

chines" are used more and more in decision-making processes. Such questions make it all the more imperative that in the future there be greater access to information in our Government agencies. The new technology is not limited to agencies charged with making defense and foreign policy. It is being utilized also by the agencies concerned with education, welfare, highways and natural resources, agencies that are not entitled to secrecy protection on the grounds of security.

Who is responsible for the computer programing?

Who is responsible for the selection of raw material fed into the computer?

Who is responsible for the analysis that goes to our policymakers as a study report or policy recommendation?

These questions concern social and political scientists, other informed citizens, the press, and they puzzle many Members of Congress.

But there are more obvious cases involving denial and manipulation of information that have nothing to do with new technology, with security or any other legitimate reasons. The pattern is clear from reams of previous testimony. Earlier, I mentioned barriers faced by Congressmen, as representatives of the people. Let's take a look at the Congressional Record for April 21, 1964, by two Members of Congress with offices just down the hall from this hearing room.

A member of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Congressman William E. Minshall, of Ohio, expressed dismay concerning changes made in Department testimony under the guise of security. After rechecking the original transcripts that were locked in the subcommittee safe, Mr. Minshall said:

More times than not the only security involved was the political security of the present administration. It was political censorship, not national security, that was the guideline in determining what should be left for you to read in the final printed copies of the hearings. The printed hearings only hint at what Secretary McNamara actually said about the interlocking of our defense and foreign policies.

Congressman Minshall contended further that half of Gen. Curtis LeMay's testimony was censored, not because of any security data that was disclosed but, because "his remarks did not happen to agree with Secretary McNamara's views."

Out in Wichita we are somewhat prejudiced in favor of the Boeing Co. We have felt, on the basis of the McClellan committee findings, that the people would have been better served—and their tax dollars better utilized—if Boeing had received the contract to build the TFX, or what is now know as the new F-111 plane. Mr. McNamara and his able press controller—and he is very able at manipulating the news—Arthur Sylvester, gave the public and the press a real "snow job" to support the decision to award this contract to General Dynamics.

Congressman Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, whose office is right next door, pinpointed the problem of news manipulation in the TFX affair with this statement during debate on defense appropriations:

Regardless of the kind of statement which has been issued, I have a confidential memorandum from Arthur Sylvester dated March 5, 1964, in which he dictates policy in the Department of Defense regarding the TFX * * * He dictates what the Navy, the Air Force, and their contractors must say about the TFX and its development.

Congressman Laird inserted in the record the memorandum issued by Sylvester. It is rigid control guideline making clear that the