

U.S. Advisory Commission on Information  
NINTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF  
UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION  
ON INFORMATION DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
LIBRARY DIVISION

FEB 1 1 1954

LETTER LR FILE COPY  
FROM PLEASE RETURN

ACTING CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ADVISORY  
COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

TRANSMITTING

THE NINTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED  
STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION,  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 603 OF PUBLIC LAW 402,  
80TH CONGRESS



FEBRUARY 2, 1954.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs  
and ordered to be printed

E  
744  
224  
JAN.  
1954

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1954

42011

~~E 744~~  
~~744~~  
~~224~~  
~~JAN.~~  
~~1954~~

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY  
COMMISSION ON INFORMATION,  
UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,  
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I transmit herewith copy of the ninth semi-annual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated January 1954. This report is required by section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress.

A copy of this report also is being sent to the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ERWIN D. CANHAM,  
*Acting Chairman, United States Advisory  
Commission on Information.*

(Enclosure: Ninth semiannual report of the U. S. Advisory Commission on Information.)

## FOREWORD

The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402) was approved by the 80th Congress on January 27, 1948, an act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations. Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953 provided for the transfer of information program functions from the Department of State to an independent agency. The United States Information Agency came into being on August 1, 1953.

Public Law 402 created the United States Advisory Commission on Information to formulate and recommend to the Secretary of State<sup>1</sup> policies and programs for the carrying out of this act. It required the Commission to transmit to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of the act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commission to the Secretary<sup>1</sup> for effectuating the purposes and objectives of the act and action taken to carry out such recommendations.

This is the ninth semiannual report by the United States Advisory Commission on Information to the Congress. The eighth report was transmitted in August 1953.

ERWIN D. CANHAM, *Acting Chairman*,  
PHILIP D. REED,  
BEN HIBBS,  
JUSTIN MILLER.

---

<sup>1</sup> Functions transferred to the Director of the U. S. Information Agency under Reorganization Plan No. 8.  
NOTE.—Mark A. May, Chairman, resigned from the Commission on August 21, 1953.

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
I. Recommendations.....	1
II. Reasons for recommendations.....	4
III. Progress since August 1, 1953.....	18
IV. Importance of the work.....	18
Appendix: Summarized recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Information in its seventh semiannual report to the Congress with brief statement of the action taken on each one.....	20

## NINTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

On August 1, 1953, under Reorganization Plan No. 8, a new United States Information Agency (USIA) was launched. It combines into one organization the former International Information Administration (IIA) of the Department of State (except the exchange-of-persons program), the overseas information activities of the former Mutual Security Agency (MSA) and Technical Cooperation Administration (TCA) in accordance with a recommendation made by this Commission to the 83d Congress in January 1953. In accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 8 this Commission is now advisory on the book and information centers program as well as on the other media. It is the only commission that is now advisory to USIA.

This report covers our observation and appraisal of the new Agency for the 5-month period August 1 to December 31, 1953. It is limited to the aspects of the work of USIA concerning which we offer comments, suggestions for improvement, and recommended actions for the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

First let it be said that in our judgment the new Agency is off to a good start. It has a new Director and a new directive from the President; a new conception of its mission, a new form of organization, and many new men in its top positions. While it is altogether too early to judge the results of its work, yet its efforts reflect an honest and intelligent attempt to comply with the wishes of the new administration and of the 83d Congress for a bold new type of program. For this effort we feel that it deserves, for the time being at least, the sympathetic support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, private industry, and the general public. This report includes a number of recommended actions on the part of Congress and the executive branch which, if taken, will we believe materially improve its chances of success. The recommendations are stated first in a condensed form and expanded in the main body of the report.

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *The new directive.*—The President has handed down to the Agency a directive which defines its mission as follows:

The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communications techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace.

It is recommended:

*That early in its 2d session the 83d Congress shall take appropriate action to express congressional intent consistent with this directive.*

2. *Congressional liaison.*—The Director of USIA now reports to the President through an arm of the National Security Council (NSC)

known as the Operations Coordinating Board (OCB) which provides an open channel of communication between the Agency and the head of the executive branch. A single official channel should be opened for constant communication with the legislative branch.

It is recommended:

*That a permanent joint congressional committee composed of representatives from existing committees concerned with foreign policies and appropriations be appointed for general liaison with the work of USIA.*

3. *Congressional investigations.*—During the past year USIA-IIA has undergone 2 congressional investigations, 1 by the Senate's Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs (the Hickenlooper committee) and 1 by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations (the McCarthy committee). It has also been investigated by the President's Committee on International Information (the W. H. Jackson committee).

It is recommended:

*That USIA be spared further formal investigations by congressional committees until it has had an opportunity to prove itself.*

4. *Closer liaison with the executive branch.*—The work of all overseas operating agencies of the United States Government is now coordinated by an arm of NSC known as OCB. Although the Director of USIA attends the meetings of this board on invitation he is not a regular voting member.

It is recommended:

*That the President designate the Director of USIA a permanent voting member of OCB.*

5. *The composition of USIA.*—All overseas information programs of the United States Government, except the exchange-of-persons program, are now in USIA. The exchange-of-persons program lies within the scope of the new directive and is currently serviced overseas as in the past by USIA personnel.

It is recommended:

*That the exchange-of-persons program be transferred from the Department of State to USIA.*

6. *Greater flexibility for USIA in the management of its budget and personnel.*—Although USIA enjoys greater freedom in its management than did IIA, yet the organization of its work in a rapidly changing international scene requires a greater flexibility than it now has.

It is recommended:

*That steps be taken to give USIA greater freedom in the management of its budget and personnel.*

7. *Career tenure for USIA overseas personnel.*—The overseas personnel of USIA over which it has exclusive control are classified as Foreign Service Reserve (FSR) and Foreign Service Staff (FSS). These are not career categories.

It is recommended:

*That Congress take appropriate action to give career tenure to at least one category of USIA overseas personnel.*

8. *Training program for USIA personnel.*—The Commission has reviewed with USIA what it is presently doing in terms of personnel training and finds the training program considerably limited due to

the personnel and budget cuts of last August. Training is important for all personnel—domestic and overseas—but it is particularly important for those persons who are going abroad to represent the United States Government.

It is recommended:

*That the training program which USIA has developed be implemented and a training school established for USIA personnel.*

9. *Higher status in United States Embassies for USIA personnel.*—In the field each USIA mission is an integral part of the United States Embassy or consulate. The new program requires greater responsibility for the head of each USIA mission, namely, the PAO. In many instances these responsibilities are equal in importance to those of the political and economic members of embassies.

It is recommended:

*That at important missions the PAO be given the rank of Minister of Embassy.*

10. *Diplomatic status for USIA personnel.*—Prior to Reorganization Plan No. 8, which separated the information program from the Department of State, diplomatic passports were issued to USIS employees holding diplomatic and consular titles and commissions as well as to other Foreign Service employees whose duties were such as to require a diplomatic passport for the effective performance of their duties.

It is recommended:

*That overseas personnel of USIA should be granted diplomatic status and issued diplomatic passports, as formerly when the information program was a part of the Department of State.*

11. *A building for the Agency in Washington.*—During 1954 practically all of the domestic personnel of USIA will be located in Washington. They will be scattered through several buildings. A building large enough and suitable to house the entire Agency has not been made available. The new conception of the program calls for closer coordination of all the media services, policy, research staffs, and administration.

It is recommended:

*That Congress authorize in Washington a building suitable to house the entire staff and operating facilities of USIA.*

12. *More translations of books and articles.*—IBS broadcasts in several languages; motion pictures are recorded in several languages and press and publications are translated in several languages. However, the book program is lagging behind in putting printed materials into the languages of the masses of peoples of other countries.

It is recommended:

*That adequate funds be provided in the fiscal year 1955 budget for more translations.*

13. *International television.*—Television is becoming an important medium of communication in the international field.

It is recommended:

*That provisions be made for the development of a plan for utilizing the new and powerful medium of television.*

14. *Greater use of American industry and business.*—Public Law 402 specifies that this should be done. It has been done to a considerable extent in many ways. More can be done.

It is recommended:

*That a greater effort be made to find ways of using the support of American private industry and business both at home and abroad.*

## II. REASONS FOR THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. *Early in its 2d session the 83d Congress should take appropriate action to express congressional intent consistent with this directive*

Here is the full text of the directive.

In carrying out its responsibilities in accordance with pertinent statutes and Presidential directives, the United States Information Agency shall be guided by the following:

1. The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress and peace.

2. The purpose in paragraph 1 above is to be carried out primarily:

(a) By explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the United States Government.

(b) By depicting imaginatively the correlation between United States policies and the legitimate aspirations of other peoples of the world.

(c) By unmasking and countering hostile attempts to distort or to frustrate the objectives and policies of the United States.

(d) By delineating those important aspects of the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States.

The new chord which the directive strikes was first sounded by the President in his inaugural address in 1953. He enunciated the positive values to which this Government and the people of the United States are committed: strength for peace; recognition of the independent rights of all nations; desire to cooperate with all friendly nations for peace; all men entitled to the blessings of prosperity and peace; and—

we are called upon as people to give testimony in the sight of the world to our faith and the future shall belong to the free.

When translated into an informational program the new note was sounded by Mr. Streibert in a recent address when he said:

\* \* \* we are not out to sell the United States. We are not trying to make them copy us, emulate us, or become like us. Rather, we are seeking to identify ourselves with the legitimate aims and aspirations of the peoples of all countries \* \* \*

The new program is based on the belief that the ties that bind a voluntary coalition of friendly countries are their common aspirations for peace—freedom of each to solve its own problems in its own way, to perpetuate its own culture, to hold its own standards of value, and to maintain its own freedom of religion. We should strive to strengthen these bonds of unity, both by emphasizing mutual aspirations and by combating Communist propaganda that stresses divided issues.

It will not be easy to carry out this directive. There are many obstacles to be overcome both at home and abroad. Abroad we are faced with suspicions that our efforts are entirely selfish; that we are out to exploit other peoples for our own interests. These suspicions are reinforced by Communist propaganda. At home a medley of voices speaks from high places in tones that resound around the world concerning our national objectives and interests. Some of the pronouncements are very disturbing to friendly nations whose support we need in our efforts to combat communism. It is not easy, in fact

almost impossible, to persuade peoples of other countries that these conflicting opinions and pronouncements are typical of American democracy and reflect our belief that every man has a right to express his opinions within the limits of common decency. Moreover, it is difficult to persuade peoples of other countries that some of our objectives are in harmony with their aspirations for peace and freedom—e. g., immigration and trade restrictions.

In the final analysis the justification for the existence of this Agency in the eyes of the taxpayers and Congress is its ability to combat Communist imperialism effectively. The power of that involuntary and coerced coalition of Soviet-controlled states is indeed a threat and a menace to the free world. Who is it that does not fear a devastating atomic war between Russia and the free world? It is this fear that motivates the personal sacrifices that all of us must make to secure our defenses and to weaken the capacity of our enemy to destroy us. The extent to which the work of this Agency can reduce this anxiety, the more grateful the peoples of the free world will be for its efforts. The greater the success of this Agency in reducing the threat of war by psychological means, the less we shall need to tax ourselves for military security.

The task of combating the spread of communism need not be elaborated here. It is clearly implied in a recent report—The Strength of the International Communist Movement—published by a special committee on security affairs of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations. We are faced with a highly organized, ruthless, and unprincipled propaganda machine against which our most formidable weapon is the unvarnished truth which we believe will unmask the ugly face of this monster in the sight of the peoples of the world.

As we see it, this Presidential directive assigns to the new Agency a task that will tax to the utmost its capacities to perform. But the President of the United States has a military record of having accomplished feats which many of his fellow citizens thought were impossible. He did it by virtue of the strong support of Congress, the people of the United States, and the governments and individuals of our allies.

Is this then the bold new program which Congress wants? If so, congressional endorsement would be of great encouragement and would motivate the utmost effort on the part of its administrative officials all the way down to the lowest ranks of its employees to redouble their efforts in a determined attempt to make the new program a success. If, on the other hand, it is not the new program for which Congress is looking, we believe that the executive branch and the Director of the new Agency are entitled to know more definitely than has been known in the past the type of program which Congress is prepared to support.

*2. That a permanent joint congressional committee composed of representatives from existing committees concerned with foreign policies and appropriations be appointed for general liaison with the work of USIA*

The Commission renews its recommendation made to Congress in its seventh semiannual report. The following is quoted from it:

IIA (now USIA) does not now deal regularly with any standing committee or subcommittee of Congress which is primarily interested in the substantive prob-

## 6 SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

lems of overseas information. The result of this lack has been that, while propaganda grows in importance as an arm of our foreign policy, the congressional specialists operating in this area have been limited almost entirely to the budgetary field. Officers of IIA (now USIA) have been able to turn for advice and guidance only to the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees dealing with Department of State (now USIA) funds, and to a much lesser degree to certain subcommittees of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees. Not only has this overburdened the members of these two appropriations subcommittees, but also it has meant that they have been asked to give advice on matters of policy and operations rather than on their specialty of appropriations.

Obviously, ways and means must be found for establishing understanding and effective working relations between the Information Agency, Congress, and the executive branch. The Advisory Commission on Information stands ready to play such an intermediary role, as it may, in effecting this highly desirable end. Whether on a formal or informal basis, the Commission is ready to respond to requests or to take the initiative in establishing channels of communication and for working out methods for securing such understanding and cooperation. We are thoroughly convinced that the most important first step which could be taken in this direction would be the setting up of a joint committee of Congress for the purpose.

This Commission believes that the work of the Senate's Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs has been thoroughly and extremely constructive. It has revealed the actual and potential strengths of the Information Agency as well as its weaknesses.

### *3. That USIA be spared further special investigations by congressional committees until it has had an opportunity to prove itself*

If recommendation No. 2 is adopted there will be no further need for special investigations by Congress of the work of this Agency. The proposed permanent joint committee should in conjunction with the work of the United States Advisory Commission on Information be entirely adequate for keeping Congress fully informed at all times on the policies, programs, projects, and management of USIA.

The wide and unfavorable publicity that resulted from one of the congressional investigations gave the Agency such a bad name that professionally competent persons were reluctant to accept employment in it. This may be one reason why the Director has experienced considerable difficulty in filling the top positions.

It is recognized, of course, that congressional investigations are often needed for the sake of security and economy; yet it should be remembered that the personnel of an agency that is constantly under attack or subject to the threat of periodic attacks necessarily become cautious, anxious, dull, prosaic, and inefficient in their work. This is particularly true of an agency that prepares messages for overseas distribution. Those who prepare these materials are perforce made cautious of how the messages will sound or appear to the investigators and completely lose sight of whether they will be effective with their intended audience. This situation is all the more vicious and destructive when each employee fears his fellow workers.

Some of the investigations which this Agency has undergone in the past year have produced unfavorable impressions abroad on the very persons to whom the program is directed. When these people hear, through our media of communication, constant reports of attacks upon the Information Agency—challenges directed at it for supposed

failures, inadequacies, poor techniques, poor programing, etc., how can we expect them to have any confidence in an Agency which does not enjoy the confidence of those responsible Government officials who seem constantly to be attacking it? The capacity for disseminating catastrophic news—which has been developed to the highest degree of efficiency by American communications media—insures that adverse reports of this kind will get the widest circulation throughout the world. It is not too much to say that the desirable results sought through the activities of the Information Agency are largely offset, if not destroyed, by this constant counterbarrage which is so generously distributed to the peoples of the world.

We believe that Congress should be kept fully and frankly informed on the work of this Agency. This can be accomplished much more effectively by a permanent joint congressional committee, as recommended above, than by sporadic special investigations.

4. *That the President should designate the Director of USIA a permanent voting member of OCB*

By recommending, in our seventh semiannual report, that IIA be lifted out of the Department of State and placed in a new Agency of Cabinet rank, we were giving expression to our belief that the Director of the new Agency should be in the closest possible contact with the Office of the President and should be coordinate with the heads of other divisions of the Government engaged in overseas operations. We feel that the Director of USIA should be a participant in the deliberations concerning the coordination of overseas operations, and not be in the status of being "coordinated" by others. He is a member of a team and should be given first-class citizenship on the team.

5. *That the exchange-of-persons program be transferred from the Department of State to USIA*

We make this recommendation in full realization that we are trespassing on the ground of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. The fact, however, that the exchange program overseas is serviced by USIA personnel gives us a right to speak.

There were no doubt reasons for keeping this program in the Department of State when the rest of IIA was transferred into USIA. One is historical. When Public Law 402 was enacted in 1948 there were voices in State, and outside, who spoke for keeping "culture" separate from "information" or "propaganda". Hence the act was drawn to recognize this separation. From 1948 to 1952 the Washington office under the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs was divided into the Office of International Information (OII) and Office of Educational Exchange (OEX). In the field, however, the two were combined. When IIA was organized in January 1952, OII and OEX were abolished and replaced with a different plan of organization. At this time the line between "culture" and "information" was less sharply drawn in Washington.

In the field, however, and from the beginning, the informational and cultural work has been well integrated. Cultural officers work closely with the officers assigned to press, motion pictures, and radio. Pamphlets prepared by the press section are distributed by the information centers, motion pictures are also distributed through the information centers and large use has been made of them by cultural officers.

As to the exchange-of-persons program, exchangees upon returning to their native country have written articles for newspapers and magazines and delivered addresses before a large variety of audiences on their experiences and impressions of the United States.

On the whole these activities have done much to promote the main purpose of the Information Agency in promoting mutual understanding between the United States and other peoples. It is clear therefore, that the exchange-of-persons program is in fact an integral part of the work of the USIA.

USIA is conceived to be basically an Agency of general education on a worldwide scale. It dispenses facts and ideas to noncaptive audiences. Among these are not only facts about American life and culture but ugly facts about communism.

The question has been raised as to whether or not the exchange-of-persons program overseas should be administered by the Department of State, rather than USIA. From our point of view this would be an unnecessary duplication of effort and would involve an increased appropriation to the Department of State. However, it would not be possible to reduce the appropriations to USIA accordingly because of the other duties that are now being performed by its overseas personnel particularly its cultural officers.

*6. That steps be taken to give USIA greater flexibility and freedom in the management of its budget and personnel*

Although USIA is completely autonomous and has much more control over its budget and personnel than did IIA, yet it is by no means free from bureaucratic restrictions placed on it (a) by other agencies, such as the Civil Service Commission, and (b) by its own internal bureaucracy. Its personnel who were transferred to it from IIA and MSA brought with them their former habits of work and the rules that they had learned to live by. Like all habits and rules these particular ones lack flexibility.

Many bureaucrats suffer from an occupational disease which Veblen called "trained incapacity." It is chronic but not fatal to the person, but when too many are afflicted by it, it becomes fatal to an organization. One symptom is that the patient can think of 100 reasons why something new or unusual but really very simple and important cannot be done. These reasons are all drawn from the rules which he knows and lives by. Such rules, originally means to ends, later become ends in themselves. Other symptoms are profound sense of status, resistance to change of routine, defense of prerogatives, or an "official" attitude toward outsiders.

Members of this Commission, in their trips overseas, have seen many instances of the effects of bureaucracy on the work of USIS. We have seen exasperating instances where requests for authorization or small allocations of funds for special purposes, such as programming for a particular national holiday, or for renting additional space for a particular period of time, have had to work their way up through the long channels of administrative procedure, sometimes to get lost in the pigeonholes and sometimes finally to arrive back with an equivocal answer weeks after the event has passed. We have found instances in which the transfer of personnel from one assignment to another—sometimes even at the same post—has been delayed for weeks or months in order to go through the long process of loyalty

investigation, etc., even though the person has been cleared by previous investigations and is already charged with work of as great or greater secrecy than that with which he would be concerned in the new assignment. We have seen instances where in particular countries "representation" funds have been so limited—allocated on a country basis—that it has been impossible to do immediate, imperative jobs in order to achieve the objective of the operation in that particular country. We have seen instances in which—following these frozen techniques of personnel transfer—a man has been suddenly jerked out of an information post and given a new tour of duty, without the slightest regard for the disastrous effect which such unheralded transfer might have on the program from which he is taken, and without provision for a new man being sent in to take his place. We have seen occasions on which new men, finally sent in after lapses of months of time, have been entirely unprepared for the task; who have found it necessary to get acquainted all over again with the language, the people, the customs, the habits, and the religions of the people.

A recent instance occurred in USIA when Mossadegh was overthrown in Iran and USIS was free to restore operations. The director wanted to rush reinforcements to Iran immediately. But there were rules to be reckoned with—rules about transfer of Foreign Service personnel, rules about transferring items in the budget. It was finally done but only after some drastic violations of self-imposed rules inherited from the Department of State.

USIA can, of course, set up its own internal ground rules, within the framework of restrictions placed on it by basic laws administered by other agencies under their rules. There are some restrictions, however, that we feel Congress could and should remove. One is the controversial question of budgetary restrictions on funds for so-called "representation." This term is Department of State jargon and should be dropped from the vocabulary of USIA. The field officers of USIA need funds not for representing the United States at official dinners, cocktail parties, etc., but for winning friends and influencing people by picking up the check when a persuasive conversation has been reinforced with a good meal. There is no more reason why such operating costs should be paid out of their own pockets than for them to pay for the paper on which the Wireless File is printed. One of the costs of "public relations," as every businessman knows, is the expense of entertaining clients and customers. USIA officers in the field are our "public relations" officers. It is a major part of the business of our overseas personnel.

There are other budgetary restrictions that hamper the work of USIA. This Commission believes that the Director should have a modest discretionary fund for use in emergencies. The need for such a fund is self-explanatory and implicit in the nature and work of the Agency.

*7. That Congress take appropriate action to give career tenure to at least one category of USIA overseas personnel.*

Following the approval of the reorganization plan, the President issued an Executive order transferring to the Director of USIA complete personnel authority over Foreign Service reserve (FSR), Foreign Service staff (FSS), and Foreign Service local (FSL) employees.

The major exceptions were authority to regulate allowances and differentials and authority to issue or grant diplomatic and consular titles and commissions. No authority was transferred to the Director for employment of Foreign Service officers. The Foreign Service Act, however, permits the assignment of Foreign Service officers (FSO's) to the program by the Department of State. The Foreign Service officer career system is such that it is not feasible for the new Agency to employ Foreign Service officers under the Department of State's system. Consequently, the need for career officers of this type must be met by negotiation with the Department of State for assignment of Foreign Service officers to the program. This arrangement for assignment of Foreign Service officers to the program has disadvantages for USIA in that the program cannot rely on these officers for extended service. After 1 or 2 tours of duty, the officer and Department normally insist on rotation to other types of Foreign Service work.

In the long run this lack of a career group similar to the Foreign Service officer category will handicap the program. The Foreign Service personnel system, as established by the Foreign Service Act, places basic dependence on the FSO category to provide the backbone of the Service.

The salary structure of the Foreign Service Act establishes two separate salary structures for staff and reserve employees, and the 4-year limitation on the employment of reserve officers further handicaps the program. The only permanent employees the Agency can hire for overseas work are staff employees. Salary structure for staff employees does not permit employment at the higher salary levels. Officers employed at the higher salary level must, of necessity, be placed in the reserve category and the 4-year limitation prevents their employment for extended career service.

The Commission has been informed that the President has authorized a study on overseas personnel administration which is now under way. We endorse this study, but the need is immediate as far as USIA is concerned, and in our opinion Congress should make special provisions for USIA overseas personnel.

8. *That the training program which USIA has developed be implemented and a training school established for USIA personnel*

In our sixth report to the Congress, which was dated July 1, 1952, we made specific recommendations with respect to a training program for personnel of the International Information Administration. Upon receipt of this report by the Secretary of State, he made a reply to the Commission that positive action was being taken to improve the training of the IIA personnel. This was reported in our seventh semiannual report to the Congress, dated February 1953.

We have reviewed with the United States Information Agency what it is presently doing in terms of personnel training and find it is considerably limited due to the personnel and budget cuts of last August. We have had an opportunity to review a training plan for USIA which would seem to be quite adequate if it were implemented, and we cannot urge too strongly the necessity for such a training program. Training is important for all personnel—domestic and overseas—but it is particularly important for those persons who are going abroad to represent the United States Government. The pro-

posed training plan incorporates all of the points which we outlined in our sixth report. We feel that this is one of the most urgent problems facing the Agency and would recommend that immediate action be taken.

*9. That at important missions the PAO be given the rank of Minister of Embassy*

The new Agency is resolved to give greater responsibilities to its field officers both in matters of operation and in determining specific country objectives. There is, therefore, an acceleration of a trend started 3 years ago when this Commission first recommended greater decentralization. Thus in each country the PAO is the most important man in the program. He is the key to our success. Working with a small staff, often pathetically understaffed, often by himself, at remote posts, he runs the operation where the program pays off, on the front lines overseas. In many respects he functions as an ambassador.

When we are visited in this country by the King and Queen of Greece, when our Vice President makes a good-will tour of the world, when the President's brother goes down to Argentina to iron out diplomatic differences of long standing, when the President of the United States goes to Mexico or Canada for similar purposes, we see at once the effectiveness of the "personal touch" and the importance of "people." When an American Ambassador makes a tour through the country to which he is assigned so that the people of the Nation have a chance to see him and hear him speak, the good-will results are tremendous, as everyone who is acquainted with our diplomatic relations is well aware. We need in every country of the world at least one public-affairs officer who can be available for just such good-will operations. He should be available for speaking to all manner of groups of people—business, educational, religious, governmental, labor, etc.—and his work should be so organized that he would have practically all his time available for such purposes. In order to achieve this, he should have sufficient secretarial help and an administrative officer to whom he could safely entrust the routine of the office operation. Thus he would be left free and available for breakfast, luncheon, dinner, and many other kinds of meetings where he could associate with the people of the country to which he is assigned. There he could speak on all possible occasions concerning those phases of American life and policy about which we wish the people of the world to know. We cannot afford to be stingy with appropriations for such purposes. We cannot assume that the formal approaches of books, motion pictures, broadcasting, etc., can achieve the objectives which we have in mind. No one would assume that in the United States, for example, a Member of Congress could possibly carry on a campaign for election or properly keep in touch with his constituents between elections by the use of such formal methods of communication. We take it for granted that the personal contact, the personal interpretation of governmental policy, and the personal explanation of governmental action is an absolute minimum requirement. How much more important it is that the same method should be used in other countries of the world which have little or no background understanding of what goes on in the

United States and which are subject to the most vicious campaigns of misrepresentation and untruth.

The effectiveness of this kind of personal work depends in no small degree on the prestige status of the man. The higher he ranks in the Embassy, the more attention will be paid to what he says.

*10. That overseas personnel of USIA should be granted diplomatic status and issued diplomatic passports as formerly when the information program was a part of the Department of State*

Prior to Reorganization Plan No. 8, which separated the information program from the Department of State, diplomatic passports were issued to USIS employees holding diplomatic and consular titles and commissions as well as to other Foreign Service employees whose duties were such as to require a diplomatic passport for the effective performance of their duties.

In working out the details for implementing the reorganization plan, it was agreed that when the United States Information Agency was established the status quo would be maintained in the field with respect to diplomatic and consular titles and commissions, and by inference with respect to diplomatic passports for persons holding such commissions. In fact, the Department of State concurred with an instruction to the field, dated July 29, 1953, which reads as follows:

*9. Diplomatic and consular titles and commissions*

The Director of the new Agency (USIA) will have no authority with respect to recommending to the President, or granting diplomatic or consular commissions. Diplomatic and consular titles and commissions in effect on July 31, 1953, for IIA reserve and staff employees will continue in effect after August 1 for employees transferred to USIA. After August 1, the Director will request the Secretary of State to recommend to the President or to grant any additional or new diplomatic and consular titles and commissions to USIA reserve and staff employees in individual cases as he determines that such titles and commissions are necessary to the effective performance of the program.

Prior to August 1, the Department of State recognized foreign information activities as a normal and legitimate component of embassy and consular programs. Reorganization Plan No. 8 did not alter the status of the program in the field. There should be no question as to whether this Agency performs diplomatic and consular functions. A recently issued National Security Council directive charges the Agency with "explaining and interpreting to foreign peoples the objectives and policies of the United States Government." However, since the creation of the United States Information Agency, the Department of State questions the validity of issuing consular titles and commissions and diplomatic passports to USIA officers in the consulates. The Department has also sharply restricted the issuance of diplomatic passports to USIA officers in the embassies. The Department will no longer issue diplomatic passports to domestic program officers making trips abroad, except for the Director himself.

Although the Department has placed in effect its new restrictive policies, the questions of granting diplomatic and consular titles and commissions and issuing diplomatic passports to USIA employees are being reviewed by it. The Commission urges that the diplomatic status of the program be preserved. This recommendation is based on the following:

1. Prior to Reorganization Plan No. 8 the information program was accorded diplomatic status by the Department of State.

2. It was not the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 8 to alter the status of the program but rather to strengthen it.

3. Basically, the information program carries out diplomatic-consular functions as it is concerned with interpreting and explaining United States foreign policy and objectives to foreign peoples.

4. The Department of State accords diplomatic recognition to the information programs of other governments.

5. Diplomatic status is necessary to obtain appropriate diplomatic protection for the program, its property, and personnel, and the free entry of program property through customs.

6. Proper diplomatic accreditation of USIA officials is necessary to receive official recognition from their counterparts in the host Government and to enable them to conduct pertinent business effectively.

*11. That Congress authorize in Washington a building adequate to house the entire staff and operating facilities of USIA*

During the past 3 or 4 years the work of the Agency has been hampered by the fact that its domestic forces have been divided between New York and Washington and by the further fact that in neither city have they been housed in one building. The Commission is in sympathy with the directive of Congress that the Voice of America operations be moved to Washington by June 30, 1954. Whether this deadline can be met remains to be seen.

A search has been made in Washington for an appropriate building and one has been found which, although not entirely satisfactory, will serve the needs of the Agency for the time being. However, the Agency still finds its staff spread out in 3 or 4 buildings, 1 of which is considerable distance from the others.

The Commission believes that the work of this Agency would be substantially improved if its entire personnel and necessary broadcasting facilities could be housed in one building.

*12. That adequate funds be provided in the fiscal year 1955 budget for more translations*

Another important phase of the information program which requires more emphasis is the translation of representative American books. There are vast numbers of people throughout the world who can be reached only through their native tongues. The extent to which the Reader's Digest is now being distributed throughout the world, in various translations, is a good example of what we need in this respect. If we expect to get useful results from our libraries or from pamphlets which we distribute, we must have translations of material which can be placed in those libraries and in the hands of such people.

The translation program has been seriously limited by the reduction in personnel both in Washington and in the field and the loss of trained staff, making it impossible to even maintain the program within the present allotment for the current fiscal year. In the fiscal year 1953 private publishers abroad were able to publish 582 translated editions in 41 languages, totaling approximately 11 million copies of American books. During the first 6 months of fiscal year 1954 only 130 titles were reported published.

Some tentative measures are being made to alleviate the limitations in the program by sending Washington staff to the field to give direction and encouragement to the translation program and to train employees in the field to assume responsibility for this work.

Recently the policy has been adopted of translating the Wireless File into Spanish and Portuguese for transmission to the Latin American countries. We are delighted that this is being done. As a matter of fact, the Commission noted this discrepancy and made similar recommendations several years ago. This is a good illustration of how slowly this operation has been moving. From time to time we hear about the large number of copies of the Bible which are distributed throughout the world and into how many languages the Bible has been translated. From time to time we get reports on the considerable number of translations of books by outstanding American authors. These are instances in which private enterprise—either American or foreign—has done what we should be doing on a very large scale: selecting material with great care and having it well translated into lay language.

*13. That provision be made for the development of a plan for utilizing the new and powerful medium of television*

The Broadcast Advisory Committee of the United States Advisory Commission on Information<sup>1</sup> has given considerable attention to the possible use of television programs overseas. The committee has submitted to the Commission this information:

Semiannual surveys by the International Broadcasting Service (IBS) on the status of international television show that there are now 23 countries on the air with regular or experimental television transmissions as against 5 in 1950. It is estimated that by 1955, 42 countries will have established transmitters. In 1950 there were approximately a half-million sets. Today there are over 3 million throughout Europe, Latin America, and the Far East with an audience of 30 million. The impact of television on the foreign viewers has been just as tremendous as it was in the United States during its early days.

The Soviet Union is building a high-power television transmitter in Communist East Germany from which they can service an area covering not only a large area of Eastern Germany, but also much of West Germany, parts of Switzerland, France, the Saar, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Large screen community-type sets are being installed in the Soviet Union in small towns close to Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad, where television programs have been on the air regularly for approximately 2 years. Satellite countries are being drained of their production of television equipment, and reports have been received that the Soviet Union is beginning to place filmed material on television stations throughout Latin America and even on the BBC in London.

The Broadcast Advisory Committee feels that television will play an increasingly important role in the information program and that adequate funds must be appropriated for this medium. Television is a strongly competitive field. Curves of experience in private industry

<sup>1</sup> The membership of the committee is: Justin Miller (chairman), John H. DeWitt, Jr., William A. Fay, Donley F. Feddersen, Jack W. Harris, Henry P. Johnston, Frank Marx, Joseph A. McDonald, Howard S. Meighan, John F. Patt, and Chris J. Witting.

show that television has been rising steadily. It is, therefore, extremely important that IBS lay the groundwork with overseas telecasters now so that when television reaches its full stride they will be in a favorable position. The committee strongly recommends a projected plan covering the use of television for the next 3, 4, or 5 years.

14. *That a greater effort be made to find ways of using the support of American private industry and business both at home and abroad*

The Smith-Mundt Act, at several points, specifies that the information program should make as much use as possible of American industry, even to the extent of abandoning certain phases of the work of the Agency when it appears that American industry has succeeded in achieving the particular job in an adequate manner. The Commission believes that this principle, enunciated in the Smith-Mundt Act, is capable of considerable expansion beyond what has been done so far.

Thus far private industry at home and abroad has been used in the following way:

- (a) Through the Private Enterprise Cooperation staff (IOC) of USIA;
- (b) Contracts with private industry; and
- (c) The informational media guaranty program.

(a) To date, 811 private organizations have cooperated with USIA through the Office of Private Cooperation (IOC). Numerous others have cooperated directly with the media divisions. Business firms, nonprofit organizations, schools, colleges and communities, nationality and fraternity groups, and cultural associations are assisting in this work.

An excellent example of the kind of cooperation being offered is the wide distribution accorded the President's speech before the U. N. on atomic energy. In addition to the extensive coverage by USIA media, 250,000 copies of a 1-page digest in 10 languages were distributed as mail inserts by more than 250 private organizations. Translations or summaries of the text were printed by 350 foreign-language newspapers in the United States with a notice urging readers to send the clipping to friends, relatives, and business associates abroad. The Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc., invited 85 foreign correspondents to a press conference in order to explain what American organizations are doing to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. A short USIA film on the speech is being shown overseas by Universal Pictures.

During the past 3 months 4 other USIA films have been accepted by major motion-picture companies for distribution in their theatrical circuits around the world. Another project receiving current emphasis is the encouraging of more institutional advertising by American firms abroad to help portray the advantages of American free enterprise and United States foreign policy objectives.

Many business firms and civic groups conduct regular collections of used American magazines for shipment overseas. Large numbers of newsstand returns are being forwarded to USIS posts. The exchange of letters is being encouraged between groups and individuals in many countries. A booklet to assist American tourists in becoming better "unofficial ambassadors" is receiving wide distribution through

shipping lines, airlines, and travel agencies. An increasing number of firms are cooperating in the presentation of translations of American books to selected individuals and institutions. Medical and scientific organizations are informing their international colleagues of the facilities available to them in USIS libraries.

In order to enlist such extensive cooperation in these and a variety of other projects, IOC has distributed a number of inexpensive brochures outlining briefly and specifically the ways in which groups and individuals can help. Further plans center on encouraging national and local associations both here and abroad to devise and carry out activities completely independent of USIA materials or distribution sources. In this way it is hoped that even with a comparatively small USIA staff and budget, private cooperation can become increasingly productive and effective.

The Commission recommends that sufficient funds and staff be provided to explore and utilize all possible means of encouraging additional private organizations to further the aims and purposes for which USIA exists.

(b) There is a high degree of professional proficiency in the United States and upon the part of American businessmen in other parts of the world, in this whole information area, in the production of material—motion pictures, newspapers, magazines, broadcasting scripts, sales programs, and material used for advertising.

The amount allocated for this purpose could be considerably expanded and well used to avoid the large-scale staffing of personnel at low salaries under strict Government regulations where the product of their work may be foredoomed to inadequacy.

USIA has contracts for the implementation of numerous activities which private organizations are equipped to handle more economically and as well as the Government. Examples of some of the contracts for USIA are contracts for the use and operation of radio facilities, contracts for construction of Government-owned radio facilities, contracts for engineering research, contracts for production and transmission of radio programs to Latin America in Spanish, contracts for the original production of all motion pictures, contracts for the recording of foreign-language versions and the printing of multiple copies of films, contracts with non-Government research organizations for evaluation studies and appraisals, contracts for the printing of pamphlets for distribution in Latin America, contracts for the preparation of English-language textbooks, contracts for the assembly of exhibits, contracts for the condensation and adaptation, review, production, purchase, and distribution of books, and contracts for securing book translations and dramatic productions rights.

In general we believe that Government payment for information service done on contract should be made to private industry when the service can be as well or better done and at a reasonable price. Such payment to all contractors does not constitute a subsidy—but a payment for value received.

*Support to private industry.*—Many private industries, particularly press, publications, and motion pictures are engaged in extensive distribution of books, magazines, newspapers, and films overseas. Even though some of them receive Government assistance on a limited scale, the Government does not and should not censor the content of these products.

Overseas production by private broadcasting companies presents a peculiar problem to USIA. This problem stems primarily from the fact that overseas distribution of news and other programs of private broadcasting has not thus far been profitable enough to result in a large international broadcasting business comparable to the overseas business of the motion pictures, press, and publications industries.

It may be that it is in the best interest of the United States Government to support the development of overseas broadcasting by private industry just as it is deemed in the public interest to support foreign and domestic aviation, the merchant marine, and other industries. In such an event, however, it would not be proper for the Government to exercise any supervision or censorship of its programs.

If the Congress believes that support to private industry for overseas broadcasting is in the public interest, this Commission recommends that such support be made independent of the USIA appropriations.

(c) The informational media guaranty program, administered up through July 1952 by the Mutual Security Agency, has enabled USIA to increase the flow of American books and periodicals abroad by overcoming the barrier caused by dollar shortages in certain countries and making it possible for American publishers to be paid in United States dollars for blocked local currencies received from sales abroad. Through the contracts under the IMG program American books and periodicals are now flowing to the booksellers of the following countries: Austria, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Yugoslavia, Israel, the Philippines, and Formosa. Since October 1948 local currencies equal to over \$11 million were converted into dollars under the program. As of November 30, contracts guaranteeing the future conversion of local currencies equal to almost \$6 million were made with over 100 United States publishers, etc.

The IMG program operates on the basis of an agreement between the United States and a foreign government. Applications for contracts by American publishers or producers must be approved by both Governments, thereby insuring that informational materials exported will be consistent with United States' interests as well as acceptable to the foreign government. Conversion of local currency receipts to United States dollars is accomplished on application by publishers or producers to the United States Information Agency. All types of books, periodicals, films, translations, and foreign publication rights may be sold abroad under the program provided they meet the criteria of eligibility established by the Agency.

The sale of representative American information materials through regular commercial channels abroad is a valuable adjunct to the regular program activities of the United States Information Agency especially in countries where United States dollar exchange restrictions limit the importation and distribution of United States' books, periodicals, and films. This is illustrated dramatically in the case of Israel. Previous to the initiation of the IMG program (fall 1952) virtually no United States books or periodicals were available in the bookstores or on the newstands. Reading material of Russian origin was on sale throughout the country. Recent reports from Israel state that Communist publications have been forced out of the market since many bookshops are as well stocked with American books as the average bookstore in America.

### III. PROGRESS SINCE AUGUST 1, 1953

#### PROGRESS TO DATE

The creation of a new Agency has resulted already in several improvements over conditions that existed a year ago.

First, the Director reports directly to the President who is giving the new Agency firm support.

Second, through participation in the Operations Coordinating Board, the Agency is informed well in advance of important policy pronouncements and actions, thereby enabling it to prepare for full exploitation. Its work is coordinated better, on the whole, with that of other Government agencies.

Third, policy guidance both from the Department of State and from other departments and agencies flows more freely and at higher levels. One of the arguments against taking IIA out of the Department of State was the fear that it would be cut off from policy guidance by State. We are pleased to be advised that the contrary is true and that arrangements with the Department of State are working even more effectively than before.

Fourth, the Director reports to us that the authority given the Agency to dismiss incompetent personnel in certain categories has resulted in greater overall efficiency of work.

Fifth, the Agency has set up its own board for personnel promotions and problems concerning transfers.

Sixth, the Agency has 15 supergrade positions which have been allocated by the Civil Service Commission and assigned to top staff appointees.

Seventh, the Agency has established its own security office.

Eighth, much greater decentralization has taken place. The appointment of 4 Assistant Directors for the 4 regions has thus far proved to be a wise move.

Ninth, the budget for fiscal year 1955 is set up on a regional basis for the first time. This will permit concentration of efforts in places where the need is greatest.

Tenth, the media are reorganized as service departments which "fill orders" from the field.

Eleventh, the evaluation staff is centralized in accordance with a recommendation in the Commission's Seventh Semiannual Report.

These are all important signs of progress.

#### IV. IMPORTANCE OF THIS WORK

In previous reports we have stressed the importance of the work of an international information service. We conclude this report with a reemphasis of its importance.

This Commission believes that the dollar value of this Agency to the American taxpayer should be estimated from the point of view of its necessity as an arm of national security. Although its effectiveness may leave much to be desired, yet we cannot do without it in the face of the menace to peace and freedom created by Communist imperialism. For example, some Members of Congress have asked why do we have USIS missions in friendly countries. The answer is, for the same reason that we are giving economic and military aid to friendly countries—namely, to help them hold their defenses against

communism. Why are we spending 40 to 50 billion dollars annually for military defense? To stop the spread of Communist imperialism by force. Why are we spending one-twelfth of 1 billion for USIA? To stop the spread of revolutions in free countries. The United States Government is in the international information field out of sheer necessity. It dare not pull out of this field any more than it would dare to pull out of military defense. Russia's military might is within her own boundary, but her propaganda might is on the loose in the world. We must do all in our power to thwart it, unmask its lies and pretenses, and break its hold over allegiances and loyalties of men.

In recent months the hope of negotiating an agreement with Russia that would lessen tensions and reduce the risk of war has been revived. It is still clear, however, that no one can negotiate successfully with the Russians except from a position of strength. It is clear that military strength is not enough. There is another strength which will pressure the Russians to be less truculent and more amenable to frank and fair discussions of basic issues. It is the moral strength of a united free world. The unity which provides this strength requires more than a mutual understanding between the peoples of the free world. It requires further the firm belief that the peoples of the free world fervently desire to be guaranteed freedom from fears and suspicions of each other. These are ties that bind free nations into a voluntary coalition. The major tasks of USIA are to promote the unity of the free world and to combat the efforts of the Communists to divide the world into conflicting factions.

## APPENDIX

Below are the recommendations made by the Commission in its seventh semi-annual report to the Congress and a brief statement of the action taken on each one.

1. That the International Information Administration (IIA) be separated from the Department of State and placed in a new agency of Cabinet level in which there is vested authority to formulate psychological strategy and to coordinate information policies of all Government agencies and consolidate all overseas information programs.

Reorganization Plan No. 8 separated the IIA from the Department of State and created a new agency, known as the United States Information Agency, responsible for planning, programing and implementation of United States information activities abroad. The new agency reports to the President through the National Security Council and sits in upon invitation with the Operations Coordinating Board of the Council as an adviser on matters involving information and propaganda considerations. The Agency collaborates with the Department of State and other members of the Board in the development of information policies, plans, and programs designed to support national security policies and foreign policy objectives. (Elsewhere in this report the Commission recommends that the President designate the Director of USIA as a permanent voting member of OCB.)

2. That a permanent joint congressional Committee on International Information be established to provide liaison between the legislative and executive branches.

No action has been taken by the Congress on this recommendation.

(The Commission in this report recommends that a permanent joint congressional committee composed of representatives from existing committees concerned with foreign policies and appropriations be appointed for general liaison with the work of USIA.)

3. That Congress authorize IIA to release domestically, without request, information concerning its programs.

Executive Order No. 10477, issued in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 8, transfers from the Secretary of State to the Director of USIA the authority to keep the American public informed about the international information aspects of the foreign affairs of the United States.

4. The United States must take a more vigorous offensive in its information program, to be launched from a platform of basic principles carefully worked out and enunciated.

The mission of the United States Information Agency is set forth in an NSC directive adopted by the President and NSC on October 22, 1953.

5. IIA must have better information on the effectiveness of its programs.

The Agency is constantly endeavoring to improve its evaluation procedures and progress is being made in this direction.

With the creation of the United States Information Agency a centralized Office of Research and Evaluation (IEV) was established and all media evaluation functions were transferred to the Office of Research and Evaluation. Three-man media research and evaluation staffs will be placed in the press, information centers, motion pictures, and broadcasting services. These staffs are part of IEV and will be responsible to the Director of IEV.

The Agency has continued the policy of contracting with nongovernmental research groups. There are presently approximately 15 contractors doing research studies for USIA. A contract was established with the University of Illinois and the Agency now has a report entitled "A Program of Research and Evaluation for the International Information Administration" (now USIA). This report recommended a study be undertaken on the basic assumptions under which the information program operates. Such a study is now being conducted by a nongovernmental research group. This report also called for gathering together available information on communications theory. Such a study has been started.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION 21

6. There must be more emphasis upon mutual activity in the information field between the United States and other nations. Although all formal agreements with other nations must be negotiated by the Department of State, USIA is continuing to promote cooperative projects with official and private organizations in many countries. Most USIS libraries are in constant contact with ministries of education and other cabinet offices and assist them in preparing exhibits and in compiling special collections of technical and educational materials. In almost all cities where budgetary restrictions have necessitated the closing of USIS libraries, the collections have been taken over by local libraries. In Germany, many of the America houses are now locally financed and operated.

Although the NATO information program is not conducted under USIA aegis, the Commission is pleased to note that the operation of the NATO caravan, a traveling exhibit designed to explain the objectives of the organization, has now become the responsibility of the European governments. Similarly, the recently established Marshall scholarships, though in no way connected with USIA, serve as one more indication of an ever-increasing intergovernmental cooperation in the exchange of information.

7. IIA should make a continuing effort to encourage and direct private organizations and individuals to be of more assistance.

Plans for expanding the Agency's private enterprise cooperation program have been prepared, but as of this date (January 1954) have not been implemented.

