

This screen of secrecy is a barrier to reporters, as representatives of the public—to citizens in pursuit of information vital to their business enterprises—and is a formidable barrier to many Congressmen seeking to carry out their constitutional functions. Many loyal, conscientious Government employees share our concern. They recognize the right of a taxpayer to know how his money is being spent; to know how public business is conducted; the reasons for decisions that affect the lives, businesses and future of our people.

A the Senate Committee on the Judiciary found in 1946 and found again in 1964, and as this subcommittee has reported in the past, there is no justification for most of the secrecy. If permitted to continue, this policy of secrecy will lay the foundation for a totalitarian bureaucracy, that will be an even greater threat to public welfare.

This subcommittee I hope will share our concern for the future as well as the present. Well-educated citizens already tend to regard problems of Government as too technical and too complex to follow closely. Their apathy has grown with the more intense manipulation and control of information and the frustrations of trying to cope with Government redtape.

Donald N. Michael, a social psychologist and a resident fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies here in Washington, makes some pertinent points about the future in a new book, "The Next Generation." He notes that our concerned young people and adults will continue to feel frustrated and inadequate in the face of complexities and secrecies. He foresees a mounting trend toward developing policies through a technique of rationalization, which may be based more on technological factors than on wisdom. These techniques of rationalization can have good and bad consequences. At their worst, Dr. Michael says, they could lead to a garrison state.

(Parenthetically, we might point out that in the hearings on Senate bill S. 1666, the "right-to-know" bill, Government agencies appeared to utilize rationalization rather than wisdom to justify policies denying access to information.)

Some time ago in a paper presented to a symposium at the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, Dr. Michael, who is an expert in the study of cybernetics, raised other questions about how computer techniques may affect democratic processes. These same questions also concern the public interest in how Government decisions are reached.

"Roughly, the situation to be faced," said Dr. Michael, "is that social problems to be met will require the increasing application of computers by the Government to clarify the problems and opportunities, and to design and implement effectively the needed programs for social betterment."

He notes that often defense and foreign policies are formulated through analysis of data processed by computers and that the basis for these decisions are "only dimly apprehended by the informed public and totally beyond the comprehension and often the interests of the general public."

Then Dr. Michael asks, "How, then, will the interested layman be able to find out what 'models' were used that provided the 'facts' or interpretations on which the policy is based?"

These are vital public questions as to how Government decisions are reached. They will grow in importance as so-called "thinking ma-