authorizes the corporation to accept support from local, State, and private sources to achieve its purposes, and that in time it will develop a broad based pattern of financial support in which Federal funds will be but one element.

The bill sets out guidelines to aid the corporation in achieving its objectives and purposes. In an effort to strengthen the objectives of the legislation, a number of amendments to this title of the bill were adopted by the committee. Two of these are matters of nomenclature. As originally submitted, the bill was titled the "Public Television Act" and the agency established by title II was to be known as "The Corporation for Public Television." Since all the purposes of the bill, as described in its particulars, are intended to assist noncommercial radio as well as television, we believe it is desirable to include both concepts in the titles. Thus, it is proposed by amendment that the act be known as "The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967" and the corporation as "The Corporation for Public Broadcasting."

Another amendment proposed by the committee relates to the method of appointment of the Corporation's Board of Directors. Originally, S. 1160 proposed a 15-man Board, all to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with appropriate safeguards with respect to equitable geographic and occupational representation, conflict of interest, and the staggering of Board member terms of office. The committee's amendment proposes to retain the essential safeguards, but to modify the determination of Board members so that nine members will be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, and six members to be elected by the appointees, according to criteria otherwise contained in the bill. Throughout the hearings, universal determination has been expressed that the Corporation have maximum possible freedom from governmental or political interference or control. President Johnson voiced this concern when he said:

Noncommercial television and radio in America, even though supported by Federal funds, must be absolutely free from any Federal Government interference over programming.

Dr. James Killian, who headed the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, to which group this Nation is heavily indebted for much of the vision

in these proposals, came to the same conclusions when he said:

The Commission categorically affirmed that the Corporation . . . must be private and nongovernmental and that it must be insulated to the greatest possible degree from the threat of political control.

Other witnesses expressed the same concerns.

We believe that incorporation as a private nonprofit corporation, the appointment of responsible Board members, and other provisions relating to funding and reporting will assure the necessary insulation of the Corporation from governmental or political pressures.

Similarly, since the fundamental purpose of the bill is to strengthen local noncommercial stations, the powers of the Corporation itself must not impinge on the autonomy of local stations.

Local or regional educational broadcast stations must be free to accept or reject the programs and services which the Corporation will make available. This freedom is also implicit in the station's license from the FCC. We believe such assurance of local autonomy in determination of broadcast programs is essentially provided in such provisions of the bill as will restrict the Corporation to grant-and-contract authority to develop programs, and the restriction that the Corporation may not own or operate any type of program production or transmission facility. We also believe such assurance can be strengthened through several amendments to the language of the bill as originally submitted:

First. The first of these occurs in—section 396(g)(1)(b)—that portion of the bill which refers to the power of the Corporation to "assist in the establishment of a system of interconnection" for educational broadcast stations. Our amendment modifies that statement to make this authority refer to "systems of interconnection" to be consistent with other sections of the legislation and to assure the diversity of interconnection capability which will be necessary to effective usage as well as autonomy of local stations.

Second. Among the activities of the Corporation—section 396(g)(2)(d)—in the original wording, was the authority of the Corporation to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial radio and television programs and "develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including publication of a journal." The committee's amendment would restrict the Corporation's authority to disseminate information to the publication of a journal.

Third. One of the most complex questions raised during the hearing involved the function of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB—with respect to a national system of interconnection for local noncommercial stations. Under the provisions of the original proposal in section 396(g)(2)(E), the Corporation was prohibited from dealing directly with common carriers who normally provide interconnection facilities; instead the Corporation was limited to providing

contracts or grants to an intermediary organization that would undertake to contract for the interconnection.

Dr. James Killian, speaking for the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, urged that if a viable system of public television was to be brought into being authority must be given to the Corporation to provide interconnection facilities directly where the circumstances warrant. He viewed interconnection primarily as a means of program distribution but not as a means of establishing a fixed schedule network organization. The Corporation would use the interconnection facilities to distribute and transmit programs at all hours, but each station would be required to make its own decision as to what program it accepts and broadcasts and at what time. In addition, the Corporation needed flexibility for those special occasions when live or simultaneous broadcasts were desirable. Fears were expressed that if the Corporation was given this authority it would tend to develop a fixed schedule, network-type operation and thus the local station would be placed in a difficult position to control effectively its broadcast schedule.

The heads of the three commercial television network systems—Dr. Frank Stanton, Columbia Broadcasting System, Mr. Julian Goodman, National Broadcasting Co., and Leonard Goldenson, American Broadcasting Co.—agreed with Dr. Killian with regard to authorizing the Corporation to deal directly with the common carriers on the issue of interconnection facilities. In fact, Mr. Julian Goodman, of NBC, who was asked to study and submit his observations with regard to this issue as it involved the problem of interconnection, stated:

I do not see what affirmative values would be gained by making it necessary for the Corporation to make interconnection arrangements through an intermediary organization; on the contrary, I believe efficiency, sensible administration, and simplicity of operations would be served by enabling the Corporation to make these arrangements directly with the carriers providing the service.

The Corporation needs this authority not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation but to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities that warrant the Corporation directly contracting for interconnection facilities. Even under these circumstances, however, it should be made clear that the decision to broadcast such a program remains with the local station. This section, therefore, has been amended so as to give the Corporation the flexibility and discretion to arrange for interconnection directly with common carriers, as well as with other appropriate agencies when the circumstances warrant. This authority will be particularly important as the improvement of future transmission technology makes possible the use of domestic satellite interconnection systems for interconnection of educational broadcast stations.

In this connection, I should observe that the record developed by the subcommittee hearings contains substantial reference to the future of domestic satel-

lite systems and their possible relevance to the potential and problems of non-commercial educational television and radio. We are all aware of the proposal which has been advanced by the Ford Foundation which would establish a nonprofit corporation for the control and operation of a satellite interconnection system for television and radio, the proceeds of which might, under certain circumstances, benefit public broadcasting. We are also aware of the counterproposals which have been made by Comsat, A.T. & T., and similarly interested parties.

Although it is clear that the future of satellite communications systems for domestic interconnection may have a high degree of relevance to noncommercial public broadcasting, it is equally clear that the issues and problems of satellite systems are matters for technical experimentation and research, as well as policy discussion and debate, which will take time to resolve. It is my conviction that the needs which this legislation is designed to meet are of urgent importance, and should not wait upon the resolution of problems involved in domestic satellite communications systems.

#### TITLE III

Title III of S. 1160 authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct or to contract for a study of instructional television, with an authorized amount of not more than \$500,000.

It is clear that public television and radio broadcasting holds out the promise of educational and cultural advantage for the American public which warrants the establishment of national policy and financial assistance reflected in the preceding provisions of this bill. However, it is also clear that the role of television in relation to instruction requires a much broader assessment than has thus far been possible of the relation between our rapidly expanding communications technology and the full range of our educational needs.

It is increasingly evident that the total needs of our educational system—and the total potential of communications technology to serve those needs—transcend the uses of conventional broadcast transmission.

The development of television systems utilizing closed-circuit and 2,500-megacycle frequencies for instructional purposes is already under development in many schools and colleges. But this cannot be viewed in isolation. The enormous possibilities of the new technology for information storage and retrieval, the relationship of radio and television to computer-assisted instruction, and the possibilities in interconnection of such devices are among the technological phenomena which are only dimly understood at present in the context of instructional need and purpose.

While concurring in the need for the study proposed in title III, the committee feels the original language of the authorization may be insufficiently broad, with the result that important facets of the problem may be omitted. Therefore, as an amendment, we have proposed rewording of section 301 as follows:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio (including broadcast, closed circuit and instructional television fixed services) and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials such as videotapes, films, discs, computers and other educational materials or devices, and such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

We also propose this title be amended to delete section 302, entitled "Content of Study." With the amended wording and broadened objectives of section 301, we believe this section to be unnecessary, and that the exact method of undertaking the study should be left to the Secretary and the research experts who will conduct the study.

Mr. President, in summary, I believe it is worth noting that in our hearings on this measure, these propositions were supported by all witnesses, representing many facets of the American society and economy. Although many variants of detail were proposed and discussed, some of which have been incorporated in amendments offered by the committee, all who testified concurred that the needs to which this bill is responsive are urgent and that the time to make a significant beginning toward serving those needs is now.

In urging the enactment of S. 1160, as amended, I should like to repeat a statement I made in opening the subcommittee hearings, and which I believe still to be relevant:

The opportunity before the Congress and the challenge of this issue are of paramount importance for the future growth of this Nation. It is an opportunity and a challenge that may be forever lost if we turn our backs against the propositions outlined in this legislation.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing now to answer any questions on any title, at any time, in any way; and for that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and, if agreed to, be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I should like to ask him about the possibilities of the FCC taking action which is not related to this particular bill, but which is closely related to a subject which has deeply concerned the Senate for the past month to 6 weeks; namely, the enormous cost of political advertising on television and the tremendous advantage this gives to candidates who have money or to candidates who are supported with big money.

We all know the devastating impact which a television campaign can have. We have seen many instances of it. It is getting to the point that money can prevail, especially in a very close race.

We are also aware that, as Herbert Hoover asserted 40 years ago, the public owns the airwaves and that the Federal Government is the only agency which can act in this interstate area to lay down guidelines to make certain that the airwaves are used in the public interest.

We are also aware that television stations are peculiarly profitable and do not need this political advertising revenue, having a return which is excellent and gives every prospect of continuing to be very good.

Many owners of television stations have told me that political broadcasting, even if the revenue is substantial, is a headache for them, something they would like to get rid of, something they do not want.

Under these circumstances, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island whether, in his judgment, it would be possible to consider a provision in the law or, whether the FCC could act on its own in connection with television stations and networks, to persuade them not to sell time for political campaign purposes but to provide free time to a limited extent, say, for 2 or 3 weeks before an election. To begin with this provision might apply only to general elections where there are just two legally qualified candidates. In primaries or three party races this proposal would not apply. We might start with congressional and gubernatorial elections.

For example, one-half hour free time to a candidate for the Senate; one-half hour to a candidate for Governor, in a general election; perhaps five 1-minute spots and ten 20- or 10-second spots, to each candidate 2 weeks before the election. No other time allowed.

What I am getting at is that this would be a legal requirement and give a candidate for election the opportunity to get his message across to the public on prime time—in a limited, not an excessive amount of time. Big money working through the electronic media of today have come to dominate many political

campaigns. Big money can literally buy an election through television.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks by saying that the radio spectrum belongs in the public domain. The airwaves belong to all the people of this country. They cannot take full advantage of this radio spectrum unless someone explores it and utilizes it. That, of course, is the reason why we began the system of licensing certain broadcasting stations and networks which are under the control of the FCC. The Senate Commerce Committee, of course, has legislative responsibility in this area.

The commercial networks own five broadcasting stations in five of the best areas in the United States of America. When I say the best areas, I mean populated areas which provide large audiences. I am talking about New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Miami, and Chicago—places of that kind.

ABC owns five TV stations. It cannot own more than five VHF stations, under the FCC rules. NBC owns five, and CBS owns five. But the broadcasting stations which they own are under Federal regulation. Therefore, by indirection, the networks are also controlled. In testimony, given from time to time, it has been developed, in so far as opportunities for the networks are concerned, that their profits are rather meager in comparison to the profits they earn from their broadcasting station. There, of course, the profits are astronomical, especially if one has the good fortune to get a VHF station in a city such as Providence, Atlanta, or Richmond. In that case, I think we could go to bed and begin to count our money. I mean, it is a boon. It is like discovering the pot of gold.

Mr. President, under the Communications Act, we have what is known as section 315. Section 315 is a paradox.

In the first place, while it protects the candidate in that case where his opponent is given broadcast time, he has a perfect right to claim equal time, and he usually gets it. It is what happens every time the President makes an appearance on TV when he is a candidate. The Republicans ask for equal time, and they get it.

That was true when President Eisenhower was in the White House and we Democrats thought he was getting on the fringes of politics. We asked for time and got it. There is nothing that a politician is more sensitive to than that when it is getting near election time.

The point is that, because of section 315, the broadcasters and networks would have to give equal time to every possible candidate. Sometimes there are 15 or 20 legally qualified candidates running for the same office. The minute we begin giving them all equal time, there will be a stampede. Some people will want to go on television just so folks back home can see how nice they look. Each legally qualified candidate is entitled free time once time is made available to one candidate. So it poses a dilemma.

In 1960 a bill was introduced in Congress whereby the networks and licensees would be compelled to give a certain number of hours a certain number of

weeks before election to the candidates for election to the office of the Presidency.

We had hearings on that bill. Finally, in conjunction and with the support of my colleagues, I reported a resolution to the effect that the networks in the presidential campaigns would be relieved from the provisions of section 315, so that they would not be obliged to give equal time to all candidates. Thus candidates on the Communist ticket, candidates on the Prohibition ticket, or other candidates were entitled to equal time. Complete discretion was given to the broadcaster. That law led to the famous television debate between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon, which I think Mr. Nixon regrets to this day.

To make a long story short, the next year, or sometime after that, I suggested a proposal that would relieve the licensees from the effect of section 315 in congressional and gubernatorial elections, as a starter, in order to bring about what the Senator from Wisconsin is suggesting.

I think he has a marvelous idea. One trouble is that we run up against a stone wall, which is section 315. I will tell the Senator frankly, when I came on the floor with a proposal to modify section 315, most of the opposition came from Members of Congress who were fearful that if we give discretion to the licensee, a broadcaster could begin allotting time as he pleased. He could give time to the candidate of his choice. He could stress one candidate, thereby leaving his opponent out in the cold.

If we can work out a system whereby we can cut down the confusion which naturally occurs in situations like this, we would be making progress.

There is a gentleman in Chicago by the name of Lar Daly who went around dressed in an Uncle Sam suit. He is a perennial candidate and is dressed up in this regalia. As a matter of fact, one time the Ambassador from a foreign country was received by the mayor of Chicago. Lar Daly wanted equal time. Under the law, the commission ruled that, since he was a candidate for the same office, equal time should be granted to him because there were some political connotations involved in the reception or ceremony. So Lar Daly was given equal time.

My answer to the Senator from Wisconsin is this. I would hope we could work out a system whereby some of this burden could be shared by the public. How we do it is the dilemma of our time. We have struggled with it and have been unable to reach a conclusion. The only solution invented thus far is that we relieve the broadcasters from section 315, which would give them tremendous power, and the Congress of the United States is reluctant to do it. Does that answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has answered it very well, but I would like to ask if it would not be possible to confine this proposal to general elections. I wonder if it would be possible to have the provision prohibiting political TV ads confined to the regular nominees of the Democratic and Republican Parties

in the general elections, and provide limited free time 2 or 3 weeks before the general election.

Second, I wonder, if, in the judgment of the Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the Communications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, it would be possible to prevent, proscribe, or prohibit other paid political broadcasts on television, so the big impact of money, which has so distorted our campaigns in the past, and promises to do so even more in the future, could be prevented?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I am willing to wager that there are Members of the Senate who would want to give Mr. Wallace equal time. I do not think there is, but there might be a member of the Prohibition Party in the Senate, who would want to have equal time. Something ought to be worked out. I will tell the Senator that the American people are dismayed when they hear that someone has spent \$500,000 to win a senatorial campaign when the position pays a salary of \$30,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How about the possibility of starting in an area where it would work? I realize the difficulties we face. How about with respect to those senatorial and gubernatorial races where there are only two candidates?

Mr. PASTORE. I introduced a bill to relieve the effects of the provisions of section 315 in senatorial campaigns. It did not get through the committee. Many Senators believe it is too broad an authority. The Senator will remember our good friend from California, Clair Engle. The Senator will remember how he made a fine speech on the floor, imploring us not to remove the provisions of section 315, because of what could happen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree whole heartedly that section 315 should not be completely removed. There is no question that if it is removed, it would have to be replaced with something.

Mr. PASTORE. If it is removed, it means that every candidate has the right—

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be removed only in general elections where there are for instance regular candidates in the Democratic and Republican Parties, and no other candidates.

Mr. PASTORE. Under our two-party system, that is logical. The trouble is that there are many other candidates who have the same right, and, I am afraid, under our Constitution they could enforce that right. The public has the right to hear dissenting views; the candidate does not have to be the popular candidate of the Republican or Democratic Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course the public has that right. In those cases my proposal simply would not apply.

Mr. PASTORE. I know it was—

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not want to pursue it, but I wanted to put the idea across to the Senator from Rhode Island. I would like to have it discussed by the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee to see if we could make some progress in this area. I hope one day soon we will find an answer to the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Another aspect of this problem is that most television stations today are using the authority they have to editorialize. If we give them the power by suspending section 315, to do these other things, and they turn around and editorialize, then you are really in trouble, are you not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The only authority I had in mind is to give equal time to both candidates in a campaign in which there are two nominees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But how far do you go?

Let us take my own town of Seattle. The race for prosecuting attorney of King County may be more important to the people than the race for Congress. Where do you draw the line? How far down do you go?

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Washington that in that area, you start where you can. If you can make progress in congressional and gubernatorial races, maybe you can work something out in other areas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are trying to do. As the Senator will recall, we are trying to get educational TV up to a point where we can evaluate these things, and maybe they can perform a service politically.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know it is a fine bill. However, I was discussing another aspect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that.

Mr. PASTORE. On educational television, you may run into a little bit different situation, although section 315 applies, because it is all under Communications Act of 1934.

I realize what the Senator means, and I am hopeful that something can be worked out; but up to now, it has been a hard nut to crack.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, to pursue a bit further the subject raised by the Senator from Wisconsin, it seems to me that this is going to be a very difficult matter to work out. I have sympathy for what the Senator seeks to accomplish, but, even limiting it to the presidential elections, if this had been in effect, say, in 1924, it would have eliminated the great Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin. Only the candidates running on major party tickets would have had that opportunity, and he would not have had it.

To bring it down to the congressional level, in my own State of Virginia, in 1962 or 1964—I do not recall at the moment which—in the Third Congressional District, we had a Democratic nominee, a Republican nominee, and an Independent Democrat for Congress. I supported strongly the Democratic nominee, but I think that Independent Democrat—who came within a few votes of winning—had just as much right to the use of the facilities of radio and TV as did the nominees of the two major parties.

To turn to my own situation last fall, I

had three candidates against me. I was the regular Democratic nominee. There was a Republican nominee, and the Conservative Party said I was too liberal, and they put up a candidate against me.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator repeat that, please?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Conservative Party said I was too liberal, so they put up a candidate against me. It cost me 60,000 votes. Then the Republicans—JOHN COOPER's party—said I was too conservative.

Mr. COOPER. I deny the charge. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Then I had another opponent, a Socialist; I guess he thought I was too conservative also. But as my friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] points out, the election came out nicely and my plurality was 117,000 votes.

But it seems to me that all those people who ran against me should have had the same opportunity for the use of public facilities or public airways as I had, or as did the nominee of the Republican Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Where you have cases like those to which the Senator has referred, the Coolidge-Davis-La Follette race in 1924, or the Byrd race for the Senate in 1966, it seems to me that this cannot apply. You have to start off with the situation which is most common—that maintains in more than half of the cases—that is, you have a Democratic nominee and a Republican nominee, or a Democratic nominee and one from some other party, and you provide that the station must provide a significant but limited amount of free time for both candidates, and sell no time to either of the candidates.

I agree with the Senator from Virginia that there are many difficulties, situations where it would be completely unfair to eliminate third parties, if you provide that the Democratic and Republican Parties are the only ones affected; but I think we have to think hard and continuously about this question, or we will be overwhelmed by the power of money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I think the Senator is correct, but if I may get back to—

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield to let us hear from the Senator from Texas? I think he represents the other side of the coin.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes. I think we should hear from the other side of the coin.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, we should.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while I believe there is a real need for something in the area about which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] speaks, I would like to point out that at the same time we must protect the right of the minority to be heard.

At the time I was elected to the Senate, in April 10 years ago, there were 21 candidates against me—22 of us in all.

Sixteen put their names on the ballot and had difficulty in financing campaigns, but six of them were on the radio, television, in the newspapers, and everywhere. From the efforts put forth, I would think you might have called those six major candidates.

I do not think any of us had any rights over the 16 who could not raise the money to get on television. I think all had equal rights.

I think every candidate has an equal right to the airways—rather a spectrum than individual airways—which belongs to all the people. I think no one has a right to pass a law and say, "We got the most votes, therefore we are entitled to those facilities."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I think under section 315, we should not overlook one very important fact. That is that there is a fairness doctrine, which would still be in effect even though we repealed section 315.

I strongly believe that section 315 is doing much more damage to public campaigning generally than it is doing good. What it is tending to do at the present time, and will continue to do in the future, is provide stations with the right to deny even the major candidates the opportunity to express themselves.

In other words, the station is going to say, "We have to deal with section 315; if we permit you to appear, we have to permit 15 other candidates to appear also." The easiest way is for them to go ahead with their regular paid programs, denying the opportunity for people to hear what the candidates have to say, denying them the opportunity to make an intelligent judgment after observing the candidates on television. I believe that is the attitude which will follow if section 315 stays on the books.

I think it is much more fair and much more in the public interest to eliminate section 315, and simply have the stations required to obey the fairness doctrine. They still could have their licenses suspended or revoked if they did not follow the doctrine of fairness. That, in my opinion, is much more fair than trying to divide up the time on a minute-by-minute basis, of the candidates, and the order in which they appear. I hope that someday we will repeal section 315, and rely upon the fairness doctrine. I do not believe, however, that such action belongs in this bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield now to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I wish to return for a moment to the pending legislation. The Senator from Rhode Island has made a very effective and able presentation on Senate bill 1160. I wanted to ask the Senator a question or two in regard to it. Before I phrase my question, I should like to preface it by saying that I have a great fear of government propaganda. I might say that I subscribe to the views of the third President of the United States, who happened to be a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who said that if it were left to him whether to have a free press or a free government,

he would take a free press, because without that, we could never have a free government.

I am concerned about Government propaganda. I have great confidence in the Senator from Rhode Island, and I have great confidence in the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the committee chairman.

I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he feels that adequate safeguards are contained in the legislation to prevent Government control of the program content and the facilities.

Mr. PASTORE. The answer to that question is very simple. I think that the one factor that took up most of our time in the discussion of this legislation was the concern on the part of the committee and most of the witnesses that this corporation should be completely out from under the control of politics, and that it should not indulge in politics.

As a matter of fact, the point was raised:

Well, you are providing for 15 incorporators or members of the corporation to be appointed by the President, and that is too much authority for the President.

In order to compromise that matter, we came halfway between the recommendation that was made on the draft bill, and the recommendation made in the Carnegie report. The Carnegie report provided for a corporation to consist of 12 members, six to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the other six to be elected by those that had been appointed by the President, thus giving us a board consisting of 12 people.

The reason they did this is that they thought that at least six members should be outside of the control of the President or not be beholden to him.

Frankly, I did not go along too much with that viewpoint. I think this is an important piece of legislation.

My argument was that if the President of the United States can appoint a member of the Supreme Court, who is confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and who, in fact, makes the decisions that guide the destiny of this Republic, why can he not appoint members of such a corporation subject to the confirmation of the Senate?

In order to resolve the matter and bring about such a guarantee, the pending bill provides that nine of the members shall be appointed by the President, subject to the confirmation of the Senate, and that the other six member shall be appointed by the nine members who have been appointed by the President.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Not yet. That is only part of my statement.

There was a condition contained in the measure that the corporation shall have the responsibility of developing public awareness. The question came up: "What do they mean by public awareness? Is that another gimmick for public control?"

So we took those words out of the measure, and then provided in the bill that there shall be no interference what-

soever on the part of the Government with relation to programing.

I think that in drawing this legislation we did about as good a job as anyone can do in putting words together that would give us that guarantee.

We must realize that we cannot give a guarantee on human nature. We must look to God for that. But as far as words go, I think we did a good job.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, with reference to not being able to give such a guarantee, that recalls another Jefferson quotation which I like:

In questions of power then let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

That is why I like to stick to the Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. I like to do so, too. I think the Constitution is the best document ever written by man, but we must have men carry out that Constitution.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the six members who are to be appointed by the nine members appointed by the President be subject to senatorial confirmation?

Mr. PASTORE. No. The nine members appointed by the President will be subject to senatorial confirmation, and the six will not.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Was there a reason behind that?

Mr. PASTORE. The reason behind it was the argument made by Dr. Killian in the Carnegie report to the effect that he and the Commission thought it would guarantee independence from the political interference.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it came to my attention the other day that the Office of Economic Opportunity had requested \$179,000 with which to set up a radio station and a newspaper in North Carolina.

Why in the world should a Government agency put out its own newspaper, a general circulation newspaper, and have its own radio station?

The statement has nothing to do with the pending bill, I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, but it makes me more concerned that any legislation which we pass in regard to television and radio should provide that the interest of the public are safeguarded, and that there is the least possible opportunity presented for Government manipulation or propaganda.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree with the Senator more. I think that was ill-advised. I do not think they need a radio station. We have enough media so that the Government can put its cause over to the people without that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator knows that I have already made some statements in the RECORD.

I favor the bill. I think its purpose is good. I think its intent is high-minded. I think that we have done our level best to regulate public television and keep it from heavyhanded Government control.

I think public television is certainly needed in this country because commercial television programming meanders so often from the mediocre to the moronic, and its god is glamour. It is probably the most misused or to so large a degree unused medium of communication since man decided he could make an intelligible sound so as to be understood by another man.

Television is often a horror to contemplate or, at the other extreme, a bore to observe. It has its great, high moments. It has its great programs and fine documentaries. But always the test is, Does it pay? I think there ought to be another test in the American cultural concept, and that test ought to be, Will it improve the intellectual standards of the American people?

Bearing in mind what has been said about the Constitution, will television aid, in that most sympathetic phrase in the Constitution, the pursuit of happiness? There is very little happiness to be pursued in the average television program. There is violence to be abhorred or absorbed. There is cheap drama to be observed, where one to advert to the beer can or the kitchen stove. There is monotony in the presentation and more violence in the very sell of the commercials, which scare us to death.

I am one of the great number of people in this country who have television sets and who join in the general apology, when someone comes in for a visit, which is to the effect, "We never look at it"—which is wrong—or "We hide it behind the door. We don't keep it in the living room."

There is a vast national apology going on in this country for the television. This I do not say in derogation of the great networks or of the other people who present programs. I certainly praise educational and instructional television. I praise what television has done in the public interest. But I should like to see public television begin to satirize. I should like to see the days of Addison, Swift, and Pope revived in this country, if that be possible.

I should like to see the satire of Buchwald. I should like to see people made fun of. I should like to see Senators, Representatives, the President, and everyone else made fun of within the limits of decency and good taste, without any fear that the Senator from Rhode Island or the Senator from Pennsylvania could do anything to the person who satirized, because there is no satire left in this country. There is no opportunity for satire. If any does appear, everybody jumps to condemn it.

I would hope that public television could bring to this country the gift of satire.

O wad some Pow'r the giftle gie us  
To see oursel's as others see us!

I believe it can be done. I believe that public television can arouse, inspire, and cause people to react strongly. Then the more strongly they react, the more apt they will be to react in the last process which the mind summons up: that is, the act of thought.

I should like to see people start thinking in this country—and thinking seri-

ously. I should like to see television achieve its potential.

If the Senator from Rhode Island will excuse me for having indulged in a certain amount of oratory, what I am really saying is that I am for the bill, and I hope it passes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I should like to add my support to the bill so ably managed by the Senator from Rhode Island. As I have seen him agonize over the decision on the atomic energy development in Illinois, I have enjoyed observing him relish the subject of educational television and have been pleased by his being in the forefront of one of the most important steps this country and the Congress can take.

My own interest in educational television goes back 15 years ago, when a group of us organized the fund for adult education, of the Ford Foundation, a board that I served on for 10 years, and of which, I was chairman of the board for 3 or 4 years.

We felt that there should be in this country a situation with respect to public television comparable to the relationship that Carnegie developed with public libraries.

So we took \$24 million of Ford Foundation money and invested it in the concept of educational television over a period of years.

We started the educational television network. We organized committees to interest communities across the country in developing local support for educational television stations. We pledged the initial purchase of equipment for all of those stations. In the period of the lifetime of our fund, we started 45 educational television stations, including channel 11 in Chicago. We did so by convincing each community that educational television was a community need and interest that had to be served; that the great educational institutions, labor, and business, civic leaders, and religious leaders should get together to provide community spirit and support. We found that the communities were able, in these stations, to effectively regulate and control the use of educational television in such a way that it has been remarkably free from criticism.

In looking at television, I have always felt as did Erwin Cannon, who once said that it would be better to have one good thought sent by tom-tom than to have some of the trash and trivia that goes across television networks on the commercial bands through this modern electronic miracle of communication.

Second. As a private citizen, a company with which I had been long associated sponsored, for the first time, prime nighttime television broadcasts in the public service, and worked with all three networks in sponsoring public service television programs on controversial subjects.

It is with this minor background in this field that I now indicate my desire to support, with great enthusiasm, the Educational Television Act of 1967. I am gratified to have this opportunity to support a national commitment for the

further development and growth of this very exciting medium.

The bill before us, Mr. President, represents a decided advance in two aspects of our national life which will distinguish it, in my judgment, as milestone legislation.

First, it represents a strong national commitment to the development of a vital national resource. The opportunities for enrichment of the lives of our citizens afforded by educational television are of truly enormous proportions. It is significant that our recent advances in space-age satellite technology contribute heavily to the feasibility of bringing instruction and enrichment into the lives of all our citizens. Every citizen in the country who has access to a television set—and there are few in our society who can not make such a claim—can claim the benefits of this bill which, in the language of the committee report:

Will aid and encourage the bold and imaginative plans for educational broadcasting which have been put before (the Committee) in the course of . . . hearings on the bill.

The second significant aspect of this proposal lies in its endorsement and reliance on private sector initiative, leadership, and capability. The creation of a private, nonprofit corporation to undertake the development of educational television reflects what I regard as a growing trend toward a new definition of the role of the Federal Government in pursuing national goals and solving national problems.

Earlier in this session, I introduced the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. My bill proposes a private, nonprofit corporation and envisions creation of a new private sector-Federal partnership to achieve the national goals of decent housing and suitable living environment for all our citizens. I stated then that—

The responsibility for conducting a national program of home ownership for initially lower income families should lie with the non-governmental sector, including both private enterprise and non-profit organizations and groups. *The role of government should only be one of reinforcement and guarantee, rather than execution and control.*

I regard the bill before us as a similar undertaking by a similar partnership. I am confident that the private sector is mindful of the responsibility and the challenge of this partnership. I commend the many interested foundations and organizations—the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Comsat Corp., and our great national networks, CBS, NBC, and ABC—whose interest in and contributions to this concept more than amply justify the confidence of Congress, as it will be expressed by enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, at the same time that I commend the committee and its chairman for their excellent report, I express the hope that we will not forget that the work to be done in this effort to develop a national educational television and radio resource is only barely begun. I am confident it will continue in the progressive spirit of this positive step forward, and I pledge my support to its progress in the years ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the principle underlying the creation of a publicly financed and governmentally controlled radio and television network raises very serious questions of basic constitutional policy. I have given long and careful consideration to the provisions of this bill and have concluded that I must oppose the adoption of title II of this bill.

Under title II, the Federal Government would be moving into an entirely new field of operations, for which there is no sanction whatsoever under the Constitution. I have read the Constitution carefully, and I can find nothing in it which authorizes Congress to legislate either in the field of education or of non-commercial broadcasting, and certainly not in the two of them together. While these fields have been touched upon in the past in authorizing grants for the construction of educational TV facilities, title II goes far beyond assistance to local effort, and sets up a quasi-governmental corporation for the production of programs of information and opinion. If we continue to use the general welfare clause as an open end to the Constitution, then the Constitution itself as a governing document will become meaningless.

Despite the safeguards pointed to by the proponents of the bill, there can be no doubt but that it violates both the spirit and the letter of the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

While this bill would not abridge the freedom of any existing news media, it would set up new media financed at least in part by the Government. No one in America today believes that any media in the world, financed by any government, is truly free. By setting up a federally funded Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Congress would be setting up media that are not completely free. I believe that contributing to the growth of even a segment of news media not completely free would be an abridgment of freedom of speech.

No one seems to have noticed that the method of funding this corporation is comparable to the method used by the CIA to finance Encounter magazine and other operations, that is to say, a partial grant with no apparent strings attached. All of the professional liberals and intellectuals in the Nation protested that Encounter and many of the other supposedly free operations had been compromised by U.S. Government support. Now I am not sure that Encounter was a wise choice as an anti-Communist weapon. Moreover, it was not a domestic magazine serving the American people. Yet the Corporation for Public Broadcasting will have a profound influence upon the American people, and I find it strange that our American liberals are not up in arms against the proposals in this bill. Anyone who truly loves liberty must oppose this bill.

Now I know that this bill has carefully excluded partisan politics from the pro-

grams of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Obviously, this is a wise move. American politics is not, however, composed only of partisan politics. We have ideological divisions as well. Nothing in this bill safeguards against the capture of the corporation by a small clique with definite ideological biases. The bill actually facilitates such a capture. On the 15-man board of directors a majority of just five of the President's nine appointees elects the other six. Thus a president could quickly have 11 of his men controlling the output of the corporation.

Moreover, the supposed independence of the corporation is called into question by the language of subsection (A), which appears on page 16, and authorizes the corporation "to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions." This clause could be used to develop and disseminate propaganda promoting the policies and programs of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Justice; Agriculture; Commerce; and so on. We would have propaganda designed to influence pending legislation, whether authorization or appropriation. I say to every one of my colleagues who values his independent judgment in assessing legislative proposals backed by Government agencies that those who vote for this bill are voting for something that has a vast potential to be used against them.

The meaning of the language from the text, "to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control," is all too clear. The bill provides maximum protection from the interference of Congress, but it provides none at all from the manipulations of the executive branch, or worse yet, from capture by an ideological minority opposed to the programs of both. Congress must not abdicate its responsibilities to uphold the Constitution and the right of free speech.

The capture of this corporation by an anti-American minority is more remote, but quite possible. Normally, an aggressive president could be expected to use such a potent weapon for his own ends. Yet, at the same time, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be a vital target for radical and revolutionary ideologies. Once the directors are selected, they are completely free agents, answerable to no man or group of men. They are free to continue, or to break, allegiance to the President. I realize that no broadcasting station would be forced to accept the offerings of the corporation. But it is more realistic to foresee that most of their offerings will be accepted without close scrutiny by the local broadcasters.

Let me give one example of a case which has already taken place. Two or three years ago National Education Television, known as NET, the present private educational TV network, distributed a program entitled "Three Faces of Cuba." This program had been filmed mostly in Cuba, under the supervision of Castro's henchmen. Presumably, it was approved by his Communist propa-

ganda experts. Its producer was a well-known American leftist, Robert Cohen, known for his attacks on the House Committee on Un-American Activities and sympathetic documentaries on Red China and East Germany. The final product was a notorious film extolling Castro. Yet it was shown to thousands of innocent schoolchildren all over the country as an objective evaluation before a storm of protests caused its withdrawal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the tape recording made from the film "Three Faces of Cuba," broadcast on March 22, 1965, by Miami, Fla., educational channel 2, WTHS, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an evaluation of this film entitled "Anatomy of a Film Analysis of 'Three Faces of Cuba'" by Edward Hunter, a professional propaganda analyst, also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks following the transcript just referred to.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are no built-in checks in this bill to insure that the Corporation will act responsibly. In fact, everything that guarantees so-called independence guarantees a potential for irresponsibility.

I see nothing in the bill, for example, which would guarantee that persons attacked by these public programs would have an opportunity to reply. I see nothing which would enable the opponents of certain ideas or philosophies advanced on a program produced by the Corporation to present contrary views.

At present in broadcasting, we have the FCC's fairness doctrine, under which stations must make available free air time for opposing views. But this bill goes beyond mere broadcasting into Government-subsidized production. In fact, the point of the bill is to prepare productions equal in effectiveness to those of commercial TV. If the Government is going to underwrite such productions, it seems to me that the fairness doctrine should be expanded to include the expanded field of Government activity and that equal production facilities and budgets should be made available to opposing views upon application to the FCC.

I also see in this bill provision for the publication of a "journal." If this journal turns out to be anything more than a program log, then it seems to me that the freedom of the press would be directly impinged upon. I would want some assurance that we do not have some potential here for a weekly, even daily, newspaper sent free to schoolchildren across the land.

I would also like to see some specific provision which would bar the Corporation from producing any programs which would influence legislation or promote the activities and visionary schemes of Government agencies or attempt to justify actions of the executive branch.

Mr. President, I can understand the desire of some to use television as a

means of education. I think it is one of the finest means of education; but title II goes into the production of programs, as I stated, and this, it seems to me, is going entirely too far.

## EXHIBIT 1

## THREE FACES OF CUBA

(Transcript of the tape recording made from the film "Three Faces of Cuba," broadcast on March 22, 1965, from 9 to 10 p.m., by Miami, Fla., educational channel 2, WTHS)

ANNOUNCER. The following program is from NET, the National Educational Television Network. This is the story of three Cubans, three men from different levels of Cuban society whose lives have been changed by Fidel Castro. It is the story of Cuba today told by the three Cubans in their own way.

The first Cuban was a university professor in Havana, alienated and displaced by the revolution. He is now living in exile in the U. S. because his family remains in Cuba, his face will not be shown, nor his name revealed.

The second Cuban is Jose Garcia Nicolas. He is an ardent revolutionary. To him the new system represents an opportunity for unexpected power and status.

The third Cuban is named Francisco Salgado. He is an unskilled laborer. Today he accepts the revolution not for political reasons but because it has brought him his first steady job. The words you will hear are those of the three Cubans themselves. (The martial notes of the "26 of July Movement" hymn are played for 25 seconds, followed by thunderous applause that lasts another 25 seconds. Nearly one full minute of hymn playing and applause.)

(Voice of first Cuban.)

Raul Castro is the organizer who is well trained, cool operator, very unemotional, in a way mainly in his police like ideas.

Che Guevara is an Argentine physician, probably the more idealistic in the group, contrary in a way to Blas Roca who is the Stalinist, the old Soviet type (uproar 10 seconds)

I think Fidel Castro is an extraordinary man, one of the important men in our age. In his university years—I remember him at that time—he was a very leader-like figure. He would like to get into arguments and discuss them at length, sometimes for two days, without even moving from a bench in the plaza of the university. He is a volatile, exuberant type of leader, overtones of demagoguery are always present, of course, in the personality of the man. He believes himself to be a Christ-like figure . . . Messiah, a possessor of the Holy Ghost, saying . . . he is in my pocket every morning? (In Cuban vernacular, when one is very sure of having something—be it a friend—a case—an idea—it is commonly said figuratively: "lo tengo en el bolsillo"—which translated literally reads: "I have it (or him) in my pocket.")

Sometimes this figure [Castro] appeals to the low classes. He uses then a type of speech which is repetitive but full of impact ideas. There is no real philosophy but emotionalism in his type of speech. Then he appears as a middle of the road intellectual, able to manipulate faces which are very attractive. However, you find him speaking very intellectually about trends in modern painting and things of the sort. This means that he is a very important leader because he is a born demagogue in this respect, but a demagogue that appeals not only to the masses but to those of the intelligentsia.

Castro has taken this revolution quite personally, therefore, he would do anything to save the situation and therefore resort to any kind of alliance. (Now Fidel Castro's own voice is heard over the roar of the masses, shouting at the top of his voice: "que viva la revolucion socialista"—"long live

the socialist revolution"—"que viva el Marxismo-Leninismo"—"long live Marxism-Leninism"—finally he shouts "Patria o Muerte"—"Fatherland of Death"—followed by popular gay music. Time: 50 seconds.)

Announcer. The first Cuban, one of the approximately half million exiles who fled the island since Castro came into power. He now teaches in an American university.

(Voice of first Cuban:)

My family has been in Cuba for three generations . . . I was a university professor . . . I left the country . . . I teach now in the United States, I would rather not give my name for the reason that my family still lives in Havana.

The Biltmore Yacht Club used to be one of the most exclusive societies. These were private clubs in which the old families belonged from generations to generations; they represent a kind of elite. Fathers and grandfathers struggled so the grandson of their son get it because it meant something society-wise. In order to belong to such a club you had to be voted in by the members. This is why even Batista could never belong to it because no matter how many pressures he would have exercised otherwise, everytime his name came for vote it would be turned out. (Immediately 20 seconds of a romantic song.)

This is the Havana Hilton Hotel renamed Havana Libre Hotel. Was the leading place for the American colony and is also a kind of symbol for the socialist revolution take over.\* Nowadays, instead of the American tourist having a beer or a cocktail in the bar you find the Russian technician or the militiamen or the Negro worker. \* (Background music is heard through this narrative.)

One of the main attractions offered to the tourist were the night clubs, among them, for example, the Tropicana in the outskirts of Havana. These cabarets also have gambling casinos attached to them run by American gamblers, professional gamblers from the Las Vegas set up. Today, of course, the American tourist is absent, the gambling is gone. We find these places run by the government. (All the time background music is heard, after the last word is heard a few bars of a song by a woman is heard (5 seconds). The people that go there are in the middle class, or sometimes in the lower middle class, of course the typical guajiros, the peasant, never goes there. For him the carnival in the streets is the real entertaining. (The background music of the woman singing stops and immediately the rhythm of a "conga" is heard for 12 seconds.)

The revolutionary themes are intermixed with the activities of the carnival, the costumes, the movements adhere along the lines of the propaganda (gay music is heard as background. Then the speaker stops and we hear 9 seconds of rhythmic music with drums.)

Mixed with the social elements we also find the voodoo elements . . . the old traditions taken from Africa. For the Russians this type of mixture of the tropical atmosphere and the socialist element is something very strange for them (18 seconds of drums and bells, typical Carnival music, is heard.)

Castro has taken the Negro question as one of the points in his program. The Negro in Cuba, he brought from Africa his idols. He was left to believe in them. He lived in the sugar plantations, he intermarried with the Spaniards . . . in fact, all through the previous years to Fidel's takeover, the only discrimination was in the social clubs, the high class clubs, in some type of university jobs, it is true, but nothing compared with what Castro has exploited later. Varadero Beach, one of the beautiful beaches in Cuba, had private clubs and private residential sections. Into these sections, of course, the poor elements of the population or the Negroes could not enter. He was not expelled violently but he was not given accommoda-

tion. What Fidel has exploited is that this wealth and all this tremendous things that the dictator built for the high classes is now going to be yours . . . you can use the yachts, you can enjoy the big mansion . . . he told the Negro: You must feel bad, you must have a headache, something must be wrong with you because you don't even fight to go into the Biltmore Yacht Club. He, of course, exploits continuously the fact that the Negro situation in the United States is in a bad shape not for the external policy (?) of the United States but for the state of the masses down there. (Here he is interrupted by a tremendous uproar of a great mass of people shouting and clapping during 9 seconds.)

The middle class in Cuba was a very hard working class, some of them, people that would have been working a whole life to build a house in Varadero because it was a dream—because it was the end of the road, this was the kind of Utopia. The middle class at the beginning thought that it was a political revolution mainly to clean up corruption and destroy the brutality of the dictatorship, never realizing that it was a real social revolution. The last years of the Batista regime they would just go around playing the week-end, like if nothing was happening . . . Castro started by dispossessing these people of their property, the income was reduced to 600 dollars a month, at the most; the owners of houses would only be given the one they occupied; the savings accounts were reduced to 10,000 dollars per person; the real middle classes were the ones that suffered mostly.

The anti-American feeling that is prevalent in the Castro government was started quite early. One of the things that people do not understand in the United States is the fact that many of these big companies when they go out of the United States they act completely different. Here they pay taxes . . . Here they are regulated . . . The gentleman in the car stops with the red light . . . and so forth . . . Now this same person . . . exactly the same human being . . . goes to another land and suddenly becomes different . . . becomes a colonizer . . . and this thing got out of hand very early in the history of the Republic. Now, Castro took advantage of the negative sides of these things . . . he said: If we have gangsters in the Capri and we have gangsters in the Havana Hilton from the Batista regime, we are going to get rid of these people . . . He didn't stop one step further and he said: We are going to nationalize these big . . . the American industries and the refineries and I am going to run them with Russian oil. The Esso refinery is called now "Nico Lopez" refinery. Sabotage has been attempted several times by the underground but the security measures are quite effective. It has not been possible to do any damage to the inside installations, only minor damages once or twice to the fuel tanks outside.

One of the greatest of the economic blockade that the United States has imposed on Cuba is the oil from Russia being brought in English vessels. The English sublet these ships to the Russian government and they bring in the oil. If the flow of vessels from the Russian ports stops it would be a tremendous breakdown for the whole regime because everything is run mainly with oil. (Here is a long pause followed by 16 seconds of gay music featuring the high notes of a trumpet.)

The blockade has been more effective against the socialist regime of Castro in minor mechanical equipment (the trumpet and the band continues playing as background music) such as cars, refrigerators and airconditioned equipment and things of the sort. These were, of course, 90% American made, therefore you find in the streets of Havana cars that don't run because of lack of parts, that car has to be thrown out because of lack of maybe a bolt and this is

where the thing hits the cars. (The background music never stopped but, suddenly, the "mysterious" exile stopped talking and we had another 15 seconds of solid music.) But in heavy equipment it is a different story. Lots of trucks and machinery and harvest devices are coming continuously from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Russia. (Another 14 seconds of music, gay, happy music followed.) Russians, Czechoslovakians and Eastern Germans . . . They have come over to help with military installations and sometimes to heavy equipment distribution . . . Sometimes to administer farms . . . (here the speaker stops talking and the whistle of a locomotive is heard, good and loud, for 5 seconds).

The Cuban Army today is the best trained and the best equipped one in all Latin America, approximately 100,000 regular men and about 300,000 to 400,000 militia . . . then you have the weapons coming from Russia and Czechoslovakia . . . the radar (?) guns and patrol boats and radar systems and missiles and airplanes . . . it will take a very massive major military operation to invade the island, to do something in the way of changing the situation by a military take over (the speaker stops and we hear the sound of guns and machine gun being fired and a distant plane taking off; this sound effect lasts 12 seconds). The sight of the Russian soldier disguised in civilian clothes in the streets of Havana became quite an experience with many of the Cubans. . . .

A phrase that you could hear very often in Cuba was: "Castro's revolution is very good but communism is not good. The revolution has been betrayed . . . now U.S. imperialism—quotations—has been replaced by Russian imperialism . . . This is not the Cuban nationalistic revolution wanted but the bringing of a foreign nation to rule the political destiny of our own land (again he stopped to let the audience hear the roar of a jet plane taking off and fading away in the distance, for a total of 11 seconds).

The amount of people that have left Cuba since the beginning of the Castro regime is quite difficult to determine. They would place the figure in about half million human beings. The moment you decide to go you have to apply for the visa and the passport. The lines in front of the Mexican consulate, waiting in line sometimes a whole day, or two days, but this is only the beginning of the nightmare . . . Then is the long waiting period . . . the period also procuring some pesos in the proper hands, or the visa never appears. . . . Finally the permit comes . . . then you have to surrender all your properties. . . . If you still own a house you have to give it to the government . . . then you have to wait for a place in a plane to Mexico or to Spain. If you don't have the pushing that it takes to get a place for you tomorrow then you may wait one year. . . .

In the beginning, of course, it was the Batista people, then came the very high aristocracy . . . the high classes . . . immediately it was followed by the professionals, mainly engineers and doctors . . . then some intellectuals . . . university professors . . . then the middle class, then the workers . . . and the peasant even (small pause and again a distant uproar like a plane passing by is perfectly audible—this lasted 7 seconds).

When the National Institute for Agrarian Reform—The INRA—became a very powerful institution one of the first things they did was to diversify the agriculture. The basic economy of Cuba, of course, was sugar. Not only now sugar was going to be raised but also some other crops. This brought about a great confusion. The corn and the rice that were introduced into this scheme failed for lack of preparation. This brought about rationing with the people waiting in line today for everything, the complete new measure that Cuba never witnessed. Castro blamed all this trouble to the United States blockade,

but this blockade of the imports that the island had before is combined definitely with the lack of results of many of the plans that the INRA put into effect. The government now owns about 70% of the land. After this failure, sugar is being planted in great quantities once more but at the present time, of course, the sugar situation is about 40% down in relation to the pre-Castro days.

These houses were given mainly to the poor elements of the population. Of course this does not mean that everyone is completely and totally happy. The official figures mention the need of 400,000 units and only 25,000 have been built so far. The people that have received these new houses—a little better than 5%—act as one of the main sources of support for Castro and the revolution. (The speaker stops. A bird is clearly heard singing for 8 seconds and when the bird stops Castro's high pitch voice comes in strongly shouting: "Nuestro pueblo se enfrentará" (our people will face) followed by applause.)

The revolutionary defense committees are groups of citizens that Castro has established in Cuba. They are the watchdogs of the revolution, they are supposed to check on every neighbor, report any suspicious activities like meetings, like gatherings of people at late night. It works quite effectively. Castro in many cases has discovered many underground movements trying to form there (all this time Castro's voice is perfectly audible in the background giving a highly emotional speech, at times becoming somewhat stronger).

If you express an opinion in a cafe, if you complain about transportation, if you complain about rationing or you complain about food that's alright . . . but if you are a teacher or an educator and you express an opinion which is not (Castro's voice is heard louder in the background as the speaker makes a convenient pause) the official one, then you get into trouble, because this is indoctrination for the youth. The moral issue remains that, of course, it is a police state and that people go to jail just for the thinking basically against the revolution. (Again a pause and Castro's voice is clearly heard referring to "trabajo"—work.)

In many cases the political prisoner in Cuba is treated even worse than the common criminal. (Pause and shouts from the crowd are overheard.) There are no tribunals and no real court procedures nowadays. The exact number of prisoners is impossible to determine. Estimates vary from 70,000 to 15,000 like Fidel himself has expressed. (Pause and Castro's voice coming in again in the background strong and forceful, full of fire.) The families of the prisoners have tried to always help them one way or the other. Committees have been formed . . . Letters sent to international organizations . . . These have not worked very well, really. After all no totalitarian revolution is generous. If you don't have connections or know anyone you stay in jail until you die, disappear, get freedom in the next generation . . . No one knows what . . . (another pause and the voice of a singer is heard clearly singing: "el dia primero aquel" (that first day . . .)

The Becarios constitute one of the groups in Cuba today which are better off (pause and the singer is overheard again). They are the young offsprings of the peasants, or of the low class workers, or of the Negro who were born in the interior of the island and for the first time they come to Havana (the music grows in intensity "al cabo del primer año rapite . . ."—at the end of the first year repeats). They are treated very nicely by the government, they are given accommodation, clothing and transportation and they are put through college and universities (music strong again). The Becarios are housed in the old big mansions of the rich class in Miramar, in fact in my own house when I left there and they use all things that were left in the house, the

furniture and the radio and so forth. These are the people that Fidel mainly counts on for the future. Fidel knows very well that if his revolution is still in power in ten years he will be safe for ever because they, the new generation . . . like what happens in Russia, for example, is perfectly indoctrinated in the new system. (The speaker stops and the singers—a very fine, well balanced group with good voices and rhythm to spare sing for 30 seconds—one half a minute—" . . . para contra ley le deparan los de abajo, para el hombre sin trabajo muerto de hambre en el batey . . ." and the chorus sings: "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel', "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel'" . . . for against the law applied to the ones below, to the unemployed starving to death at the batey—farm home site— . . . and the people after one year repeats 'thank you Fidel'—and the melody dies off with the music of the guitars repeating the leitmotiv "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel'. The Americans don't understand most of the lyrics but they surely understand 'gracias Fidel' and that is all that is necessary.)

These people represent a dying class in Cuba. These are the people that have been given the alternative of either joining the revolution or being completely displaced. In a totalitarian state like such as Cuba if you do not belong to an organization . . . to the party . . . to the militia . . . you just . . . you are out. In some cases if you have some properties then you can live on with that to the rest of your days: The law says you are paid an allowance until you die. If they would come to the United States or go to any other country they would just find themselves with 5 dollars in their pocket. There is no claim . . . there is no moral commitment or force inside these people to make them move so they just vegetate . . . (pause and the singers play: "y el pueblo después de un año repite 'gracias Fidel'"—and after one year the people repeats "thank you Fidel").

Shortly after the revolution triumph, elements of the Catholic Church slowly but firmly started to oppose Castro. Castro reacted quite quickly by deporting all foreign born priests, a measure that affected mainly the Spanish orders. With the nationalization of the Catholic schools many of the chapels were transformed to warehouses or to schools of pure Marxist indoctrination. Just as the wave of anti-Catholicism approached a climax the Vatican started an official policy of separation of church and politics. The results were very immediate. A Castro envoy to the Vatican and a new papal nuncio with full powers in Havana. The churches remained open. Mainly the people within the churches are older people.

My family has a mausoleum in the "colon" cemetery (music heard far away very softly, guitars and singers) at least fifteen people are buried there. My parents and my grandparents and some of the relatives. (Same music goes on in background) in the 30's and 40's the cemetery became a status symbol. You had to own two Cadillacs and then a big tomb inside the cemetery. If a big angel was on top (?) it was better. Some of these tombs were like the ancient Egyptian ones, with corridors and two or three floors, elevators, air condition, private chapels. Now, this was one of the elements that Fidel took as part of the corruption of the past, this desire to express in death the difference of classes. Today the cemetery is nationalized, does not belong any more to the Catholic Church and although people continue to bury their dead there, it is not even so easy to buy marble nowadays and if you just leave with all your relatives the weed grows and the dome of the tomb may crack and just remain so.

If my father and mother remain still there an allowance is given to them monthly until they die one day eventually. If the situation would remain like that with no possibility of even visiting them one day, it probably will

be the end of a long line. (You hear the guitars and singers very near—3 seconds.)

ANNOUNCER. The second Cuban, a man completely dedicated to the success of Castro's new social order. Before the revolution he was a part time mechanic. Today he is a factory official and an officer in Castro's militia. (Music starts immediately after this, coming closer everytime, people uproaring and singing Cuba si, Cuba si, Cuba si, Yanquis no immediately after the music—20 seconds.)

(Voice of second Cuban:)

My name is Jose Garcia Nicolas, 38 years old, I work at the Empresa Consolidada Del Cigarro as a personal (he probably means "personnel") manager. When Fidel come to Cuba I was very, very happy because I was expecting something new. I knew the change . . . I knew something in my mind that is different that the other government we used to have in Cuba. First we have to form a militia in each factory. They showed me how to handle machinegun and M-1 and all American guns. I spent 17 months as part of my duty, second lieutenant, then the personnel manager quit Cuba so they said to me: "Do you want to take the place of the personnel manager of the Empresa?" I was surprised because I don't think that I can make good. Before the revolution I used to have two different jobs. I made \$480 dollars a month. This income made me of the middle class, you know, so when I take this job I make \$290 dollars. That means that my income comes down so I am here for about almost 30 months in this job. I am proud I got it; I expect to do good. I am not expect to disappoint the revolution. Every morning I have to use the phone to call the factory to ask him what happens if they got any trouble, so I can go there and see if I can fix the things with the union and the managers. Somos Socialistas . . . it means we are Socialist in mind and body (a few notes are heard on a guitar, small pause and a singer starts singing: "Yo del Ingles conozco poca cosa pues solamente hablo en Español, pero entiendo a los pueblos cuando dicen: Yanqui go home"—I know very little English; I only talk Spanish, but I understand the peoples when they sing: Yankee go home—then you hear the singer and guitar fading and the voice clearly starts talking again—music and song 17 seconds.)

Before 1959 I bought my . . . my car, a Plymouth 1950, the moment the car stops I have to change for a bicycle or a bus. So I have to take the bus because my brake wasn't good this morning (the singer approaches again, now singing clearly: "Lo dicen en Manila y en Corea, en Panama, en Turquia y en Japon, el clamor es el mismo en todas partes: Yanqui go home"—They say it in Manila and in Korea, in Panama, in Turkey and in Japan, the demand is the same everywhere: Yankee go home."—17 seconds—while the music is fading again the man starts talking).

They call me that they have got trouble over there so I get there and asked the manager; he is a Negro, a good fellow, one of the best men that we have in the whole Empresa. Imagine a Negro managing in a factory before the revolution! The real position of the Negro in Cuba before the revolution came is the same as the United States Now! And now, you see that by myself we . . . We go dancing together, we have dinner together, we have lunch together. (Small pause.)

Before the revolution came it was very difficult to get in a cigarette factory. Sometimes the worker has to pay for getting a job over there. It was a big corruption in the union. Now . . . it is not anymore.

This is Yolanda my wife, 32 years old, we got married in 1952. She is going shopping with her ration books. We got one chicken per person a month, we get 16 pounds of rice a month,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a pound of meat, if we don't have meat, if we don't have the

rice that we used to have before the revolution we accept the problem. We got to fix our troubles in our own way so we don't have to complain about that.

I have been using the same barbershop since I moved this place. Armando was with the police before the revolution he was a copper, and 90% of the coppers hit the people in the street . . . they kill the people in the streets! Before the revolution they take everything they want, clothes, cigarettes. They go to the movies . . . they don't have to pay anything. I think he doesn't like the revolution on account he doesn't have any political pictures in the barber shop, even in the house. And he doesn't express in any good way about the revolution and I don't know why he stays here, I surprised, I think he is making about \$15 or \$20 dollars a day . . . he is making good money . . . is the only one we have around.

Before the revolution I had to quit the school because I had to go to work (brief pause) so I quit the school in the sixth grade in 1939. I decided to go to school at night because you have to improve your intellectual, otherwise you won't help much the revolution. So I'm taking class from Sunday to Friday from eight o'clock to ten thirty. I think is good thing to go to school, I like mathematics and Spanish my teacher is one of the youngest teachers that we have in school, is . . . a nice pretty gal (en-tonation with gaiety of the last phrase) Delay, Delay (?) is her name. We are always talking how pretty you come tonight teacher, what happen, you going some place, the movie? Oh no, I am going to my boyfriend. And I don't think my wife is jealous about the teacher, is one of those things, you know. Is a teacher, we respect her as a teacher. They show us the way we can go to a socialist country and next, become a Communist country . . . I believe that they say because it is the scientific thing. It's very interesting when you left a school 20 years ago and then you have to go to school again, the teachers go more easy for you.

My wife Yolanda works in the Cuban Telephone Company (before saying this last phrase you clearly hear a telephone operator saying: "Miami I have a messenger call going to Tampa, Florida) She makes the International calls from Miami, Europe, China, the whole part of the world. It was a private company an American Company, they was nationalized in 1959. So the revolution came, the revolution need qualified people so she told me she want to work. Say I, I don't want you to work all the money I am making is enough to support the family. Says "Listen, I want to work because the Revolution ask for people who speak English.", my wife makes \$135 dollars a month. She doesn't come back at home until eight o'clock in the morning but I think she is making pretty good. She says that she likes the job. (small pause while you are listening to the operators in the telephone company and one of them says clearly "go ahead, hablo," then, you hear voices).

This is a CDR meeting. The main duties of the CDR defense is watching the counter-revolutionaries, watching the "gusanos", gusanos means those people who doesn't are with us. The gusanos says that they are afraid of talk that we put them in jail if they talk. That's a big lie! We are Marxist, we are Leninist, we don't accept such a big liar! You can talk everything you like, except against the revolution. You have to talk right. You can talk rumors or bolas. Gusanos tell that Fidel is a traitor, we don't accept that because Fidel is . . . is honest. We know that. If I can slap a face I'll do it! If I have to smash their head, we smash it; I (you immediately hear a great uproar of voices singing, "Cuba St. Yanquis No")—53 seconds.

When the meeting was out I was to get

home at two o'clock in the morning. So I get up at six o'clock to make some voluntary work at the sugar cane field at Pinar Del Rio, Habana Libre Central. I was talking with my assistant and other three other members that suppose to come, come to the sugar cane field for voluntary work.

So Monday morning I will tell them what happened that only three came. I wish the employees of the Empresa, the one hundred and twenty five come to make voluntary work but I can't make those people come to sugar cane because all those people, even my brother doesn't think about it. My brother is a doctor! He stays at home, he doesn't want to come make voluntary work. I don't think he likes the revolution because he used to have good money and now he has to work eight hours. But I got an idea he become a good revolutionary, I hope so because he doesn't think bad things. I don't go to sleep, I go to voluntary work, I like to do that kind of job! Because you feel happy. They don't care about the revolution they prefer to stay at bed. Someone's make the job for him. (The noise of an approaching car sounding the siren is heard) The guy is my assistant, Luis San Martin, is one of the best man I have as assistant. The girl is Gisella. Before the revolution she was a domestic and become a good secretary now and one of the best girls that we have there. She is a member of UJC. That means Union de Jovenes Comunistas—Union of Communist Youth—she is a quiet girl and dynamic and nice girl (brief pause, then you hear children singing, children songs—11 seconds).

Today is Pepin's birthday. He is 8 years old. I felt a little tired because of the voluntary work last day but I happy when I see my boy is coming at 8 and all those kids coming to the house (all the time the children singing are heard in the distance in the background) and we buy a cake with 8 candles and we invite all neighbors (now the voices of the children are heard loud and clear for 22 seconds) Yolandita is a little mad because everybody was so interested in Pepin and the cake was for Pepin, so next time will be Yolandita.

This is my father in law profirio. He works at the cigarette factory. He was a cab driver in Chicago, he too lived in the States about 20 years and he got married in Cuba and went to Spain also during the Spanish Revolution, the Civil War. I was there three times in the States. Before the revolution came I was eighteen years old. You know . . . when you are young you are looking for something new. I was trying to stay there but they asked me for money, two thousand dollars . . . if I have two thousand dollars I don't have to go there looking for nothing, so I stayed here.

There is another children come to the party and some of the fathers doesn't are with the Revolution. We accept because the kid don't have the fault of the fathers. The children can come to my party anytime they want. We don't care about that. (Brief pause and children singing again and laughing and applauding, then the children start rhythmically: "Denme La F. F. Denme La I. I. Denme La D, D, Denme La E, E, at this point the man starts.) Give the F, La Otra, I can't hear it, more louder, say give me the F, give me the I, louder, I can't hear you, give me the D, give me E and give me the L, Fidel, Fidel (then children voices clearly singing rhythmically "Fidel, Fidel, campeon, te comiste el tiburón en las playas de Girón" "Fidel, Fidel, campeon, te comiste el tiburón en las playas de Girón"—Fidel, Fidel, champ, you ate the shark at the beaches of Girón . . . Fidel, Fidel, champ, you ate the shark at the beaches of Girón . . .)

I wish I could talk with Fidel personally. He leads the revolution and he show the Marxismo-Leninismo. I think he is the greatest man I ever saw in my life (at this point

the children that have been singing all the time in the distance got closer and said clearly: "Fidel, seguro a los yanquis dales duro"—Fidel be sure to hit the Yankees hard—while fading away again.) I hope that my kid grow up in a socialist country and a Communist country (the children that were singing all the time are heard clearly singing "Fidel, seguro, Fidel, seguro, a los yanquis dales duro. Izquierda, Izquierda, izquierda, siempre izquierda"—Left, left, left, always left. (While the children finish their singing a march is heard approaching while the children voices are fading completely, many voices as in a meeting—49 seconds).

ANNOUNCER. The third Cuban, he is a semi-illiterate and knows little of politics. He is typical of the farmers and laborers who make up the bulk of the island's population. (Brief pause, and a voice saying in Spanish: *Mi Nombre, Francisco Consegra Salgado. Su edad, mi edad es 46 ño* (here a new voice starts serving as interpreter repeating what he says . . .) My name is Francisco Consegra Salgado, I am 46 years old, "Trabajo en Salud Publica, champeando los solares yermos, parte del rio y zanjas, para que la plaga no ataque al pueblo"—I work at a public health department. I use my machete to clear the bushes so as to wipe out the mosquitos near the river. (Brief pause, then a noise as an instrument cutting, a machete.) I make \$88 pesos and 10 cents and I work 6 hours every day (in the background the noise is audible all the time, then a "conga" is heard and the voice starts again). Before the revolution I used to make more on occasion but I didn't have a steady job (the "conga" still is the background music). So, before, I could have made . . . \$100 dollars in 15 days, for instance, but then I was off work, now I make less but my job is steady. The boots and the working clothes are given to me by the ministry, that is why when I finish work I take them off, put them away and I change into new clothes. (More music—10 seconds—a voice saying clearly: "a gozar, a gozar, a gozar.")

After I get off work I like to go to a nearby cafe where I like to have a glass cold water and some coffee and I invite my friends to have coffee with me. There's my friend Mesa, and Rafael Adalberto.

The papers are handed here. We have to sign them daily and give them to the foreman who will take them out afterwards to the ministry. This is done for payroll purposes so that our name appear on them and they know which day we worked. I know many cafe that due to the shortage of cups are using marmelade jars.

I can walk home, all the way home, but on this day, because is raining, I decided to take a bus take me home (pause).

Some of the people who work with me we like to stop at this pastry place and buy some pastries and some bread, some of us we like to eat our bread here so we stayed (?) out back before taking it to our house. But there seem to be some people that do not favor revolution, they go around saying "I am hungry and there is no another this no another that" whatever the people get I do get also so there I don't feel there is a shortage of food. (Unintelligible word.) Bread is no rationed you can buy as much bread as you wish. This picture that we see here about Fidel, Camillo, are hung in these bread houses which have been nationalized by the government are hung up on the walls by the government . . . after I finish eating my pastries and bread I get on board bus number ten and I get a transfer for bus number twentythree. Afterwards I must still get another bus to get home. The fare cost me eighteen cents, it takes me about 30 minutes to get home by bus. (you hear the bus sound as it is leaving a trumpet plays rythmically 35 seconds)

My wife name is Juanita Lafita, she is twenty five years old. My youngest son, his

name Nelson, he is six years old, then comes Vilma, she is 7. Finally there is Della who is 8 years old. I am a member of the CDR, I do guard duty at night to try to prevent any sabotage. During the Bay of Pigs invasion I am not used to my guard and block. If I see any unusual happening I would have reported immediately. (brief music sound in distance)

Now I have a couple of pigs and a few chickens on the back yard. (Sounds of chickens—a second) my son Nelson is the one who feeds the chickens (chicken heard) and some times my daughters like to do that too, but he chases them away (unintelligible) a place for minor. (Chickens heard again)

The school presently existing in the neighborhood was built by the former government. My children go to this school, my wife was at the school up to fifth grade and myself up to fourth grade. My son wishes to become a technician when he grows up, one of my daughters wishes to become a nurse and the other is fond of domestic work. These toys they are playing with now were brought them by the three Wise Men on the night of January 5th. I buy toys for them; I paid three dollars for each doll so that they would find them early when they woke up in the morning of January 6th. Before the breaking of Cuban/United States trade we used to get American toys here in Cuba, they were good dolls and I say this without detriment to the quality of the Socialist dolls which happen to be good dolls too. Back in 1962 we received a shipment of toys from the People's Republic of China and that made us very happy because we felt that on account of blockade we won't have as many toys available.

Some relatives of mine from Oriente Province came to see me. How long was it that we have not seen each other, and it was because of the hurricane that has hit us in Oriente province, it was an awful hurricane which did us a lot of damage; 4 families were lost including some members of my own family. (Dancing music heard.) We of the family seldom go out at night to the movie or dancing, but my children like to dance great deal. We have radio and always have had a radio (music in background) and they like to dance inside of the house. My wife go to a clinic where services are offered here absolutely at no cost by the government. If is a baby girl we'll name her Dania, if it is a boy we'll call him Panchito, that's the same name as the father. I keep a picture of Fidel because I am an admirer of the revolution. I also have a portrait of Santa Barbara . . . we are not Catholics . . . we never go out to church . . . I don't know the history of Jesus Christ. And not do I know the history of Santa Barbara, but I feel devotion for Santa Barbara and . . . I like to have her picture in my house.

Some of the members of the defense committee might be familiar with the work of Carlos Marx and Engels, but as to myself I am not familiar with it. (Pause, you hear the radio on) but I understand that socialism and communism is that now we workers and honest people have somebody to defend us because in the old times they really gave us a rough time. Marx, Engels, Kruschov, the social workers doing a kind of job similar to what Fidel Castro is doing with our people now (pause finish music).

This is the area where I used to live late in 1958. This was a slum in Luyano, I managed to buy the shack I used to live in for seventy pesos. Living conditions in this slum were extremely bad, when it rained there was more water inside the house than outside, there were ten thousand people also living here. Narcotics and prostitution were all over the place in connivance with the police.

With the advent of revolution things started changing. These new houses were given to us by the revolutionary government we put in so many thousand hours each of us

building these houses. In my own case I put in 3,370 extra hours and my lease stipulates that I will not begin paying rent until sometime in 1970.

There are some advantages that I didn't have before, for instance, now I work six hours a day, but after I get off work then I have plenty of extra time in my spare time during the afternoon time to grow some corn right in front my place and that means an extra income that I get for my household.

I have a Chinese fan, I needed one and I had the money, there were no other fan available; I pay forty pesos for this Chinese fan. I had to make no sacrifice to purchase it. Everytime I had a chance I save away five dollars, ten dollars, whatever I had in hand to use (a few words are unintelligible).

When I first came to Havana I had to pay out seventy pesos for the shack I used to live in, in the slum section where my house was. In addition I had to pay two pesos every week to a police copper named Horacio: Now I don't have to pay those two pesos anymore. So I could perfectly have saved up forty pesos and then buy the electric fan which I now have.

I have some relatives in Oriente, they live in huts, in country huts. Now the conditions of these huts are quite different from those that the house I live in which was given to me by the revolutionary government. The floorings are made of boards . . . sometimes made of tiles . . . sometimes plain earth . . . I feel very happy and very lucky to have a house as the one I have today and not like the one I used to have right next to a stream of sewerage water.

Some people say that the Cuban revolution is OK but communism isn't. Now, my own feeling about this: If this government has given me new housing and other facilities which I now enjoy as a human being, then, I for one say, that I like communism . . . I am a Communist.

(Unidentified voice) (the following sounds like that of the first Cuban:) This is the story of Cuba today, Cuba Socialista, Cuba today is definitely very strong military dictatorship. The freedom of speech of press, even of expressing our own opinion in the streets, is of course gone. Castro is alive. Tomorrow he may die, he may be shot but the following remains with Castro or without Castro. (In distance music is heard.) The revolution in Cuba is like a signal, is the beginning of something very big, it is not an isolated problem, it is a challenge, not only for the United States but for the nations of Western Europe as well.

As I look back upon the last five years of my life I wonder what answers could we give, what could we find as a real tool against poverty and misery which are the ideal elements of communism. How can we shape the Alliance for Progress so it becomes a real effective instrument. How can we answer the third Argentinian, the third Chilean, the third Uruguayan so the story of these three Cubans does not repeat in a carbon copy in other countries. (The noise comes clear now and the background music is approaching closer and closer—popular music 30 seconds, then about fifteen seconds a hymn which we could not identify is heard.)

ANNOUNCER. We have seen and heard what the revolution means to three Cubans, each from a different level of Cuban society. There are others who would have given different impressions yet, the experiences, the feelings, the attitudes of these three are representative of large groups of their countrymen and of life on the island today (music heard briefly).

This is NET, the National Educational Television Network.

Remember share the good life. One of the keys to the good life in South Florida is the diversified cultural and informational programs scheduled of your community television station. Support Channel 2. Send your

tax deductible contributions to the Community Television Foundation, 1701 DuPont Building, Miami, Florida.

## NOTES

1. Punctuation has been added according to pauses and emphasis in tape recording.

2. Sound effects are described by us parenthetically. The time-length of the sound effects has been carefully timed and noted. The background sound effects are a most important subliminal tool used by the Director of the film.

3. When in doubt about the interpretation of a word or sentence, because of poor recording or bad pronunciation, we have indicated so by a question mark in parenthesis.

## EXHIBIT 2

## ANATOMY OF A FILM ANALYSIS OF "THREE FACES OF CUBA"

(By Edward Hunter)

The hour-long documentary film, "Three Faces of Cuba," was brought to my attention first in script form. An advertisement in TV Guide of March 22, 1965, contains this description of it: "Producer-director Robert Cohen, who filmed TV-documentaries in Cuba, China and East Germany, returns to Cuba for this look at developments since the 1959 revolution. Three Cubans—an upper middle-class exile, a revolutionary and a worker—tell the story."

I suspected that the "China" referred to in the advertisement did not mean Free China, which the U.S.A. recognizes, and, sure enough, it did not. It referred to Red China, which we do not recognize, a subtle piece of pro-communist propaganda in itself.

"Three Faces of Cuba" was produced for the National Educational Television Network (N.E.T.), for showing through its nationwide outlets. These number 91, according to its Washington office. The film, until May 5, 1965, was available for purchase in 16 mm. width from Audio-Visual Center, N.E.T., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, although shipments came from a Michigan university. This was no small project. Students and academic circles were prime targets.

Later I had the opportunity of seeing "Three Faces of Cuba."

## FILM FITS PROPAGANDA PATTERN

"Three Faces of Cuba" brought back memories of the propaganda analysis in which I engaged for the U.S. Military and various government agencies during World War II and in the post-war years. This included many enemy films. "Three Faces of Cuba" was fully in the spirit of these films.

My first reading of the script gave me the impression that I had seen this text before, or the film. As I went over it more carefully, recollections dawned on me. No, I had not seen this particular movie, but I had come across many like it. The format was old hat. I had met this pattern in productions by Red China and other communist countries, Nazi Germany, ultranationalist Japan during its period of continental aggression, and Fascist Italy.

The intent was always the same—to white-wash totalitarian excesses and to support a regime of terror, while concealing this in a false context of impartiality and objectivity.

The script was sent me by The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., of 646 S.W. 12th Ave., Miami, Florida. A couple of weeks later I flew there at the invitation of Luis V. Manrara, its executive director, to attend a special, private showing of the film, requested of the Community Television Foundation of South Florida, Inc., of which James I. Keller Jr. is president.

It took place in the auditorium of the Lindsey Hopkins Education Center, operated by the Dade County Board of Public Instruction.

The Committee retained me to evaluate the film at this presentation, arranged at the insistence of Mr. Manrara, as the result of numerous protests against it by informed Americans and anti-communist Cuban exiles who had seen its television production in Miami. Protests against the film had come also from other cities where it had been shown throughout the nation.

## FILM IS "BLACK" PROPAGANDA

What I saw amply bore out the various accusations. The film obviously was not intended for Cubans or others acquainted at first hand with conditions in today's Cuba. The target is the American people generally, who lack the means to check up on what is in the film, and are without sufficient knowledge of propaganda tactics to detect the professional use of it against them.

Just as plainly, the target of the film includes the youth in the educational institutions of the United States.

Anything to which the respectable term, educational, can be ascribed possesses an advantage. The fact that it was a project of a so-called educational network gave it a presumed validity. As such, it was attitude-changing as regards Castro and Red Cuba, painting both in quite favorable colors, and seemingly as an aside ascribing only low motives and a base character to the United States and Americans generally. This is its primary impact in the United States, reinforcing the hackneyed smears found in red anti-American propaganda. Its approach is communist. The film is practically without a scene that can be divorced from this prored format. Yet it is presented as a factual account of present-day life on our Cuban island neighbor, supposedly arranged and produced independently, for the enlightenment of the people of the United States, including their student communities.

This puts the "Three Faces of Cuba" into a propaganda category called "black" or clandestine. The professional terms, "black," "white" and "gray," should become known to all the American people, and their usage explained, to help them protect their minds from being immobilized or captured during this cold war period of intensified assault.

"White" or overt propaganda is simple, and in perhaps a majority of cases is legitimate and even ethical. Its source is open or un concealed. The origin of whatever message is being disseminated, or action being taken, is made clear, so the recipient or audience is able to gauge its motivation. This is as it always should be.

"Gray" propaganda brings in a dissembling device. It is midway between "white" and "black." Its true source is concealed. But the channel used, that is made to appear as the source that initiated the message or action, is on the same side. The ransom of Cuban prisoners after the Bay of Pigs betrayal was a "gray" operation. The U.S. government initiated it, but the American people were told that it originated within their own ranks, which was untrue. Jack Paar, as a private television performer, lent himself to this "gray operation" initiated by Robert F. Kennedy, who was then the attorney general.

## OUR ENEMIES FAVOR "BLACK" PROPAGANDA

Then there is "black" propaganda, favored by America's enemies in their "cold war" against the United States. By this device, they release their message or initiate an action through an American vehicle as the ostensible source. This is the most dangerous propaganda tactic in the psychological warfare being waged against us. When the source of a foreign propaganda maneuver appears as American, the latter's role may be conspiratorial, collaborative, or wholly innocent, itself deceived regarding where its attitude-changing operation originated. We must guard against falling into such booby traps in psychological warfare. Those who produce mind-influencing material, as well as those

who are the recipients of it, have an equal responsibility in this. Communism could make no inroads among us without resort to "black propaganda," spread through seemingly innocent or educational fronts. These constitute a transmission belt for the "black" material initiated by the communists, with the people of the United States as the target.

"Black" thus simply means the use of an opponent to express one's own views. What could be more subversive or perilous? Yet the United States is constantly falling for this nefarious tactic. Reds employ it by using Americans to convey an anti-American message, for example. In order to shield their minds from attack, people must understand how propaganda operates. We come up against it daily in the misnamed "cold war," that is only deceitfully cold. This phase of warfare can paralyze a nation, setting it up for a fall, which is the objective of the red "psywar" (psychological warfare) planners, and the goal toward which each of their projects is pointed. The communists, to whom dialectical materialism is a bible, and who plan every action from a materialistic, collectivist viewpoint, conduct their propaganda entirely within this framework. Their propaganda is not intended just to alter a mind, but to bring about an action favorable to the red cause.

They are utterly pragmatic about this. They teach that every piece of propaganda must be designed to achieve an action of some sort. Their art work must be appraised from this point of view if we are not to be a pushover for pro-red machinations.

However arranged and whoever its participants, "Three Faces of Cuba" fits neatly into this setting. The American people, especially the inexperienced minds of our young people, with their utopian aspirations, are the main target of this film. Its message is that we have wrongly and unjustly judged Castro and communism, and that the evil is to be found among ourselves and in our free society, and not in the red ranks. The inevitable implication, too, is that we must not be lured into opposing Castro or Red Cuba—and inferentially, communism anywhere—but be friendly, and support these rather than our own country and its goals.

A college boy who sees this film and then is urged by reds on the campus, among the professors or the student body, to go out and demonstrate, carrying banners proclaiming refusal to bear arms for his country, or to fight against the red enemy in Viet Nam or elsewhere, would have been prepared by it for this. His resistance would have been corroded, unless he previously had been alerted to its propaganda content, and was able to recognize it for what it is, a deadly weapon in the red military arsenal aimed at the United States.

## FILM EXPOSED BY ALERT CUBAN EXILES

"Three Faces of Cuba" was spotted through the alertness of stalwart Cuban expatriates, particularly The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., which took up the cudgels. Thanks to it, this insidious film has been exposed. If as a result, the American people become better acquainted with the softening-up tactics used against them, and gain a greater insight into how they have been submitted to skillful, pro-red propaganda, these Cubans will have repaid to this extent for the haven given them in the United States. They well recognize the interdependence of freedom. Americans owe a debt of gratitude to these exiled Cubans for their unrelenting efforts.

The Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., pioneered among Cuban organizations in the ideological field. It is not fighting against Castro alone—nor alone for the freedom of stricken Cuba—but against international communism, on behalf of God, country and the dignity of man, knowing that these are interrelated. The Committee is doing this with a staff of underpaid and unpaid men

and women, on the most meager resources, united by the realization that the fight is a common one, in which all free peoples have an equal stake.

#### REDS CONTROL NEWS RIGIDLY

Although this film is attributed to Americans, and its sponsorship is American, and it is distributed through American channels, it is the communist voice of Castro that we hear throughout, in virtually every phase of it. Practically all, if not all of the film, was photographed in Red Cuba. The inescapable conclusion from these circumstances is that the film might as well have received the imprint of the Red Cuban propaganda ministry. Its arrangement and supervision could have been only Red Cuba's, whether the control was exercised directly, indirectly, or even tacitly. Otherwise the filming could not have been made in Red Cuba, and the sound effects could not have been added.

These sound effects are the film's most revealing clues. The sound track added to the film in Cuba, and the speech that apparently was dubbed in, constitute the most effective part of the propagandist impact. These background effects are inserted time and time again, and always with obvious intent. A typical scene is that of the smiling faces of children in the so-called new Cuba, with the voice of Castro dubbed in as if a revolutionary chorus. The subliminal intent, of course, is to attribute the happiness of the children to Castro. Otherwise why juxtapose the two? Such calculated coincidence takes place throughout the production, and had to be planned this way. It could not have happened accidentally.

No communist government permits independent film production of any sort on its soil. It demands control of what is produced, by one means or another. The form this takes is tactical alone, and may appear to be the normal cooperation given by authorities to a visiting photographer. He does as he is ordered, which is one approach, or his will coincides with what the reds want, which is another approach.

If the producer is a sympathizer, or when secret ties exist, these instructions are followed automatically. All of this makes a product "black," and it is the process much preferred by the communist cold war planners for such targets as the United States.

This is not the occasion to go deeply into a description of Robert Cohen, the photographer, but a few points should be mentioned because of their direct relationship to the film. One concerns references to him by Lyle Stuart, who is known—notorious would be the proper word—for his publishing and writing in the fields of obscenity and extreme leftism; he puts out a sort of tabloid called "The Independent."

He gave his whole, 16-page issue of September, 1964 to a several months' stay he made in Red Cuba, during which he: "met Bob Cohen and his wife Helen. . . . He also has a producer with him. He [Cohen] filmed a seven or eight-hour tv interview with Fidel a year ago [1963]. He also did a tv record of two families in Havana and now wants to make a sound tape to go with the film. Doing this for the National Educational Television network.

"Bob Cohen tells me he gave some 60 or 70 lectures on Cuba after his last visit here. . . . He had his own problem (I think he had gone to China) on passport renewal. He refused to answer questions on the passport renewal form, saying that all they were entitled to know is that he is an American citizen."

The Supreme Court in a recent decision has rejected this position, so we can expect prosecution of some of those, at least, who have been defying this country's laws and interests.

The film, as made evident by Lyle Stuart's report, as well as by the testimony of its contents, is a patchwork, processed job, plac-

ing together bits as fit the the context and the objective, then inserting the sound track in order to round out the propaganda task.

The "three faces" of the film are those of an "ardent revolutionary," an "unskilled laborer" and "a university professor . . . now living in exile in the U.S." These conform to the image that the reds create, as a party of workers and peasants, in which intellectuals find their most satisfying outlet.

Two of these are described as Cubans residing in present-day Cuba, and they echo the communist line intact and faithfully. The film follows the format of a production in a free society, whose inhabitants may speak freely, without apprehension over being held strictly to account for every word they utter.

Only the exceptionally well-informed can tell by looking at the film that this was not the case with those interviewed in it. But without such clarification, a deceit is perpetrated on possibly the bulk of its viewers, especially among the youth.

Of course, they say only what they are instructed to say by the propaganda specialists of the Cuban red regime. Otherwise they would be dead ducks! Much the same is patently obvious for the man described as a professor, if not entirely so, for his family was said by the announcer to be still residing in Cuba. His identity is not given, but what should be obvious is that enough sympathizers of persons susceptible to its pressures were connected with the film in one way or another to make quite sure that Castro's henchmen know who he is. Any intelligent man in his position certainly would go under this assumption, that is, if he had any feelings for his family. Such persons left behind, anywhere from Red China to Red Cuba, are hostages for the words and deeds of their relatives residing abroad. They are constantly under an implied or enforced threat or blackmail as countless tragic cases attest.

Blackmail and ransom are well-known, profitable pressures exercised by Cuba's red regime, as elsewhere in the communist orbit.

Whoever knows anything at all about communism knows that anywhere, in any red country, anyone tapped for an interview is known to the authorities, and is going to praise the reds to the skies, no matter how he hates them. In no communist land is there any direct relationship between what one says and the facts. These have to be read between the lines, in the environment, and at best can only be deduced by an educated guess. The idea that a television program can be produced in Red Cuba, with interviews of Cuban residents, and have it give in any way the slightest clue to their actual thinking, is sheer ignorance of how communism operates. One might say that such an interview would give a view of what the red authorities want others to believe about red policy and how people think. No more than this, though.

Looked at this way by alert, informed viewers, some useful information can be gleaned from such films.

Naturally, under such circumstances, even if this had been an ethical attempt to obtain the views of an anti-communist, Cuban refugee, he would not have dared to say anything really detrimental to Castro and Red Cuba, and as can be attested in this case, he certainly does not do so in this film. Quite the contrary. He eulogizes Castro, justifies the communist revolution, and in effect condemns the past society. At the most, he does not go beyond the strictures of an anti-anticommunist. A viewer who is unacquainted with propaganda techniques, certainly a customary student who sees the film, would presume that it is what it presents itself as being, an educational and therefore an objective picture. He would likely accept its pro-communist message as a genuine expression of opinion. He would have no way of knowing whether there was any propaganda manipulation in the film.

Yet there is evidence of such calculated planning from start to finish, for in practically every detail, it conforms to the traditional format of a pro-red propaganda movie.

#### FILM'S OMISSIONS MORE DANGEROUS THAN ITS ASSERTIONS

The major propaganda device used in the film is fabrication by omission. The salient facts about nearly every issue discussed are omitted, and practically the only details included are those that put Castro and communism in a favorable light, irrespective of how much processing and posing they require. The most important omissions, of course, are references to the control mechanism employed by the Cuban Reds, with the guidance and assistance of Chinese, Czech and Russian specialists in brainwashing and terror. All details of atrocities and terror, perpetrated by Castro and his red compatriots, are left unmentioned. Not even a hint suggests that any such excesses take place. Yet incontrovertible evidence has accumulated of such bestiality. This alone would make the film a hoax. What has been omitted from the film, and this must have taken highly skilled and brazenly callous doing at times, is immensely more significant than what was put into it.

Some of the efforts at concealment are ludicrous once seen through, but if undetected, are a highly effective propaganda ruse, of a particularly disarming type.

In the film, the worker who has become an executive says there was "big corruption in the union" in the old days, but "not any more." At the very least, he might have added that trade unions as we know them do not exist in Red Cuba or in any other communist country. They have been converted into what are known in the United States as "company unions." Under communism they are arms of the state, enforcing its demands for increased work and decreased pay. One of the earliest actions of the Castro regime was to crush the strong labor union movement that was in existence. This is typical of the glaring omissions in the film.

The religious symbolism is raw. The announcer tells the viewers at the start of the film that it is the story of three men "whose lives have been changed," the change being achieved by Castro. The setting makes this approach evangelical. A preacher would have been more specific, saying three lives were saved by Christ.

The implication is subliminally left that there is such a similarity. This religious note is strongly reinforced later on. The presumed professor tells us that Castro regards himself as "Christ-like," as a "Messiah," and as "a possessor of the Holy Spirit." No hint is given that this might be sheer blasphemy and a lie, making black into white in the Orwellian manner of the Newspeak and doubletalk of the prophetic novel, "1984."

So far as this film is concerned, too, there is no trace of atheism in Castro or the communist regime, only a sympathetic attitude towards religion.

#### SAME AS ATTENDING A RED RALLY

Almost at the start of the film, at the conclusion of the announcer's capsule descriptions of the "three faces" presented as representative of today's Cuba, the dynamic and enthusiastic voice of Castro is heard neatly and propagandistically fitting into the setting. Indeed, this could be a Castro rally that the audience is attending. The film creates a mood for it. This is the very effective participation gambit, by which on-lookers are caught up by the acting, and subconsciously participate in the scenes. The emotional type—and we all are, in varied degrees—especially youth, and any who come upon the film unconcerned, easily can be moved by this technique into becoming sympathizers of Red Cuba and communism, and their patriotism be commensurately decreased.

## STIRRING MUSIC, THEN APPLAUSE

The announcer practically begins the film with reference to the "university professor in Havana," who "is now living in exile in the U.S." Ordinarily, one would have said that he had been forced to flee—an admission that there was something to flee from. But not in this presentation. He was "alienated" and "displaced." The implication is that he does not fit into the new society. The second man, described as "an ardent revolutionary," and the third as an "unskilled Cuban," are both said to have been benefited by the revolt. As the announcer completes these descriptions, the hym is played of the July 26 Movement, Castro's original rebel group, and "thunderous applause" is heard.

After such an inspirational start, one would feel mean to possess negative thoughts about the Castro regime. If the audience were young, such a psychological opening would be influential in creating a favorable image that would be difficult to change later on.

The first voice that follows the announcer's sounds as if it is the professor's, although it comes on without any introduction.

It offers a rhetorical description of Castro, whom he says he remembers from university years. He provides a superficial analysis of him as an exuberant talker, a "born demagogue" who thought of himself as a messiah. Nothing bad about this, of course. Not a word about his record as a killer from his early years, a criminal type who brought his vicious traits into politics, making it gangsterism and a government racket of the worst sort. A curious statement is made to the effect that Castro has taken the revolt "quite personally," and would "resort to any kind of alliance" to maintain it. At this point Castro's voice is dubbed in, shouting "Long live the socialist revolution," "Long live Marxism-Leninism," and finally, "Fatherland or death," ending up with popular music.

## EXILES PROFESSOR CARRIES RED PROPAGANDA

The alleged professor is supposed to present the opinions of an exile, but actually he repeats the hackneyed, red propaganda line as regards both Cuba and the United States. He says the middle class first thought that the revolt was intended only to clean up corruption, "never realizing that it was a real social revolution."

His seeming criticisms of the Castro regime are rendered respectfully, as a Castro propagandist might present them, as a fulcrum for what actually is favorable and helpful to the red dictator.

An objective film that sought to give opposing viewpoints would have balanced the pro-communist point of view with the opinion of at least one person who was truly anti-communist, and in a position to state freedom's case. This film made no attempt to do so. The few hints of its are a disarming cover for the pro-communist line. The implication is that, as a refugee, the exile in the film would be anti-Castro, and talk at least as frankly as the two who show by their words that they are enthusiastically pro-Castro. This is not done in this film, which alone would make it red propaganda. Special note should be taken, too, of the role occupied by this presumed intellectual. Instead of speaking out against Castro and communism, the role into which he is fit, he is the channel for some of the major red themes. He reinforces the pro-Castro statements of the other two. In actuality, we have virtually no anti-communist or anti-Castro viewpoint expressed in the film.

In propaganda tactics, this is the loaded panel device, in which pro-reds and fake "liberals" monopolize a discussion, often over television, sometimes placed in opposition to a supposed anti-communist who is, at most, a cautious middle-of-the-roader, and is employed as a foil to strengthen the arguments used in support of the pro-red line. The

public should learn to recognize this customary tactic.

## WEDGE-DRIVING TACTIC EMPLOYED

An inseparable part of red psychological warfare is its wedge-driving or splitting tactic. Red gains are frequently the result of success in this alone. Indeed, if the communists were less adept at planting suspicion and sowing enmity between its foes, it would have expired many years ago. As might be anticipated from the format, the "three faces" contribute their bit to this, too.

The so-called professor tells us that the oil embargo we imposed on Cuba is being broken by Russian oil "brought in English vessels." He points out that if this flow of oil stopped, "it would be a tremendous breakdown for the whole regime because everything is run mainly with oil." In other words, he reminds us that England, our ally, is keeping Red Cuba in operation. Significantly, this is followed by a long pause, and then sixteen seconds of gay music that features the high notes of a trumpet. As much as if to say: "It won't stop coming; the American embargo is a farce! America's closest ally has broken it."

The implication is given that the other countries of the free world will bring about the failure of United States efforts to blockade Red Cuba.

The same professorial voice is employed to say that sabotage by anti-Castro elements did little damage to the American oil installations seized by Castro. No detail is given of any single, successful action by anti-Castro Cubans, in spite of the known fact that Cuba's red regime constantly complains and denounces the successful sabotage carried out against it. This, of course, would not have been permitted in this film. The opposite point is brought up on a number of occasions, for obvious psychological effect. The boycott, we are informed, did not even prevent toys from coming into the country from Czechoslovakia for the enjoyment of the children, and even electric fans from Red China were imported to make life pleasant for Cuban workers, who are shown as well-fed, in the act of munching bread, of which we are told there is a limitless supply. A closeup is significantly shown of a Cuban munching away at his bread. We even see a woman carrying home two chickens for dinner. Meager food rationing in Cuba belies the false impression of abundance which the film portrays.

## "VOLUNTARY" WORK NOT EXPOSED

If this film were not intentionally subversive, or if there were any desire for objectivity, there would have been some clarification of the statement by the factory executive that he gets home at 2 a.m. from a political indoctrination meeting, then awakens at 6 a.m. for so-called "volunteer" work in a sugar cane field, besides doing his regular, full-time work. This is the way brainwashing operates, keeping minds so fatigued that they have no time to think over what they are being told, and too weary to resist. The red hierarchy exults over such excess exertion as proof of the people's enthusiasm.

"Voluntary labor" should be exposed as forced labor, for it is obligatory. A task is set forth, perhaps the harvesting of a sugar crop, and people technically are asked to "volunteer." But enough of them are obliged to volunteer to do whatever work the government wants done. The numerous pressures available to communism ensure this. The proof that "voluntary" means "obligatory," in the language of George Orwell's *Newspeak*, is that one never hears of a case when volunteers are asked for, and an insufficient number are obtained because of refusals. There is no alternative. Volunteering is obligatory.

An objective film certainly would have further clarified this statement by adding that the Cuban reds have instituted "military

conscription," and put those drafted onto labor tasks at the minimal wage that soldiers receive, patently an example of the callous exploitation of labor. A television program that leaves the impression that one volunteers to work under communism in the manner that we use the word in the United States is lying to its viewers. Young minds—or any minds—should not be submitted to such falsification in the United States. Free speech does not mean that our children must undergo disloyal and even treasonable teachings. Yet when films of this nature can be shown as "educational," without their being explained for what they are, this is exactly what is happening.

The unannounced voice, presumably the alleged professor's, arises again at the concluding portion of the film, in a continuation of its role as transmission belt for the Cuban red propaganda machine. Castro may die, or even be assassinated, the "professor" says, but his work will remain. Music arises in the distance. He goes on to say that the Cuban revolution is a signal for "something very big," and that this is a challenge to both the United States and Western Europe.

## FILM FOLLOWS A RACIST LINE

The film parallels the communist propaganda lines in practically all respects. One giveaway is the disproportionate stress put upon the Negro as a black man, and his supposed good life in present-day Cuba, as contrasted with the bad life he is supposed to be leading in the United States now, actually likened to his position in Cuba before Castro came on the scene and purportedly rescued him!

This is, indeed, an insurrectionary film, for it maligns the United States and its way of life, and whitewashes that of Cuba under the communists, encouraging an attitude of support for the latter country against the former. The American Negro cannot fail to get the point quite early in the film. The poor and the Negroes could not enter Cuba's "private clubs and private residential sections" and swim at the pleasant beaches before the communists came, but now Castro has opened these to all the people, the film declares, combining a whole set of propaganda twists and half-truths. This glib message is conveyed through the voice of the anonymous figure described in the film as the exiled professor, who declares that Castro told the Negro that "something must be wrong" with him because he "don't even fight" for these rights.

At a time when the socialist-communist political complex in the United States is inciting racial disorders, unwilling to accept any orderly, legal reforms, seeking only to use the Negro issue as a medium for insurrection and the overthrow of the free American form of society, susceptible minds are sure to catch the insurrectionary implication. "You Negroes in America, and you who feel deprived," Castro seems to be saying, "get out on the streets and fight!" What other purpose could there be in making these gratuitous and falsified comparisons with life in the United States in a film that supposedly deals only with conditions on the red-dominated island of Cuba?

The racist issue is rubbed in again and again, sometimes subtly, as in the scene supposedly representing the American role in Cuba before Castro. Now in the Cuban hotels, "instead of American tourists having beers and cocktails in the bar," we are told, there are Russian technicians and Negro workers. The Americans who went to Cuba apparently were all colonizers, gamblers and exploiters, according to the so-called professor. Not a whisper is uttered concerning the really fine contributions and the unstinted assistance that the United States provided to raise living standards generally and enhance the dignity of man. The night clubs were the froth of it, yet they are made to

appear in this propaganda film as the drink itself.

The strip-tease girl wriggling in a bikini in an Americanized nightclub scene is apparently a Negress. The film is full of such indirect allusions and slurs. They are subliminal in nature, irrelevant to the proclaimed purpose of the film, usually consisting of asides or reactions circuitously aroused. Sometimes they are blatant, as in the factory executives' reference to his Negro associate—"we go dancing together."

According to the film, the role that American influence played in Cuba existed only in the form of practically nude dancing girls, raucous nightclubs and gambling joints. These are presented as having now been cleansed and made wholesome by Castro, and opened to middle class and lower middle class revolutionaries for innocent recreation.

We are told that the Negro in Cuba's past was left "to believe in his idols," and we are shown how he supposedly has been brought by Castro into an equal and proud rank alongside his white co-revolutionaries.

#### FILM ATTACKS AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN

In the film, the so-called professor indulges in the usual smears against Americans and United States business generally, as are found in all pro-red propaganda. He repeats, as something taken for granted, that American companies abroad are dishonest and guilty of crimes against the countries where they are established, and that the United States citizen abroad "suddenly becomes different . . . becomes a colonizer."

This is all he has to say of the country where he apparently has found exile, although why he speaks this way is a question left unanswered by the film. The points he brings out practically always parallel the red propaganda line.

#### COMMUNIST IRON-FIST CONTROL

Everyone knows that Castro has set up a watching system to force everyone to spy upon everyone else. One of the purposes of this network of informers is to terrify the people, to make suspicions mutual, so that nobody will trust his neighbor or even relatives and kinfolk. A communist regime regards it as advantageous to have the public exchanging gossip about the ubiquitous ears and eyes of the red rulers, and the fearful controls exercised by the secret police. The film contributes to this state of terror. We are told the system "works quite effectively." "Many underground movements," we are informed, have been uprooted even before they got started. The warning could not be expressed any plainer, especially from the mouth of a supposedly anti-red Cuban. Everyone knows Cuba is a police state, so we are told it is one, and that "people go to jail just for thinking basically against the revolution."

Castro himself has said it is communist, and every communist regime is admittedly a dictatorship. Why the subtlety, then, except to befuddle the reader or viewer? Both the film and a "fact sheet" that was secretly distributed at the private showing, were alike in this use of sophistry, as a cover for what intrinsically is misinformation and falsehood.

Red purposes are advanced when propaganda about ubiquitous controls is spread among exiled Cubans and Americans. The Cubans can be discouraged by it from engaging in freedom movements that could be successful. The Americans might be led by it to withhold help that could be decisive in freeing Cuba.

#### RED TACTIC FEIGNS OBJECTIVITY

The film did not need to be censored by the Cuban reds, for its whole theme and continuity could have been arranged only in collaboration with them, excluding anything that conflicted with the red propaganda intent. A special note should be made, for an

insight into the propaganda tactics used, that nothing critical of Castro or of communism in Cuba was included that was not already public knowledge throughout the world, but some allusions were permitted only to what everyone already knows. Anything superficially detrimental to the regime was presented in such a way as to produce a reaction in its favor. This was the extent of the supposed objectivity of the film, which actually is subjective, slanted in favor of Castro's seizure of power for the communists, and must have required professional guidance throughout.

The red tactic for controlled criticism can be recognized easily. Before something detrimental to communism has been exposed, every effort is made to prevent its disclosure, and to smear and terrorize those who seek to bring it out. But, as can be observed in the United States in anti-anticommunist circles, once the public has learned of it and it no longer can be hushed up, the fellow-travelers and the fake "liberals" shout louder about it than those who did the exposing. Simultaneously, they concentrate on squelching efforts to reveal whatever has not yet been brought to the surface regarding the crimes of communism.

The admission is made in this film that the exodus from Cuba now includes intellectuals, workers, "and the peasant even." Admission is made, too, of the well-known fact that the sugar crop suffered a setback, and that the diversification program in agriculture has not worked out well. Everybody knows these things, so there can be little or no harm to communism in relating them, rather benefit, by giving the impression that the film is fairly balanced, honest and objective, and that communists are free to openly discuss their errors and setbacks.

The test is not in disclosures of what is already known, but whether any derogatory data that is still being concealed has been brought to the surface. The pro-red propagandist keeps this from happening by this transfer tactic, diverting attention to what is already known. The public, the target nowadays of intensified propaganda that is devised with scientific precision, must learn to identify this tactic, too, and to detect the deceit in it.

As regards the present backward housing situation, the so-called professor lets himself go so far as to declare that while homes were confiscated and given to the poor, "this does not mean that everyone is completely and totally happy." What a lame criticism! Is anyone on earth "completely and totally happy"? Of course not. This is the gentle, whitewash approach used whenever criticism is made of the reds.

#### AMERICANS FOOLING OURSELVES

Much of the communist propaganda that has been channeled into the United States has slipped through undetected because those responsible for its presentation lacked the necessary background and knowledge, or were sympathetic to the issues presented. There is a widespread pat assumption that the American people could not be fooled by it. This is a most dangerous situation. The characteristic of young minds is that they accept words and facial expressions at face value, which is in the American tradition, and is one of our most prized traits, that we are struggling to preserve and safeguard. We should not allow advantage to be taken of this natural goodness in youth, so as to exploit and mislead it. That this can be done behind the sugar, bamboo and iron curtains is sad enough, but we betray our youth when we stand back and let it happen here.

The bulk of a normal audience—young and adult—viewing the "Three Faces of Cuba" over an outlet of an educational channel in a normal American city, would accept it under this sponsorship as objective. The failure to label it for what it is, the presenta-

tion of Red Cuba as Castro and world communism want the United States to picture it, is as heinous as the provision of obscenity and drugs for young minds. All this is happening under pro-communist encouragement and incitation. This analyst, well knowing the dictionary meaning of the word "treasonable," unhesitatingly applies it to such a situation. A pretense at objectivity, or a college degree, is no excuse for it; it only compounds the criminality inherent in it.

The showing of "Three Faces of Cuba" anywhere in the free world without propaganda clarification submits the minds of viewers to a diabolical softening-up process in the interests of communism against their own country, and certainly should not be permitted. In the U.S., it spreads defeatism and subversion. Elsewhere, it appears to confirm what the reds say about us and about themselves.

The film can serve a useful purpose in our society, nonetheless, if it could be presented along with a thorough propaganda analysis of its contents at the same time. Indeed, it would be a valuable film for study in classes in communications, in our colleges and universities, where propaganda is being studied.

The immediate objective would be the restricted one of detecting the communist propaganda infiltrated into this specific film. The longrange objective would be to teach how to detect propaganda inserted into films generally. Nowadays, such knowledge is most essential, yet lacking. Although this film is presented as the story of Cuba today, its theme is a twofold one, neither facet of which truthfully portrays the Cuba of today. The film is part of a worldwide, anti-United States propaganda campaign now being vigorously waged by the communist international network. Its anti-American, longrange objective is demonstrated by slanderous scenes concerning our past influence in Cuba, the alleged hatred of America in countries allied to us, and the racial problem generally. This is its primary theme.

Its secondary theme is the happiness that communism is supposed to have brought to Cuba, contrasted with the island's alleged unhappiness in the past. Happiness under communism is a well-worn red theme, obligatory in propaganda inside red areas, propagandized outside as well. Happiness must be claimed in all descriptions of life under communism. "Three Faces of Cuba" has glowing faces in obviously posed scenes, of adults and especially children, but where the crowds are panned, they could not avoid photographing the grim faces which were not posed for the film.

The factory executive says he engages in so-called "voluntary" labor—we would call it labor conscription—"because you feel happy." The happiness line is part of a charged propaganda atmosphere that makes it unlikely for the average viewer to see through the falsehood of it. A class in propaganda techniques would have this explained in useful detail. I am told that in the United States, groups of high school students have been brought together to view the film, and to hear talks praising it. These programs are held after school hours, so school authorities technically can avoid responsibility. Young people would be inclined to take the posed scenes for the actuality. The film is made up practically entirely of such acts.

#### FALSE OBJECTIVITY HIDES BRAINWASHING

The film ends up with a plug for the Alliance for Progress, to make it "a real, effective instrument," which considering the pro-socialist character attributed to it by many reliable, well informed sources, may be a more apparent than a real anti-Castro statement.

In an equally weak ending, as if the program just had to inject something into it to counterbalance its consistent one-sided-

ness, if only for the record, the announcer cautiously admits "there are others who would have given different impressions."

Why were they not allowed to do so? There was ample opportunity, if there had been the slightest desire.

If these briefly stated, isolated points hastily brought in at the conclusion, of a seemingly anti-Castro nature, were not for cover purposes, maybe the explanation can be found in the requirement that groups enjoying tax exemption must be objectively educational. There could hardly have been any less objectivity than in "Three Faces of Cuba."

If any objectivity were the intent of the producers and sponsors, the least they could have done would have been to present the film as a defense of the Castro regime, and a portrayal of it as Castro would like to have it seen. Presented this way, as a representation of how the red bosses like to think of themselves, the film might be informative, even if primarily for psychiatrists.

#### FILM'S GOAL IS BRAINWASHING AMERICANS

The film is clearly aimed at the brainwashing of the American people, using Red Cuba as a medium. It can hardly be aimed at Cuban exiles, whose views certainly run counter to those interviewed in the picture. That Cubans abroad are not the target is shown, too, by the fact that the film is produced only in English, with no known Spanish version. Its producers surely realized they could not fool the well-informed Cuban exile community, and so sought to ignore it.

In all totalitarian states, the focus is on praising the head of state. He symbolizes the power complex. Castro certainly is the hero of this film.

Of course, among all peoples since the beginning of time, the man who gains respect and inspires others, especially youth, is someone ready to stand up for what he believes, and is willing to fight for it. The Castro enthusiast in the film provides this image. In his defense of "Fidel"—he is Fidel to him, too, as well as to the so-called refugee professor—he proudly declares: "If I can slap a face I'll do it. If I have to smash their head, we smash it." We hear at this point voices singing in Spanish, "Cuba, yes! Yankees, no!"

The tune, to the words, "Fidel, be sure to hit the Yankees hard," heard in the United States by a youthful audience particularly, without explanation or refutation, can have only a confusing effect. In the United States, such presentation constitutes training for treason.

Red propagandists have infiltrated into American schools, and we can be sure they would amplify such expressions later on, perhaps in group meetings or during sit-ins and so-called teach-ins. For us to permit this is more than naivety. In the colloquial expression, it is "asking for it!"

The music inserted into the film includes "Yankee go home," and to stress this point, the statement is made that this is the attitude of peoples everywhere, "in Manila, Panama, Turkey, Japan," listing some countries friendly to the U.S., without explaining that this is the work entirely of the communist conspirators in those places, and not the reaction of the people. If the announcer would have explained only once that some such passage as this obviously had to be red propaganda, for the Cubans interviewed had no firsthand knowledge of what was transpiring in those lands, some slight indication would have been given of a desire to give the film a fair balance. No such effort is made at any time.

A piece of unfounded, basic communist propaganda is inserted casually with the remark that, with the passage of ten years, the new generation of Cubans would be "perfectly indoctrinated" into the communist system, "like what happens in Russia." Well,

the truth is that in the U.S.S.R. the new generation, as the old, has not been brainwashed into ideological acceptance of communism.

Indeed, this is the nightmare of the red ideologists. Only their continuation of terror, and what is equally effective, the belief calculatingly spread that there is little or no hope of getting help from the West—particularly from the generally anti-anticommunist United States—prevent the lid from blowing off.

The fact is that constant reports come from the red bloc about difficulties with the new generation, as with the old. Acceptance of communism, divorced from the various pressures exercised by it, is as far away as ever, if not more so. The future actually is hopeless for communism. What is inevitable is its ultimate defeat. The red hopelessness-inevitability line, that seeks to convince us that it is hopeless to oppose communism because its victory is inevitable, is sheer propaganda, astutely aimed at creating defeatism on our side, while distracting attention from the futilities of communism.

This red line is based upon another trick we should guard against. An unproven and even unfounded thesis is taken for granted, as if indisputable, and on this illogical basis a whole supposition is built up. In the film, the false thesis of communists acceptance by the Russian people is presented subtly, with the implication that it would be only a matter of time for the same to happen in Red Cuba. This is sheer buncombe.

The so-called professor fits his words neatly into this red hopelessness-inevitability line by virtually taking it for granted that Castro communism is here to stay.

Music is played during this mesmeric scene, as if the audience were present at a rally of Castro supporters who feel real affection for him. There is little subtlety in this, but young and uninformed people alike certainly can be expected to be carried away by the excitement of it, unless forewarned.

Some Cubans are quoted in an offhand manner in the film as saying that communism is not good, but that "Cuba's revolution is very good." As Cuba is admittedly communist, the hairline logic is difficult to fathom, except that it provides an opportunity to express approval of the red regime.

The extent to which various participating Americans knowingly collaborated in its production is irrelevant in this analysis. What is relevant is that no film of this character can obtain the cooperation of a communist country without being favorable to it, and following the inflexible instructions and the iron-clad regulations of the red regime in all forms of art, as weaponry in the war for the mind.

"Three Faces of Cuba" is not an infiltrated film; it is a "psywar" operation. Practically every scene in the film fits into the overall pattern of a pro-communist operation. If this were merely a case of pro-red infiltration in an objective film, there would not be this continuity. What the film essentially lacks is objectivity, and what it possesses is a pro-red bias.

The reaction of the viewer of this program, if he accepted its presentation as accurate and the whole story—and few people think about what has been left out when they are sufficiently moved or entertained—would be that he was wrong in believing the bad things that are said about Castro and Red Cuba—about communism and socialism in general, and their proclaimed war against us, that is aimed at our destruction as a nation and as a free people. The viewer would be inclined to suspect that it might be the other way around. Maybe we are the bad ones, as Castro says! This is the implication—one might say the subliminal impression—that the film seeks to convey. There is treason in such an approach. In 1965, naivety is no longer an excuse for it.

#### CONCLUSION

No longer in 1965 does any excuse exist for program sponsors or producers to claim ignorance of the life and death struggle between the international communist conspiracy and the free world. Naivety might have been understandable years back, but no longer. A careful reading of the script, and then a viewing of the film, convince this analyst that those who are responsible for it knew what they were doing, and had a Marxist objective in view, unless they are utter opportunists, or political psychotics, hating their country. Otherwise their political innocence must be boundless. The only way this film can be presented objectively and not harmfully would be as an example of how communists put their propaganda across in a disarming, sophisticated way, with a scene-by-scene analysis of the propaganda. This would make the film a useful lesson in propaganda techniques, and show how the reds infiltrate their subversive ideas through a fake objective approach.

Only this way can the film cease being pro-communist in impact. Indeed, this should be the objective, providing an example of how free people are able to convert an enemy maneuver into an advantage for our nation and liberty's cause, contributing truly to our educational needs in the cold war.

If the film had been presented merely as a defense of the Cuban red regime, the harm that the film can do would be greatly reduced. But it is presented with an American countenance, and as such is gross deception. The fact that such a film is shown to ordinary students without any of this clarifying information is shocking, and constitutes a prostitution of the educational process.

[From "Who's Who in America," Vol. 33 (1964-65)]

#### BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF MR. EDWARD HUNTER

Hunter, Edward, foreign correspondent, author; born in New York City, July 2, 1902; son of Edward and Rose (Weiss) Hunter; self educated; married to Tatiana Pestrikoff, June 30, 1932 (divorced May 1961); children—Robert and Tate Ann. Reporter and news editor of various newspapers, including Newark Ledger, New Orleans Item, New York Post, New York American; reporter Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune, 1924-25; news editor Japan Advertiser, Tokyo, 1927, editor Hankow (China) Herald, 1928-29; Peking Leader, 1929-30; covered Japanese conquest of Manchuria, Spanish Civil War, Italian conquest of Ethiopia, International News Service, 1931-36; pioneered in revealing brainwashing, introducing it to written word. Chairman Anti-Communist Liaison, 1962—. Consultant in psychological warfare to the United States Air Force, 1953-54. Served as propaganda warfare specialist, Army of the United States, with morale operation section, Office of Strategic Services, Asia, World War II. Author: Brain-Washing in Red China, 1951; Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defied It, 1956; The Story of Mary Liu, 1957; The Black Book on Red China, 1958; The Past Present: A Year in Afghanistan, 1959; In Many Voices: Our Fabulous Foreign-Language Press, 1960; Attack by Mail, 1963. Contributed articles on psychological warfare, politics and extremism to numerous magazines. Clubs: Overseas Press, Silurians. Address: 320 N. George Mason Dr., Arlington 3, Va.

#### OTHER DATA

(1) Publisher and editor of TACTICS, a monthly described by the then Congressman John E. Pillion (R-N.Y.) as "an unusually well-researched publication, worthy of the attention of anyone who is interested in sharp, concise analyses of the strategies, tactics, operations, and objectives of the world Communist movement." (Congressional Record of Sept. 24, 1964, page A4866.)

(2) Served as specialist on propaganda pressures and psychological warfare, for: Office of Strategic Services (OSS) Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, The Pentagon and other Government agencies.

(3) Mr. Hunter put the word "brainwashing" in the language and, what is more important, alerted the world to its meaning. He was the pioneer on mind warfare.

(4) History-making testimonies of Edward Hunter for Congressional committees, made available by U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., include: "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program," and Communist Psychological Warfare (Brainwashing)."

Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask the manager of the bill, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a few questions concerning the operation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting which is proposed to be established by title II of S. 1160, if the distinguished Senator would agree to respond.

Mr. PASTORE. I would be very happy to answer.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the main functions of the corporation, and probably its most important function, is either actively to produce or assist in the production, financially or otherwise, of programs for airing on noncommercial stations or networks. Is that not true?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the Senator's view, would the fairness doctrine promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission provide for the airing of philosophies or ideas contrary to those which may be expressed in programs prepared by the corporation?

Mr. PASTORE. Well, the licensee who accepts the program is subject to the Communications Act, and the fairness doctrine thus applies. In other words, in order to give assurance that there will be no monopoly here to indoctrinate the American people, the final decision of whether a program will be shown depends entirely and exclusively upon the local station. Thus, if a local station does not want to accept it, that is the end of it. Under the law, the corporation cannot engage in political activities. We have written these safeguards into the law. Much of the apprehension which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has been eliminated by provisions which have been put into this legislation. But, to answer his question categorically, a local station does not have to accept a program if it feels the program does not fit within the environment it serves.

Mr. THURMOND. Would the time be offered free of charge, as is now required under the fairness doctrine, to give the opposing view?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean if they have candidates?

Mr. THURMOND. No, I do not mean candidates—I mean, for instance—

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely. If anyone feels he is offended under the fairness doctrine, he can appeal to the FCC and he will receive the same privileges and the same courtesies which he receives under commercial television.

Mr. THURMOND. He would be allowed to reply to the airing of philosophies or ideas—

Mr. PASTORE. Under the same conditions as of today. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the program.

My next question is: Since one of the most important functions of the corporation is to produce programs, it would not be likely that opposing views would receive the same treatment unless the production facilities were made equally available to those who held to contrary views. Also, since the public would be largely supporting the program through their tax money, it would seem to me entirely appropriate that the production facilities thus provided be made equally available for the preparation of programs expressing a contrary philosophy. Does the Senator agree with these observations and feel that fairness dictates not only that free air time be given, but that production facilities be made available as well?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, well now, we are getting ourselves a little confused by what we mean by "production facilities." We must understand that the corporation does not produce programs itself. This corporation will not be a fixed schedule network. It is not intended to be such a network. It is not supposed to be an operational production entity. It is not to produce programs itself. But it can contract for productions, and once it has either contracted for them or bought them, then it distributes the programs to the local stations. They will distribute their time to the local educational station.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Would a program produced by a private group, expressing opposing views to that presented by a program prepared by this corporation, be given equal time?

Mr. PASTORE. If it comes within the purview of the fairness doctrine, yes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to draw the Senator's attention to subsection (D) which begins on the bottom of page 16 and ends on the fourth line of page 17.

Mr. PASTORE. Go ahead.

Mr. THURMOND. In that section, the corporation is authorized to establish and maintain libraries and, in addition, to publish a journal. Is it intended that the journal authorized to be published be limited solely to an explanation of programs offered, or will it be open for publication or articles on a wide range of different subjects?

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that it would be immediately informative as to what is going on, so far as a program is concerned. In other words, the journal would not be the Washington Evening Star or the Washington Post.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THURMOND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I want first to commend my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his very searching questions and for his very legitimate apprehensions as to what effect this mea-

sure might have in the matter of slanted television programs.

I assure the Senator, and I sit on the same side of the aisle as he does, that I am as interested in the rights of the minority as he is. I admire him because he defends them so sturdily. Let me assure him that his apprehensions were shared by many members of the Commerce Committee on both sides, and were expressed much as he has expressed them.

But, as the hearings continued and consideration of the bill went on, we were satisfied—and the unanimous report indicates that we were satisfied—that there is no grave danger of Government slanted public educational television because of this bill.

Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina, in all frankness, that I listen to television programs night after night, because I do not go out very much. I like to get the news and I like to see some of the programs.

I find myself somewhat irked and a little irritated, as a minority Member—frankly, as a Republican—when night after night, not once, not twice, not three times, but many times all through the evening, I see the face of the President coming on the screen. Then, after I have seen his face—which is quite familiar to us—I hear an announcement about one of the fine, and presumably beneficial, programs of our Government—educating young people, training and retraining workers, and so on and so forth—and telling the people to whom to write to enjoy these benefits.

I am not complaining. He is the President. He is my President.

I merely want to say this to the Senator from South Carolina. Those announcements are given by the private networks—NBC, ABC, and CBS—as a public service. There is not anything I really can do about it if I do not enjoy them. There is nothing the Senator from South Carolina can do about it. There is nothing the Congress of the United States can do about it, because we are not supporting them. They are being supported by the sponsors or the networks themselves. They are paying for this time. Unless the networks do something that is way out, or obviously unfair, unjust or revolting to one of the parties—and I am sure they would not do that—there is not one thing the Congress can do except to quiz the FCC Commissioners when they come before us.

The point I want to make to the Senator from South Carolina is that when we engage in launching a program of educational television which is at least in part supported by Government funds, and in which the majority of directors of the corporation are named by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, it is in my honest opinion that a system that is partially Government supported and publicly controlled is compelled to lean over backward to avoid any apparent bias, which to me sometimes seems to be quite apparent in commercially-supported networks.

If this bill becomes law, as I hope it will, and if, as time goes on, we have

occasion to feel that there is a slanting, a bias, or an injustice, we instantly and immediately can do something about it. First, we can make very uncomfortable, and give a very unhappy experience to, the directors of the corporation. Second, we can shut down some of their activities in the Appropriations Committee and in the appropriating process of Congress with respect to this particular network, if we wish to call it a network in the sense that it is general programing. The corporation is much more readily accessible to the Senator from South Carolina, any other Senator, or to the Congress, if it is desired to correct any injustice or bias which might appear.

That is the reason why, sharing as I do the very natural apprehensions of the Senator from South Carolina—and I have respect for him; he is a careful legislator at all times—I became convinced that there is no danger of a Government-controlled propaganda machine under this bill.

In fact, we will be setting up a system over which we will have some control, and those in it will not be able to ignore us, even the minority.

I wanted to make my position plain and state my reasons to the Senator from South Carolina. I again compliment him for his very careful scrutiny of this matter.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his assurances in this matter. I appreciate his remarks concerning the statement I have just made. I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for answering the questions. Nevertheless, from the study I have given to the bill, I feel it is an entering wedge which we will later regret. I am strongly opposed to title II.

Therefore, I shall ask that I be recorded against passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am concerned about certain provisions of this bill. In the State of Nebraska we have made great progress in Educational TV. It is serving our State in an excellent manner. There is participation in it by every college and university in the State. Nebraska is doing more than any other State to reach the elementary and high school pupils. It is an excellent program operating under the present law.

Our educational program has been under a system of 50-50 matching funds. I believe it is a sound system. While Nebraska has not had all the money it could use, it has developed an educational television system that has attracted much favorable comment over the country. Many of the other States have sent individuals and delegations to our State to observe it.

I also want to express my concern over title II. I believe it is an unwise departure. I do not favor it.

I express the hope that before this proposal is finally enacted into law, we will go ahead and improve existing law without title II.

It is also my position that we are making a mistake in having the Federal Government provide 75 percent of the matching funds. I think it should be retained at 50 percent.

I yield the floor.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR DEAN E. SHARP TO APPEAR AS A WITNESS IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST KITZER AND OTHERS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, earlier today I reported a resolution. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 121) to authorize Dean E. Sharp, an assistant counsel, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, to appear as a witness in the case of United States against Kitzer and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported with an amendment on page 5, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; so as to make the resolution read:

#### S. RES. 121

*Resolved*, That by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; be it further

*Resolved*, That by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX thereof, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate, and information secured by Senate staff employees pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate; be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that testimony of an employee of the Senate of the United States is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and, further, such testimony may involve documents, communications, conversations, and matters related thereto under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States, the Senate of the United States will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; be it further

*Resolved*, That Dean E. Sharp, assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoenas duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary; be it further

*Resolved*, That when said court determines that any of the documents, papers, communications, and memorandums called for in the subpoena duces tecum have become part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and, further, that such documents, papers, communications, and memorandums are mate-

rial and relevant to the issues pending before said court, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding, and then always at any place under the orders and control of the Senate, and take copies of such documents, papers, communications, and memorandums in possession or control of the aforementioned Dean E. Sharp which the court has found to be part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and which the court has found are material and relevant to the issues pending before said court, excepting any other documents, papers, communications, and memorandums (including, but not limited to, minutes and transcripts of executive sessions and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto) which the court or other proper official thereof shall desire as such matters are within the privileges of the Senate; be it further

*Resolved*, That Dean E. Sharp, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, in response to the aforementioned subpoenas may testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant (1) for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, and (2) to the offer of proof made by James Shellow, Esquire, attorney for defendant George Hruban, and Frank Oliver, Esquire, attorney for defendant Phillip Kitzer, Junior, in the above entitled cause said offer of proof having been made on the 12th day of May, 1967, and appearing at pages 9633 to 9641 of the transcript of the above entitled cause, but said Dean E. Sharp shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on his knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons and he shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any matter or matters within the privilege of the attorney-client relationship existing between said Dean E. Sharp and the said subcommittee or any of its members; be it further.

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the aforementioned subpoenas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting

facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 14, change the period to a comma and add the following: "Provided, That three of the 15 members of the Board shall be associated with the operation of noncommercial educational radio and television stations."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendment which is at the desk will accomplish what I think is a very important change in a very important piece of legislation. We are taking a giant step forward by providing for a method of operation for noncommercial educational television and radio—in other words, noncommercial educational broadcasting—a real forward step to which this Congress can point with extreme pride.

I think no single Member of this body can point with greater pride than the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], for the great work that he has done in this regard.

A number of changes were made from the original bill as it was submitted, and I think those changes have been made for the better. I think none of us who participated in the hearings would contend there are no mistakes and no imperfections in the bill. It probably will be found to be wanting in items which we have not even discussed, and to have shortcomings as to some of the items which we did discuss.

Two primary objects are sought in regard to safeguards. One of them is that the subject of this legislation will not be under governmental control, and the other is that the responsibility for the programing in the local community will be solely at the discretion of the individual local stations. I think to a great extent we have accomplished those purposes.

I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that to some extent we are going to have to depend upon the good will of men, and we are going to have to depend upon the appointment of capable, qualified people as the board of directors of this organization. The number of people to be appointed certainly could vary from some of the original proposals of both greater and lesser numbers than the number finally adopted, of 15; but I think 15 is a large enough number to accomplish diversity of opinion and yet small enough that it will not create an obstacle to effective operation.

I think we should provide for some members through whom the local station itself can participate in having some voice, not alone in the distribution of funds or in the arrangements for interconnections, but, what is more important to me, in the type of programs and the general tone and tenor that these educational functions will take. It is for that reason that I have submitted this amendment, which would provide that three of

the 15 directors to be appointed, whether they be among the nine appointed by the President or the six which are appointed by the nine, shall be associated with the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting industry.

I think these changes are worthwhile, and I think they would make a needed improvement in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I compliment the Senator from Indiana for the yeoman work he did in putting this bill together.

The reason why we did not particularize or state the categories or the affiliation of the board of directors was because we did not want to open up the matter too wide, and subject ourselves, possibly, to criticism from other groups, or demands or pressures from other groups.

Fundamentally, this bill requires that the ultimate decision on its acceptance of the program shall be upon the local station. The fact that this amendment provides that three of those members shall be associated with the local radio or television noncommercial stations, I think, is a desirable feature. I believe it is a good amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I want him to know that I completely endorse this bill, and I think it is a giant step forward toward better television for the American public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Indiana on this amendment. It is exactly what I had hoped to do myself. Coming from the majority, I think it is so much surer of acceptance. I would be greatly honored if the Senator would permit me to join my name with his upon the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from New York as a cosponsor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, I would appreciate that privilege.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added to my amendment as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and all the members of his Communications Subcommittee for the speed and thoroughness with which they handled this legislation, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. It is my hope that the House committees will act with similar diligence and speed so that the Nation may begin to reap the benefits of financially sound, and independent non-commercial radio and television stations.

I also commend the members of the Communications Subcommittee for facing up to one of the most delicate but important problems inherent in any history-making legislation such as this—the problem of the possibility of gov-

ernmental control or influence over broadcasting. I am talking about those features of the bill designed to keep separate the concepts of Federal assistance and governmental control; specifically the section of the bill dealing with the appointment of directors of the proposed corporation to be set up as a buffer between the Federal Government and the noncommercial broadcasting industry and as a conduit for Federal assistance to these broadcasters.

The original bill provided for the appointment of all 15 directors directly by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The subcommittee suggests that this be changed to allow the appointment of nine directors directly by the President, with these directors authorized to elect the other six. In my testimony before the subcommittee I suggested that we, in Congress, should do everything possible to avoid even the implication of Government or political influence over this corporation, and suggested a method to provide such insulation.

In all respects, I still feel that we should have gone further in attempting to assure the country that not even the shadow of Federal control would be able to fall on the new corporation. I am gratified, however, that the subcommittee and committee saw fit to accept one portion of my suggestion, to wit: that the President appoint one portion of the directors, and that these directors would elect the remainder. I would feel a little more secure, however, if the members had agreed on a second part of my suggestion to them; that half of the directors appointed by the President must be nominated by the working members of the noncommercial broadcasting industry itself.

I would also feel more secure if the measure before us today contained specific provisions for an independent study leading to recommendations on the best and most equitable method of financing the Public Broadcasting Corporation in the long term. We all know that the bill before us contains only \$9 million to set up the corporation, and that in the next session we will have to face the controversial task of providing noncommercial broadcasting with a steady source of income, divorced from the yearly appropriations process.

It had been my hope, as I said in testimony before the subcommittee, that such a study would backstop and bolster the President's announced intentions of sending to Congress next year proposals for long-range financing. Long-term financing is the core of any successful effort to make the best possible use of our non-commercial stations. All of us who believe that non-commercial broadcasting is a great, but little-used national resource, will be watching and waiting for the President's proposals next year, and must reserve the right to propose long-term financing legislation if such proposals are not forthcoming from the White House.

Mr. President, I make these observations because along with many others in this Chamber, I want this venture to succeed; and success will not automatically

accrue by the passage of this legislation. This bill is a beginning—a good beginning—to be sure, but only a beginning.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, my position on this legislation today was summed up best by the president of one of the largest non-commercial television stations in the country. This gentleman visited my office last week to support both of my suggestions but to voice concern that nothing should be done now to hinder the enactment of this legislation. He said:

I agree that this bill could be better, but we need it now. I can see no future for non-commercial broadcasting at all without Federal aid, and we must begin now or we may lose the momentum we have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New York has been very active in this matter over the years, as have many other Senators. I wonder if he agrees with me that although right now this matter may not seem to be of overwhelming importance in the scheme of things—so many things are going on in the world at the moment—it will probably be the beginning of one of the most important steps Congress has ever taken for the future of the United States?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about it. Indeed, I might say to my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, that, strangely enough, the United States is one of the few countries which has not heretofore made full use of the public airways for this kind of tremendous educational effort. I think the country will be deeply indebted to him, to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and to all of us who have had a hand in the measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Again I should like to state—I do not know whether it has been brought out today or not—that one of the reasons we can make this step forward—and it is only a step—is that the Committee on Commerce, including Senator PASTORE, myself, and some other Senators, 2 or 3 years ago finally got through a bill which required the manufacturers to produce only what we call all-channel sets.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which opened up a new spectrum of use, and is probably mainly responsible for this growth of educational TV, together with a bill we passed to give one-shot grants-in-aid to help such stations.

Now we are taking a third step. I understand from the manufacturers that it takes 4½ to 5 years for all the television sets to be replaced, but most of the people now are in the all-channel set field, and such sets are becoming more and more common.

This is a really important step. Although it is not all-perfect, and there are many problems involved, I think that when we look back on it, it will be agreed that this will have been one of the most important bills the Senate passed this session.

Mr. JAVITS. I could not agree with the Senator more. I only express the hope that other efforts of the same char-

acter may be tied in, to do benefit to our whole hemisphere. For example, I have had the privilege of playing a rather important part in the great effort to have a communications satellite for North and South America. This would be a tremendously uniting force for the world.

I believe, Mr. President, that I have a family of rather typical children. I find now, for the first time, that the educational television channel is an established aspect of their listening time. Now this is quite an improvement when I remember that they were listening to and watching sensational westerns and so forth for almost their total television time as recently as 2 years ago.

This is a personal family experience, of course, I know the situation, from personal experience. However, if we need an argument in favor of this bill this is a clincher as far as I am concerned; this is it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senate is today preparing to take a historic step in rededicating the public airways to the public service. S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967, marks the beginning of Federal support for educational and instructional television programming. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Though the expenditures authorized under this bill are relatively small, this authorization is not the most important aspect of the support Congress is giving public television through this bill. The true significance of the bill is twofold. First, S. 1160 recognizes what the Carnegie Commission, and other responsible observers have noted about the present state of television and radio broadcasting. Private, commercial interests have relegated television and radio in this country to the role of huckster, to the exclusion of their educational and public service potential. S. 1160 enacts the principle that public funds must be appropriated to relieve television and radio from their exclusive reliance on commercial revenue, so that these media can begin to realize their full potential.

Second, S. 1160 establishes administrative machinery—in the form of the Corporation for Public Television—which will effectively demonstrate that Federal support can be given to television programming without the dangers of Government censorship or improper political influences. In itself, this will create an important and beneficial precedent for broadening public financial support of public television and radio.

For these reasons, I believe the Public Television Act of 1967 deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress. I am confident that it will receive that support.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the bill before us today, S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, represents one of those noble uses of our Nation's technology which makes every member and every American extremely proud.

In 1950, a short 17 years ago, television was in its infancy. There were only 108 television stations in the United States, only one of which, WOI-TV, at Iowa State College, was licensed to an educational institution.

The Federal Communications Commission in 1952 set aside 242 station channels for the exclusive use of non-commercial educational television. By 1961, the number of channels reserved for noncommercial television had reached 268, and by February 1966, the number of channels reserved for non-commercial television had reached 329. In February 1966, the Federal Communications Commission revised its overall allotment so that today 633 reservations are specifically available for educational television in the United States.

But, Mr. President, the mere reservation of channel allotments alone was insufficient incentive to provide full utilization of noncommercial television throughout the country. As of March 1967, only a fifth of the available channels for noncommercial television were in operation, even though public and private contributions were made to the 130 existing noncommercial stations. To this extent, Mr. President, we have today but a partially fulfilled dream, and yet we all know that a greater, more fruitful utilization of noncommercial television is almost within our grasp.

In my own State of Vermont, noncommercial television will begin operation in September. For the first time in the history of the State, a communications network will be available to 97 percent of the State's population. We have both pride and great expectations for our new Vermont educational television network.

Mr. President, we take pride because of the tremendous cooperation and dedication which have gone into the formation of educational television in Vermont. Dedicated citizens from the State, local, and Federal governments worked long and hard to prepare a system which would serve all of Vermont.

In Vermont, we are justly proud of our beautiful Green Mountains. But those mountains, while providing natural beauty, also provide an obstruction to television signals. Therefore, one non-commercial television station would have been inadequate to serve the needs of all Vermonters. When the Vermont educational television network commences operation in September, four UHF channels will be beaming pictures and sounds to every corner of the State. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to see productions and activities of their State university. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to visit from their living rooms historic battlesights of the Revolutionary War. For the first time, many Vermonters will be able to watch as tons of granite and marble are quarried from beneath our beautiful mountains.

I see, Mr. President, in my State and in thousands of communities around the country an increased sense of community and understanding as noncommercial television grows and blossoms into full life. Already that pride and sense of community is apparent in Vermont. Without

a picture or a preview, the State legislature's contribution to the project is nearly \$2.3 million. For a Vermonter, this is not merely a commitment of money—but more importantly, a commitment of faith in the promise and hope embodied in noncommercial television.

The provisions contained in the bill before us today will reaffirm that commitment of faith in the promise and hope embodied in noncommercial television, for not only Vermonters but all Americans throughout our great country.

Title I of the bill expands and extends the Educational Television Facilities Act. Under the present act, my State was given incentive and encouragement from the \$800,000 received from the Federal Government. Enactment of this bill will insure that in the future States and communities will also be able to receive incentives as they construct noncommercial radio and television facilities.

Title II of this bill presents an exciting innovation in the development of noncommercial television. It embodies the heart of the proposal offered by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. It establishes a nonprofit corporation to help develop the promises and dreams of educational television. The corporation would provide an isolation from direct Government control.

In addition, it would encourage the full development of the expansive potential offered by this great media. E. B. White, the editor of *New Yorker* magazine, explained this great potential much more articulately than I could in a letter to the Carnegie Commission. Let me read a part of that letter now:

I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's, and our Camelot. It should restate and clarify the social dilemma and the political pickle. Once in a while it does, and you get a quick glimpse of its potential.

Most of us have seen that quick glimpse—often in different ways. To some of us, the programs produced by Fred Friendly and the late Ed Morrow showed us the vast horizons of television. To some of us, Theodore White's "Making of a President," or in-depth discussion of "China, the Sleeping Giant," exemplified television's potential. I have no doubt that I, too, could become a French chef if I watched Julia Childs more frequently.

But, Mr. President, whatever one's personal tastes, they often are unfulfilled because of limited choices in many areas of the country. The nonprofit corporation for public television can multiply the choices given to individuals who from time to time want to be "individuals" rather than mass audience.

Finally, Mr. President, title III of this bill provides \$500,000 for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare into an area which is even less discovered than educational television—instructional television and radio. In this modern society of ours, where scientists, doctors, and philosophers are simul-

taneously making breakthroughs from the University of Vermont to the University of Hawaii, instructional TV may prove to be as important to education as assembly line production was to the automobile.

I, for one, shall support this legislation and look forward with great expectation to the results it will produce.

I might add, Mr. President, that within a year or so this body must face up to the need for adequate financing for noncommercial television. I believe that Senator MAGNUSON and Senator PASTORE wisely decided to take the overall improvement of noncommercial television step by step, and I am certain that they will return to this body next year with ways and means for stimulating educational television economically as well as through creative encouragement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to voice my agreement with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] when he termed the bill we are now considering landmark legislation. When we consider that nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American are spent viewing television, and that the airwaves over which television and radio programs are broadcast are public property, then we realize the responsibility we as Senators have for insuring that television and radio programming makes the fullest possible contribution to the betterment of individual and community life.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will, in my opinion, make a distinct, positive step in this direction. The reasons for this have been ably set forth by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, whom I think deserves our highest praise for his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications. He and the members of his subcommittee have written a superb report, and the amendments they added to the original legislation have greatly strengthened it.

I am particularly pleased that educational radio has received the recognition and support it does in this bill. It was my privilege on April 12, 1967, to introduce a number of the members of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television of the members of the Subcommittee on Communications.

At that time I voiced my strong support for the proposals of the Carnegie Commission, and said that I hoped the intensity of concern over public television would not obscure the needs for public support of educational radio. I am, consequently, gratified to see the support accorded educational radio in this bill.

Mr. President, I think the Senate—and indeed the whole Congress and the Nation—owes a debt of gratitude to the private citizens who gave their time and energy to both the Carnegie Commission and to the study of educational radio entitled "The Hidden Medium." A number of citizens of Massachusetts were instrumental in these studies, and I would like to call attention to Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and to Dr. Edwin H. Land, president of the Polaroid Corp. Dr. Killian served as chairman of the Carnegie Com-

mission study, and Dr. Land served with him as a member. Also, Mr. Russell Jalbert, vice president of Boston University for university affairs, who both worked on the educational radio study and testified in favor of it. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island agree with me that these private citizens, and their colleagues, deserve our gratitude?

Mr. PASTORE. I would certainly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on that point. They do indeed deserve our praise and appreciation for their bold thinking and hard work. And I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator about the bill we have before us and the committee's work on it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1160

An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Act of 1967".*

#### TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

##### *Extension of duration of construction grants for educational broadcasting*

SEC. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, \$10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the next four fiscal years."

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

##### *Maximum on grants in any State*

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read:

"(b) The total of the grants for any fiscal year made under this part for the construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 12½ per centum of the portion of the appropriation for such year available for such grants."

##### *Noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities*

SEC. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392 (a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television" in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency,";

(3) inserting "(1) in the case of a project for television facilities," after "(D)" and "noncommercial" before "educational" in paragraph (1) (D) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ", or (ii) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncommercial educational radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (1) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station";

(4) striking out "television" in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

(5) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make most efficient use of the frequency assignment."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and "noncommercial" before "educational television broadcasting facilities", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application."

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television" and inserting "or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be," after "educational television broadcasting facilities" in clauses (2) and (3).

(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television purposes" in paragraph (2) thereof, and by inserting "or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be" after "educational television purposes" in such paragraph (2).

(f) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting "or educational radio broadcasting facilities" after "educational television broadcasting facilities," and by inserting "or radio broadcasting, as the case may be" after "necessary for television broadcasting".

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out "The term 'State educational television agency' means" and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'State educational television agency' and 'State educational radio agency' means, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively," and by striking out

"educational television" in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "such broadcasting".

(g) Section 397 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in clause (2).

*Federal share of cost of construction*

SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine."

*Inclusion of territories*

SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out "and" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting "and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof" before the period at the end thereof.

*Inclusion of costs of planning*

SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor."

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

(1) inserting

"SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES"

immediately above the heading of section 390;

(2) striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart" in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and inserting it before such section 398 and inserting immediately above its heading

"SUBPART C—GENERAL";

(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

(5) inserting after "broadcasting" the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398 ", or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation,".

(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The term 'Corporation' means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

"(7) The term 'noncommercial educational broadcast station' means a television or radio broadcast station, which, under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association.

"(8) The term 'interconnection' means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, transmitters, repeaters, communication space satel-

lites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations."

(7) Inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

"SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

*"Congressional declaration of policy*

"SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

"(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programming depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both the local and national levels.

"(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development, are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programming which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

"(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all citizens of the United States;

"(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

*"Corporation established*

"(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

*"Board of Directors*

"(c) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), consisting of fifteen members of which nine shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and six shall be elected by the members so appointed: *Provided*, That three of the fifteen members of the Board shall be associated with the operation of noncommercial educational radio and television stations.

"(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio or television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

"(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that (A) any member appointed or elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed or elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment or election, as follows: the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of two years, the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of four years, and the terms of three of the appointed members and two of the elected members shall expire at the end of six years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment or election was made.

#### "Election of Chairman; Compensation

"(d) (1) The President shall designate one of the members first appointed or elected to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

"(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day (or such other rate as may be determined by a vote of more than two-thirds of the full membership of the Board), including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

#### "Officers and employees

"(e) (1) The Corporation shall have a President, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman of the Board, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(2) No political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

#### "Nonprofit and nonpolitical nature of the Corporation

"(f) (1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

#### "Purposes and activities of the Corporation

"(g) (1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart,

as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations;

"(B) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting and one or more systems of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"(C) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named—

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programming costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"(D) to establish and maintain libraries and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by publication of a journal;

"(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"(H) to conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, and training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast stations, system, or network, or community antenna television system, or interconnection or program production facility.

#### "Authorization for free or reduced rate interconnection service

"(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other pro-

vision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services for noncommercial educational television or radio services, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

#### "Report to Congress

"(1) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

#### "Right to repeal, alter, or amend

"(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

#### "Financing

"(k) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$9,000,000, and for the next fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

"(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than \$250,000."

#### TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING

##### Study authorized

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio (including broadcast, closed circuit, community antenna television, and instructional television fixed services and two-way communication of data links and computers) and their relationship to each other and to instructional materials such as videotapes, films, discs, computers, and other educational materials or devices, and such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

##### Duration of study

SEC. 302. The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

##### Appropriation

SEC. 303. There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding \$500,000, as may be necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this measure is designed to improve and develop the facilities and programing of educational broadcasting throughout the Nation. I can think of few legislative proposals exceeding its importance.

With its passage, the Senate witnessed the abundant skill of the one Member of this body who, over the years, has re-

sponded consistently to meet the needs of the public when the public's interest is vital. I refer, of course, to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], whose response in this instance was no less effective than it has been to all matters requiring the most careful public concern.

In this case he has achieved a singularly constructive program in an effortless manner—a manner that belied the long and arduous work which accompanied its ultimate success. He led the way by bringing to the Senate a proposal that best fits its far-reaching objectives.

As we pass the two-thirds mark of the 20th century all of us have become aware of the immense effects broadcasting media have upon society—and particularly the effects of television upon our youth. This bill, so carefully designed and drawn under the direction of Senator PASTORE, represents a large step toward the improvement and expansion of broadcasting media in the best possible way. Senator PASTORE deserves the thanks of the Senate for this accomplishment, not to mention the deep appreciation of a grateful nation.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] deserves equally high praise for this achievement. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, legislative proposals vital to the public interest have consistently gained his deep and abiding devotion. This proposal was no exception. We are deeply indebted for his outstanding leadership, his tireless efforts and his keen knowledge and understanding.

Others joined to assure the Senate's overwhelming acceptance of an effective Public Broadcasting Act. Notably we are grateful for the support of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the highly able chairman of the Commerce Committee, whose long interest in this matter is known by all of us; the senior Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are similarly to be thanked for their strong support, as is the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY].

We are grateful, too, for the efforts of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] who, while expressing his own strong and sincere views, cooperated to assure the disposition of the measure swiftly and efficiently.

Once again, our sincerest thanks go to Senator PASTORE; a Senator whose achievements have always reached beyond the call, whose many examples of legislative ability are those to which we all may aspire.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am heartened by the passage of S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. As a member of the Commerce Committee in 1962, I strongly supported the passage of Public Law 87-447, an amendment to the Communication Act of 1934 which hastened the construction of ETV stations. Now, after the tremendous strides that have been made in the creation of facilities for educational broadcasting, we have further legislation that will allow even greater progress in this area.

This bill recognizes the important fact that the construction of facilities is only a beginning in the field of educational broadcasting. Provisions must be made to allow such broadcasting facilities to present creative and outstanding programs of a varied cultural or educational nature. Title II of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act addresses itself to the improvement and guarantee of quality broadcasting that is responsive to the needs and demands of the local community. Title II will also create the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will assist in the development of an interconnection system among educational stations and help make high quality programs available to them.

What is of historic significance about this bill is that it includes the long-neglected group of educational radio stations in the programs for aid to broadcast facilities of this nature. Although not included in the provisions of the 1962 amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, educational radio stations will be permitted, under S. 1160, to be eligible to receive Federal matching grants for construction and expansion of facilities. This legislation clears the path for these radio facilities to join in the national effort to provide topflight cultural programs on noncommercial stations for the edification of us all.

The provisions of this bill are many, all of them vitally needed in the field of educational broadcasting. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is a welcome and significant piece of legislation in an important area of our lives; its potential contribution to the cultural enrichment and advancement of our communities and Nation is immeasurable. The call in this legislation for additional, thorough studies of the uses and roles of instructional television in our educational system, as well as a variety of other broadcasting techniques and programing concepts to enrich this Nation's educational objectives, is a welcome one indeed.

I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically congratulate the Commerce Committee for reporting this outstanding legislation and making unmistakable its firm commitment to the furtherance of educational broadcasting. I am proud to have been a part of the initial progress the Senate made in this respect in 1962 when I served on the committee. It is truly pleasing to behold the prospect of continued, immensely successful strides in this field.

The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has done an outstanding job in steering this bill to passage, and is due the thanks of the Senate and the educational interests of the country for his leadership in this area of great national need.

#### MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL EDITION OF NEW YORK TIMES, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, AND WASHINGTON POST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate to what I consider to be an important international development—the merger of the international edition of the New York Times with that of the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post.

This development should produce a magnificent example of the very best of American journalism.

I think the whole country should be grateful to John Hay Whitney and Walter Thayer, of the Herald Tribune organization; and Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, of the New York Times, and should be grateful for the brilliant assistance rendered by Sydney Gruson, the editor in charge of the European edition; and Fritz Beebe, of the Washington Post, and Mrs. Katherine Graham, who is so well known to all of us, for carrying out the achievement that will result in strengthening a great American publication in Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles which were published in the New York Times and the Washington Post on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1967]  
INTERNATIONAL EDITION OF TIMES MERGES  
WITH PARIS COMPETITOR  
(By Allen Whitman)

The International Edition of The New York Times will join Monday with The New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris to publish a single daily newspaper, it was announced last night by the publishers of the two papers.

A statement on the merger was made simultaneously here and in Paris by John Hay Whitney, chairman, and Mrs. Katherine Graham, co-chairman, of The New York Herald Tribune-Washington Post International, and by Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of The New York Times.

The merger is subject to approval of the French Government, the announcement said.

The paper's name plate will read Herald Tribune, with the word "International" appearing between "Herald" and "Tribune." A line underneath will say, "Published With The New York Times-The Washington Post."

#### TIMES OFFICE TO CLOSE

The new paper will be published at the present offices of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, 21 Rue de Berri, off the Champs Elysee. The Times International Edition offices at 25 Rue D'Aoukir, near the Bourse, will be closed, according to Mr. Sulzberger.

Robert T. MacDonald, publisher of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, will serve as publisher of the merged paper, the announcement said. Murray M. Weiss, the present editor, will be editor of the new enterprise. Sydney Gruson, editor and chief executive officer of The Times International Edition, will work with the paper during the transition.

The combined paper will utilize all the worldwide news resources of The New York Times and The Washington Post, according to the announcement, and it will be distributed in 72 countries "with the largest circulation of any American newspaper ever printed abroad."

The current circulation of The Times International Edition is 47,000 copies a day, and that of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post is 60,000.

#### THREE-WAY OWNERSHIP

"The new joint-venture company," the announcement said, "provides for a one-third interest for The Times and continues the relative interests of Mr. Whitney and The Washington Post as they had been in the remaining two-thirds."

Last August The Herald Tribune sold a 45 per cent share in its Paris edition to The Post

for an undisclosed sum. The financial aspects of yesterday's merger were not revealed, and the principals declined to comment on them.

In making the announcement, Mr. Sulzberger said:

"We are interested in maintaining and strengthening the importance of the American voice abroad. Our new newspaper will be able to accomplish this admirably."

Mr. Whitney commented:

"Our intention is to continue to go forward, increasing our news coverage commensurate with this great increase in our resources. We hope to become of even greater service to the internationally minded communities abroad."

#### EXPANDED PAPER PLANNED

In also welcoming the new venture, Mrs. Graham said that the paper would expand both in content and circulation and that it would contain the fullest possible news contribution from The Post.

There was no definite word last night on the disposition of the International Edition staff of 140 persons, which includes 20 persons in the editorial department. Mr. Sulzberger said, however, that it was expected that some of the staff would be employed by the new paper. The present staff of The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post totals more than 100, according to a Post spokesman.

The new paper will publish six days a week, excluding a Sunday edition, according to Ivan Veit, vice president of The New York Times. The basic size of the paper will be 12 pages, Mr. Veit said. He also announced that advertising rates would be soon increased by an amount yet to be determined to reflect the expected rise in circulation.

The merger combines The Times, a relative newcomer to European journalism, with a paper that traces its lineage to 1887.

#### ONCE AN AIR EDITION

The Times began daily publication in Europe in June, 1949. For 11 years all the editorial work was done at The Times office at 229 West 43d Street, New York, and stereotype mats, ready to be cast and printed, were flown to Paris every night.

The printing operation was moved to Amsterdam in 1952. The paper, called The New York Times International Air Edition, circulated throughout Europe and the Near East.

On Oct. 20, 1960, The Times began publication in Paris of its present International Edition at a plant at 61 Rue Lafayette. This was a simultaneous edition of the New York paper, considerably condensed.

Teletypesetter tapes were punched in New York and transmitted by cable and wireless to Paris, where they were fed into type-composing machines. This process permitted The Times to circulate a virtual duplicate of its New York edition throughout Europe on the day of New York publication.

The concept of a simultaneous edition evolved over four years, until a major share in judgment of the paper's news content was shifted to Paris, and at the same time more of the type was set there. Last spring the paper moved to a new office on Rue D'Aboukir, and last September Mr. Sulzberger appointed Mr. Gruson as editor and chief executive officer.

Previously, Mr. Gruson has been foreign news editor of The Times. As a foreign correspondent, he had filed dispatches from Poland, Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Israel and Mexico in the course of his work for The Times, which began in 1944.

#### HERALD EDITION BEGUN IN 1887

The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post traces its ancestry to Oct. 4, 1887, when James Gordon Bennett, the younger, in self-imposed exile from the United States, started a Paris edition of The New York Herald. Mr. Bennett, who was often addressed as Commodore, was the son and heir of James

Gordon Bennett, the elder, who had founded The Herald in 1835.

Commodore Bennett, a mercurial man who once in the nude drove a tallyho through the streets of Paris, was given to whims, and one of them was to start a Paris paper. It appeared because he wanted it to; it was as simple as that.

Although he called his creation The New York Herald, Parisians soon referred to it as "Le New York" and later as "The Paris Herald." It introduced the linotype machine, photoengraving and the rotogravure process to Europe. It also lost about \$100,000 a year, which the Commodore cheerfully made up from his ample earnings in New York.

The Commodore ran his paper with an iron hand. At one time or another, he banned from mention in its news columns the names of Theodore Roosevelt, William Randolph Hearst and Kaiser Wilhelm II.

#### A FAMILIAR LETTER

He also insisted that the paper print every day on the editorial page a letter signed "Old Philadelphia Lady" that asked readers how she could convert centigrade temperatures into the Fahrenheit scale. The letter ran for 18 years and five months, and it was dropped only on Mr. Bennett's death in 1918.

The Herald published in Paris throughout World War I, when it began to make money. After Mr. Bennett's death, it was operated by his executors until it was bought by Frank Munsey in 1920. The paper was thrown rather casually into the package when Mr. Munsey purchased The Herald in New York and The Evening Telegram from the Bennett estate for \$4-million.

Mr. Munsey planned to kill the paper, according to newspaper historians, until he found \$1-million in The Paris Herald's bank account. In any event, the paper survived, although not as a very great money earner, and it was sold to The New York Tribune in 1924, when that paper purchased The Herald.

It maintained its formal name as The New York Herald until 1935, when it became The European Edition of The New York Herald Tribune.

#### MERGER IN 1934

Meantime the Paris edition of The Chicago Tribune, founded in 1918, was bought and absorbed by The Paris Herald in 1934. The Chicago Tribune's paper was one of four English-language dailies in Paris in the twenties. The two others were The Paris Times, which was founded in 1924 by a group of American newspapermen and had a brief existence, and the Paris edition of The London Daily Mail, also started in 1924 and also short-lived.

A number of American reporters and writers went on to fame from the staff of The Paris Herald. Among them were Ralph Barnes, Elliot Paul, Arthur Moss, Eugene Jolas, Harold Stearns, Bert Andrews, Tommy Thompson, William Carney, Al Laney, Wilbur Forrest, Leland Stowe, Whit Burnett, Martha Foley, Charles Wertenbaker, Kenneth Steward, William Shirer and Eric Hawkins.

But perhaps the most famous member of The Herald's staff was Sparrow Robertson, its sports columnist. Mr. Robertson was known to generations of Americans in Paris, and he was on a first-name basis with many of European royalty. He was not especially keen on names, however, and he addressed his friends, low and high, as "Old Pal."

#### SUSPENSION DURING WAR

The European Edition of The Herald Tribune was suspended from 1940 to 1944 during the German occupation of Paris in World War II. It reappeared Dec. 22, 1944, from the office it had occupied in the Rue de Berri since 1930.

The paper came under Mr. Whitney's active direction in 1961. He had previously purchased a controlling interest in The New York Herald Tribune from Mrs. Ogden M.

Reid and her two sons, Whitelaw and Ogden Reid. Mrs. Reid and her sons had operated the paper after the death of Mrs. Reid's husband in 1947.

Last summer The Herald Tribune ceased publication in New York as a morning newspaper during a strike and joined the now defunct World Journal Tribune in a new afternoon paper. Mr. Whitney then sold an interest in the European Edition to The Washington Post.

The Paris paper began to print articles from The Washington Post-Los Angeles Times News Service. It continued to publish columns by Walter Lippmann and Art Buchwald.

The new paper is expected to continue to publish these columns. In addition, Mr. Sulzberger said last night, the paper would have available to it The New York Times News Service, plus such Times columnists as James Reston, Russell Baker and Tom Wicker.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 17, 1967]

#### NEW YORK TIMES AND HERALD TRIBUNE-POST FORM INTERNATIONAL PAPER IN PARIS

The International Edition of The New York Times will combine Monday, May 22, with the New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris to publish a single newspaper to be known as The International Herald Tribune.

Utilizing all the news resources of The Washington Post and The New York Times, it will be distributed in 72 countries throughout the world with the largest circulation of any American newspaper ever printed abroad.

Robert T. MacDonald, publisher, and Murray M. Weiss, editor of the Herald-Tribune, will continue to direct the newspaper in those capacities, Sydney Gruson, editor and chief executive officer of the Times's International Edition, will remain with the new newspaper during the transition. The paper will be published in the Herald Tribune building at 21 Rue de Berri in Paris.

Announcement of the new newspaper combination and of a new partnership to publish it was made in New York yesterday by John Hay Whitney, chairman, and Katharine Graham, cochairman, of the New York Herald Tribune-The Washington Post, together with Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of The New York Times.

Its appearance on Monday will be the second major recent change in the 80-year history of the Herald Tribune in Paris. The New York Times plans to publish its final International Edition Friday night.

Last September, when the circulation of the Herald Tribune in Paris was at a record high of 62,000 copies daily. The Washington Post Co., of which Mrs. Graham is president, acquired a share in the paper. The new joint venture company that will begin operation Monday, subject to French government approval, provides for a one-third interest for the Times and continues the relative interests of Mr. Whitney and The Washington Post as they had been in the remaining two-thirds.

The Times, with a current circulation of 47,000 copies, began daily publication in Europe in June, 1949. At that time, all of the editorial work on the paper was done in New York and mats ready to be cast and printed were flown across the Atlantic to Paris every night. In 1952, the printing operation was moved to Amsterdam. In 1960, however, the paper moved over again to Paris, there to publish a simultaneous edition of the New York paper, considerably condensed. Gradually, this evolved into a more autonomous edition. It has been under the direction of Gruson for the last seven months.

The Herald Tribune-The Washington Post in Paris traces its history directly to the foundation in 1887 of the Paris Herald by James Gordon Bennett. It has been published