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OUT of the combined wisdom and aspirations of the American people can come the formula to resolve our problems, and the light to illuminate the darkness.

That is the faith on which Facts Forum is built.

Facts Forum aims always to encourage people to get the facts which will enable them to know the truth. Those of you who can or will think may not realize the power you possess in this Republic. Those who will not think, instinctively turn to you for guidance.

If the Americans who are quite capable of holding firm opinions on important questions would bother to develop and express these opinions, they would produce an informed body of public opinion which would find correct answers to all the critically important issues on which the fate of the entire world depends.

America could never be conquered or destroyed by force of arms unless the strength of her basic institutions of freedom were first corroded away.

The plan of Facts Forum provides an idea and a program by which individuals can learn to distinguish between facts and fancy, between truthful reports and false propaganda. This is of basic importance to us individually and collectively for, in our society, decisions must be made by all.

It is vitally important that both adults and young people train themselves, not only for the personal enjoyment of life, but also for the intelligent participation in government.

The promise of America that the pioneers sought on the plains and in the forests was not material security, but freedom—freedom for every man to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision could combine to make him.

We all know that there is an inborn urge in the human race in the direction of freedom; but we also know that a free society can be maintained only when a majority of its members not only desire but understand freedom. Freedom is not free.

Facts Forum is attempting not to impart but to encourage Americans to acquire the knowledge they need to preserve freedom.

Facts Forum hopes to stimulate the American people to thought and to action so that the reins of government will forever remain in the hands of the people.
Part 1
1917-1933

March, 1917—The czar of all the Russians was forced from his throne and taken into protective custody by successful revolutionists.

The Kerensky Revolution established in Russia a provisional government based upon constitutional principles.

Americans, by and large, were enthusiastic about what Kerensky was trying to do in Russia; but their warm enthusiasm chilled to horror and disgust eight months later.1

November, 1917 — The Bolshevists, a small group of ruthless political gangsters, seized power from Kerensky, murdered the czar, and instituted in Russia a blood bath which horrified the civilized world.

Lenin and Trotsky led this orgy of human butchery.1

June, 1918 — Having murdered or terrorized the opposition into silence, the Soviet regime of Lenin and Trotsky attempted to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United States. They wanted such relations for three principal reasons: (1) a Soviet embassy and consular posts inside the United States would provide diplomatic immunity and free movement to Soviet espionage agents, saboteurs, and propagandists who were already directing communist infiltration of American institutions and attempting to foment revolution there; (2) American recognition would make credits from American export firms, loans from American banks, and even loans from the United States government possible, thus enabling the Soviets to acquire desperately needed American machinery, industrial equipment, and armaments; (3) American recognition would strengthen the Soviet regime and give it respectability, both at home and abroad. The Russian people, traditionally very friendly toward America, would reconsider their attitude toward the hated tyrants of the Kremlin if America recognized those tyrants as a legitimate government.

The Bolshevists' numerous overtures for recognition were rejected by our government.2

October 27, 1919 — Robert Lansing, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, explained to Congress why it was the policy of the Wilson Administration not to recognize the Bolshevists in Russia:

"The purpose of the Bolshevists is to subvert the existing principles of government and society the world over, including those countries in which democratic principles are already established. They have built up a political machine which, by the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the ruthlessness of its methods, suggests the Asiatic despotism of the early czars."3

1920 — Bainbridge Colby, another Secretary of State under Wilson, explained our reasons for not recognizing the Soviets:

"We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a foreign government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them...."

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals."4

March 3, 1933 — Hoover's Undersecretary of State wrote an official letter to Fred L. Eberhardt, president of Gould and Eberhardt, manufacturer of machine tools, Newark, N. J. Mr. Eberhardt's firm had been doing business with Russia and had written the State Department expressing an interest in American recognition of the Soviet Union. The State Department told Mr. Eberhardt:5

"This Government has taken the position that it would be unwise for it to enter into relations with the Soviet regime so long as the present rulers of Russia persist in aims and practices in the field of international relations which are inconsistent with international friendship. This Government has been of the opinion that any real or lasting benefit to the people of the United States would not be attained by the establishment of relations with Russia until the present rulers of that country have given evidence that they are prepared to carry out in good faith the international obligations which experience has demonstrated are essential to the development of friendly intercourse and commerce between Nations."6

That was the last word of the Hoover Administration on the subject of recognizing the Soviet Union.

The next day — March 4, 1933 — Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated.

November 16, 1933 — Ten minutes before midnight — in the private study of the President at the White House, Washington, D. C., Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the United States of America, and Maxim Litvinov, for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, initiated a gentlemen's agreement, establishing formal diplomatic relations between the United States and Russia.7

May 13, 1954 — William Jenner, Republican Senator of Indiana, on behalf of himself and Pat McCarran, Democratic Senator from Nevada, laid before the Senate of the United States a formal resolution — Senate Resolution 247:8

"Resolved, That:

"(1) Whereas it is morally wrong for...

(See Bibliography on Page 14)
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the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws who, by stealth and ruthless power, have enslaved one-third of the people of the world; and whereas, the outposts and advance positions of this outlaw band, received and tolerated under the guise of ‘diplomatic missions,’ in the United States and other countries of the free world are in fact nests of espionage, seditions propaganda and sabotage; therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with the alleged Government of Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged Government of Soviet Russia.8

Same day—May 13, 1954—while Republican Senator Jenner was standing on the floor of the Senate, introducing his resolution to break off formal diplomatic relations with the Soviets and their captive satellites, Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was at Geneva, Switzerland, in formal conference with the Soviets and one of their captive satellites.7

The fascinating coruscations of light in the kaleidoscope of history! It may or may not have embarrassed Republican Secretary of State Dulles to have Republican Senator Jenner introduce such a resolution. Be that as it may.

Senators Jenner and McCarran undoubtedly posed for the American people a question of immense and far-reaching importance:

“Should America break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries?”

Facts Forum believes that a question of such grave significance to the American people should be answered by the American people. Nowhere is an informed public opinion more critically needed than in the area of Soviet-American relations. Here is a problem that both underlies and overrides every other national problem we have. If we could find a correct and positive answer to the question of what to do about Soviet-American relations we would thereby make an enormous contribution to the peace, security, and well-being of our nation.

Here, then, is an excellent answer to those millions of sincere Americans who frequently — and, it must be confessed, plaintively — say to themselves, “Oh, I know that things are in bad shape, but what can I do? I’m just one little individual person, with no influence or authority, not too much information, not sure of my own convictions, and with rather little ability to express the ideas and communicate the information I have. If the greatest people in our land are confused and divided about the terrible problems of our times, what on earth can I do about them?”

It is the thesis of Facts Forum that I, an unknown, unsung, inconspicuous American, am America. If I would, to the very best of my ability — whatever that ability is — look into the great national problems that people keep talking about, dig up all the facts and opinions on those problems that I can, and use up my own mind what I think ought to be done about them, and then let as many people as possible know what I think, I would be doing as much for my country, for the cause of freedom, as it is humanly possible for any man to do.

Well, now, Dan Smoot, that sounds like pretty good Fourth of July orating, but let’s get down off the platform for a minute and talk like real people. Now, the question you’re talking about here— “Should the United States break off Diplomatic relations with Russia and the other communist countries?” I’m going to try to inform myself on that subject, get all the facts I can, as you would say, so that I can add my little two bits’ worth to the national wisdom on that subject. Where on earth will I turn; whom can I believe; and how in heaven’s name can I ever form an opinion that I’m sure of? Oh, I know that Senator McCarran and Senator Jenner want us to break off diplomatic relations. I can write to them in Washington and get what they have to say on the subject, and I’m sure it will sound pretty good. But does that prove anything? How about President Eisenhower? He’s a pretty smart man, too. He’s more important than Senator Jenner and Senator McCarran. President Eisenhower obviously doesn’t think we ought to break off diplomatic relations with the communist countries. If he did, he’d probably be doing something about it.

I remember that earlier this year, another Senator—and I’m pretty sure this one was a New Deal Democrat—Paul Douglas of Illinois introduced a resolution in the Senate recommending that we sever diplomatic relations with the communist satellites, but not with Russia.8 His idea, as I remember it, was that this might help to break the hold that Russia has over her satellite states. Now, I could write to Senator Douglas and get his reasons for that resolution, and I’m sure they’d sound pretty good. But then I remember about a year ago, that somebody else in Congress wanted to extend diplomatic relations to some of the Soviet states that we don’t now formally recognize as independent states, like Byelorussia and the Ukraine; and his reasons, as I remember them, were that extending diplomatic relations to these Soviet states would embarrass the Soviets, because it would show that those
states aren’t really independent, and that might do something to hurt Soviet prestige and perhaps break the hold of the Soviet Union over its captive states.\textsuperscript{9} Where do I come out on this thing? The more I work at this problem, the deeper into it I get.\ldots

Well, we might, as Al Smith used to say, take a look at the record. And on the problem of Soviet-American relations, there is a rather remarkable record to look at.

On February 15, 1952, the State Department published a collection of original, official memoranda, studies, letters, cablegrams, and other diplomatic papers, all bearing on American relations with Russia, and all taken from the files of the State Department.\textsuperscript{10}

Every week, I sign this program off with a feeling of regret that I have only scratched the surface—skimmed over the highlights — with no time to present background and documentation needed for a satisfactory evaluation of the subject.

On this immensely important subject of American-Soviet relations, I will give a series of background broadcasts before concluding with a pro and con discussion on the question:

"Should America break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries?"

The background information will be taken principally from official State Department documents.

Part II

THE SOVIETS ARE INVITED

The American policy of not extending diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union was established by Woodrow Wilson and was adhered to by Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1920, Washington did lift its ban on commercial relations with the Soviet Union; and American business firms began entering into trade agreements with Soviet trading representatives.

The foreign trade of Russia—even under the czars—never did amount to much. Under the Soviet regime it has always amounted to even less.\textsuperscript{12}

Nonetheless, as the great depression settled upon the United States in the early 1930’s, there was widespread hope that if the millions in the vast Soviet empire could become customers for American goods, the stimulation of trade would ease our own economic distress.

Pressures began to build up—in the American business community, as in other sectors of American life—for our government to extend diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union.

The Hoover Administration, on its last day in office, was still resisting these pressures.

On March 3, 1933, W. R. Castle, Jr., Hoover’s Undersecretary of State, wrote to a New Jersey manufacturer of machine tools which had been doing business with the Soviets and which had expressed an interest in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.\textsuperscript{12}

Mr. Castle said:

"\ldots this Government, although not prepared to enter into diplomatic relations with the present regime in Russia, imposes no restriction on trade with that country.\ldots The Department [of State] has endeavored to reduce to a minimum the difficulties affecting commercial relations between the United States and Russia.\ldots The marked decrease in our exports to Russia which took place during the last year has not been due to the absence of diplomatic relations between the United States and Russia, but primarily to the decline of Russia’s purchasing power and to the circumstance that credit terms more favorable than American exporters have been willing to grant have become available to Soviet purchasing agencies in various other countries, such as Germany, England, Italy, \textit{et cetera}, as a result of the fact that Governments of those countries have been underwriting credits extended by their nationals to such [Soviet] agencies.

"It is not believed that the mere act of recognition of the Soviet regime would make it possible for the Soviet authorities appreciably to increase their purchases in the United States. There is no question that at the present time the rulers of Russia are desirous, in their own interests, of purchasing more goods in this country. Their inability to increase their purchases appears to arise from the circumstance that they are unable either to pay in cash or to obtain credit terms acceptable to them."\textsuperscript{12}

The next day — March 4, 1933 — Roosevelt was inaugurated and a new departure in the handling of American-Soviet relations became possible.\textsuperscript{15}

At the outset, Roosevelt made it clear to Cordell Hull that the Soviet Union was to be recognized, and he urged the State Department to speed up necessary preparations.

In 1933, however, professional civil servants and career diplomats in the State Department, thoroughly schooled...
in the old policy of not recognizing the Soviet Union, were cautious in laying the groundwork for the abrupt shift in policy that Roosevelt wanted.14

July 27, 1933—The chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs, in a memorandum to Cordell Hull, said:

"The experience of countries which have extended recognition to the Soviet Government has shown ... that there are serious obstacles in the way of estab-

ishment of relations with Russia ... and that so long as these obstacles remain, official relations ... tend to become ... the source of friction and ill will rather than the mainspring of cooperation and good will. ..."15

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of establishment [of normal diplomatic relations] with Russia ... is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country. It is obvious that, since the communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the Government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations ... is out of the question."16

"It would seem, therefore, that an essential prerequisite to the establishment of harmonious and trustful relations with the Soviet government is the abandonment by the present rulers of Russia of their world revolutionary aims and the discontinuance of their activities designed to bring about the realization of such aims. ... This prerequisite involves the abandonment by Moscow of direction, supervision, control, financing, et cetera, through every agency utilized for the purpose of communism and other related activities in the United States.17

"Another serious difficulty in the way of establishment of mutually advantageous relations with the Soviet government is the unwillingness of that government to observe certain generally accepted principles governing the conduct of nations toward each other. The Soviet government has rejected international obligations which the experience of mankind has demonstrated are vital to the satisfactory development and maintenance of commerce and friendly intercourse between nations. ...18

"The United States has suffered ... as the result of the Soviet policies of repudiation and confiscation [losses totaling] $628 million. ..."19

"A third major problem ... is the difficulties arising out of the profound differences between the economic and social structure of the two countries. Reference is made here specially to the state monopoly of foreign trade in Russia and to the class character of the Soviet state. ... Those countries which have concluded trade agreements with Russia ... such as Germany, Great Britain, et cetera, have learned to their cost that the application of the 'most-favored-nation' principle in treaties with Russia is ... distorted and ridiculous."20

"Another question ... is the treatment to which foreigners in Russia are subjected under Soviet laws and practices. Soviet practices with regard to arrest and incarceration of foreign nationals constantly lead to friction with foreign states. Matters such as these, involving the question of protection of life and property of American citizens in Russia, should be settled by agreement in order to create a satisfactory basis for intercourse with Russia."21

September 21, 1933—Cordell Hull, in a memorandum to President Roosevelt, said:

"As you know, recognition of the present regime in Russia has been withheld by the Government of the United States on account of the failure of the Soviet government to carry out certain international obligations which are considered essential to the maintenance of friendly and mutually advantageous relations between the United States and Russia. The Soviet government, for instance, has repudiated Russian obligations held by the United States Government and by American citizens, and has confiscated the properties of American citizens invested in Russia. More important still, the present regime in Russia has been unwilling to bring its interference in the internal affairs of the United States. Furthermore, there are a series of questions arising out of differences between the economic and social structure of the United States and Russia, especially the existence of a State monopoly of foreign trade in Russia. ...22

"Recognition by the United States is greatly desired by the Soviet authorities, since they are apparently convinced that recognition by the United States would be a factor in preventing a Japanese attack on the Maritime Provinces [of the Soviet Union]. The Soviet government also appears to believe that recognition by the United States would open the private banking facilities of the United States to the Soviet government and facilitate the obtaining of credits in other countries. Finally, there is no question but that the Soviet authorities realize that recognition would strengthen the prestige of the Soviet government not only abroad, but also at home, where it is faced with tremendous difficulties in carrying out its industrial and agricultural programs. ...23

"I am convinced, from the experience of other countries, that, unless we utilize every available means of exerting pressure on the Soviet government in order to obtain a settlement of outstanding
problems, there is little likelihood that such problems can be satisfactorily solved. It is evident that if loans of any considerable amount should be extended to the Soviet government except as a part of an agreement involving a satisfactory settlement of such problems, one of our most effective weapons would be taken from our hands."

October 4, 1933—An assistant secretary of state, in a memorandum to Cordell Hull, said:

"... Russia is inclined to a more reasonable attitude toward nations that have not accorded the recognition she seeks, than toward those that have. And, after eagerly seeking and obtaining recognition, she becomes more indifferent to her obligations than theretofore."

"Immediate and unconditional recognition would not be of any special moral or material advantage."

Same day—October 4, 1933—William C. Bullitt, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, wrote a memorandum to Cordell Hull, in which he said, among other things:

"Before recognition and before loans, we shall find the Soviet Government relatively amenable. After recognition or loans, we should find the Soviet Government adamant."

Six days later—October 10, 1933—President Roosevelt wrote to the President of the Soviet Union, saying:

"Since the beginning of my administration, I have contemplated the desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relations between the 125 million people of the United States and the 160 million people of Russia."

"If you are of similar mind, I should be glad to receive any representative you may designate to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our countries.""}

October 17, 1933—The President of the Soviet Union acknowledged President Roosevelt's letter and designated Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to go to Washington and negotiate with President Roosevelt for American recognition of the Soviet Union.

The State Department went to work to draw up the proposals which would be acceptable to the American government on the outstanding issues between the Soviet Union and America.

* * * * *

**Part III**

**SHORT-LIVED HOPE, DEBTS, AND DISAPPOINTMENT**

November 8, 1933—Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs—arrived in Washington. It soon became apparent to American diplomatic officials, however, that Litvinov had no intention of negotiating with them. He contemptuously rejected every proposal they made.

Litvinov had come to Washington to negotiate personally with President Roosevelt.

November 10, 1933—Cordell Hull, having achieved nothing, took Litvinov to see Roosevelt.

Roosevelt suggested that Litvinov return that evening for a private discussion.

Litvinov returned. For six days and most of six nights, Roosevelt and Litvinov were in close consultation in the President's study at the White House. Sometimes Roosevelt was attended by State Department aides; sometimes not. But no record (stenographic or other-
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wise) was made of any of the negotiations—of what actually happened; what promises were made; what commitments were mutually entered into by Roosevelt and Litvinov.20

What the world knows is that in the dying midnight hour of November 16, 1933, Roosevelt and Litvinov established diplomatic relations between the USSR and the USA, by initiating a gentlemen's agreement.26

The next day, Roosevelt released for publication twelve letters or memoranda, which he and Litvinov had exchanged the night before and which constitute the only written record of their agreements.31

Izvestiya, the official newspaper of the Soviet government, hailed the establishment of diplomatic relations as proof that "the United States...has at last been 'compelled' to establish normal diplomatic relations...Great interest in the 'Soviet experiment' attempts to introduce planned economy, and to regulate the contradictions of monopolist capital now going on in the United States, have all been a factor in that complex which has compelled the White House to remove the juridical barrier between the United States and the USSR"...32

"The decision of...President Franklin D. Roosevelt...has been the result of the development of relations between the two countries and of that long drawn out struggle which the progressive elements of the American bourgeoisie had been carrying on for the recognition of the USSR, not to speak at all of those sections of the American people who sympathize with us in principle."33

Prior to Litvinov's arrival in the United States, Roosevelt's advisors had urged him to get in writing, from the Soviet Union, specific commitments and iron-clad agreements on (1) the $620 million in debts which Russia owed the United States; (2) activities of the Communist Party inside the United States; (3) activities of the Communist International which were directed by Soviet Intergovernmental officials from Moscow, and whose known published aims were to foment revolution inside the United States; and (4) the religious and legal rights of American citizens inside the Soviet Union.34

As to the debts — the only thing put in writing was that Litvinov agreed to stay in Washington after diplomatic relations were established, in order to negotiate a settlement. Litvinov returned to the Soviet Union almost immediately after diplomatic relations were established. No beginning had been made on the settlement of the debt problem.34

The United States government had popularized the idea of recognizing the Soviet Union by leading the American people to expect a large expansion of trade with the Soviet Union after relations were established. It was, of course, impossible for this trade to expand until the knotty problem of the debts was solved, because the Soviet Union, having repudiated all foreign debts, could not obtain credits. Hence, most of our negotiations with the Soviet Union during the first year of our formal diplomatic relations with them were devoted to persistent but fruitless efforts to settle this outstanding problem.35

Before the end of the year 1933, America's first ambassador to the Soviet Union, William C. Bullitt, presented his credentials in Moscow.36

Christmas Eve, 1933 — Bullitt, in a telegram from Paris, reported on his arrival in Moscow.

This telegram from Bullitt contains indications of things to come in the years ahead, and closes in a vein of optimism which soon vanished from the American Embassy in Moscow:

"The Soviet Union considered an attack by Japan this spring so probable that it felt it must secure its western frontier in every way...37 Attack by Japan upon the Soviet Union is regarded as certain by all members of the Government and Communist Party... in Moscow, Stalin... asked me to try to see to it that the Soviet Union should obtain, in the immediate future, 250,000 tons of old rectified rails from the American railroads... the rails to be delivered at Vladivostok to complete the double tracking of the Trans-Siberian Railway..."38

"I repeatedly emphasized... that the United States had no intention whatsoever of getting into war with Japan but that our participation in any Far Eastern difficulties would be confined to the use of our moral influence to maintain
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peace. . . . The Soviet Union is so anxious to have peace that . . . even our moral influence is valued very highly by the Soviet government. It is difficult to exaggerate the cordiality with which I was received by all members of the government including . . . Molotov . . . and Stalin.728

During his first twelve, hopeful days in Moscow, December, 1933, Bullitt did not try to begin negotiations on the irri-
tating debt and trade problem with the Soviet Union, but he reported that he did casually mention the matter to Litvi-

“. . . [Litvinov] said that the Soviet Union was not interested in developing a large export and import trade, but hoped to make itself as nearly self-suffi-
cient as possible. On the other hand, if considerable credits could be obtained, the Soviet Union would be glad to con-
tinue to buy from the United States considerable quantities of imports of all kinds. . . .”729

By February, 1934, the State Depart-
ment had drawn up a formal proposal on a settlement it was willing to accept on the outstanding Russian debts. Our proposals were very generous. The Soviet Union owed us $628 million. We pro-
posed to settle for the equivalent of $90 million. But when Bullitt presented this proposal to Litvinov, in Moscow, he was amazed at Litvinov’s anger and the vehemence with which Litvinov rejected every sentence of our proposal.

Litvinov told Bullitt that the Soviet Union was not interested in building up trade with the United States, that it could get needed industrial equipment elsewhere.49

Throughout the year 1934, the only concrete proposal that Litvinov ever made with regard to the debts was that the Soviet Union would settle the $628 million of American claims against the Soviet Union for $100 million, provided the United States government would give the Soviet Union an unconditional, no-interest loan for $200 million.51

Obviously, the Soviets were no longer interested in settling the debt question between the two nations. Explanation for this can be found in the Far Eastern situation. The Soviet Union, having wanted American recognition because of its fear of Japan, got what it wanted in the act of recognition. On first hearing that the United States might establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, in Tokyo, had said:

“If those two countries continue in favorable relations for years to come, they will teach a lesson to the world that capitalism and communism can agree. And if that is realized, it will be un-
necessary for Japan to fear commu-
nism.”42

Hence, because of Japanese respect for America, American recognition of the Soviet Union eased Japan’s fear of communism. The easing of this fear re-
laxed the tensions between Japan and the Soviet Union. When this tension eased, the Soviet Union had no other immediate interest in good relations with the United States.

May 21, 1934 — Ambassador Bullitt put it this way:

“The nub of the matter is this: If the Soviet government should again become convinced that an attack by Japan was likely . . . we should probably find Litvinov willing to reach an agreement on the basis of our proposals. So long as the Soviet Union feels completely secure I believe that no agreement ac-
tceptable to us will be acceptable to the authorities in Moscow. . . . I can recom-

September 15, 1934 — Secretary of State Cordell Hull put the matter more briefly:

“Personally I have little idea that the Soviet officials will come to any reason-


April 30, 1935 — Secretary of State Cordell Hull put the matter more briefly:

“The government of the United States indicated its willingness to accept . . . a greatly reduced sum to be paid over a long period of years. . . . To facilitate the placing of orders in the United States by the Soviet government on a long-term credit basis, the Government of the United States was prepared to make . . . loans to a very large percentage of the credit granted.”45

“We hoped confidently that this proposal would prove entirely acceptable to the Soviet government and are deeply disappointed at its rejection. . . . The negotiations which seemed so promising at the start must now be regarded as having come to an end.”44

Nonetheless, the Roosevelt administra-
tion concealed its disappointment over this bitter defeat, and turned its efforts to negotiating a commercial treaty with the Soviet Union.46
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REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITY CONTINUES

July 13, 1935—We signed a commercial agreement with the Soviet Union. We granted to them a most-favored-nation treatment for their products coming into the United States. They did not grant us a most-favored-nation treatment on American products going into the Soviet Union, but did promise to buy $40 million a year in American goods.  

This was the first formal agreement of any consequence which we had been able to make with the Soviets in the first twenty months of our relations with them; and our government hailed the commercial agreement with great jubilation as the breaking of the log-jam in American-Soviet relations.

From 1919 to 1933, the American government looked upon the Soviet rulers as a band of criminal conspirators and refused to recognize them as a legitimate government.

A principal reason for this attitude was the Communist International. Organized and controlled by the Kremlin, the Comintern aimed to foment worldwide revolution—to overthrow all existing governments so that all nations could be absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In that famous midnight hour of November 16, 1933, when Roosevelt extended recognition to the Soviet Union, he obtained from Maxim Litvinov a memorandum in which Litvinov promised, for the Soviet Union: (1) to respect the rights of the United States "to order its own life within its own jurisdiction"; (2) to restrain all persons under Soviet control from any activity or propaganda likely to injure the tranquility of the United States; (3) to forbid the presence in the Soviet Union of any organization whose purpose was to overthrow or force a change in the political or social order of the United States.

These promises of Litvinov obviously referred to the Comintern in Moscow and its American section, the Communist Party USA; but these organizations were not specifically named.

Within twelve hours after he had made these written promises, Litvinov was questioned about them by American newspapermen.

Litvinov replied: "The Communist Party of America is not concerned with the Communist Party of Russia; and the Communist Party of Russia is not concerned with the Communist Party of America."

Three days later—November 20, 1933—when asked by reporters in New York whether the Soviets would really disband the Third International (the Comintern) as Litvinov had promised, Litvinov said:

"The Third International is not mentioned in the document. You must not read into it more than was mentioned."

The Communist Party's Daily Worker gave a more forthright answer to the question of whether the Soviets would keep their promise of non-interference in American affairs:

"In this country, the Communist Party . . . will more than ever strive to win the American workers for the revolutionary way out of the crises, for the emulation of the Soviet Union and its revolutionary victories."

Many Americans feared that the opening of diplomatic channels would help the communist evil to penetrate American institutions.

But on November 22, 1933—Assistant Secretary of State, William J. Donovan, in a radio address to the nation, said:

"All of our people who have felt concerned as to what might happen . . . [should feel assured that] . . . the President's resolute purpose to safeguard the integrity of our government and the rights of our nationals . . . [prevailed]."

December, 1933—Within a month after we had extended recognition to the Soviets on their promises to disavow the Comintern and the American Communist Party, delegates from the American Communist Party attended a meeting of the governing body of the Comintern in Moscow and laid plans for increasing communist activity in the United States.

That same month—December, 1933—American delegates from the Trade Union Unity League—the American section of the Red International of Labor Unions—attended a meeting of the executive bureau of this world-wide communist labor organization in Moscow and presented a formal report on the communists' efforts to organize revolutionary elements within the American labor movement. Plans were openly made for intensifying communist activity in labor groups in the United States to help the communists in their "strategic task . . . — the conquest of the majority of the working class."

In a radio dispatch to the American Communist Party's Daily Worker, published January 6, 1934, Moscow urged that the Daily Worker, "even more energetically become a real collective agitator and organizer of the workers' struggle . . . becoming the standard-bearer in the struggle of the great masses of the American working class."

For almost a year, our government overlooked these open and contemptuous violations of Litvinov's promises to Roosevelt.

August 14, 1934—After it had become apparent that the Soviets (in open defiance of the world's solemn
promises to the United States) were planning to hold the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, our State Department, in a telegram to the American ambassador, William Bullitt, reviewed some of the Soviet violations and then instructed:

"Mr. Litvinov should be ... informed that the occurrence of further acts of this nature will be detrimental to the development of the ... friendly relations ... which ... President [Roosevelt] ... hoped would flow from recognition. ... [The] American people are most sensitive with respect to interference from foreign countries in their domestic affairs. ..."792

Two months later—October 5, 1934—Bullitt reported from Moscow:

"I protested today to Litvinov orally and informally with regard to direction from Moscow of the activities of the communist movement in the United States. ... Litvinov replied that he did not even know that the Comintern Congress would take place. ..."792

Five days later, however, when Bullitt was pressing Litvinov about this matter, Litvinov snapped:

"No nation ever starts talking about the activities of the Comintern unless it wishes to have as bad relations as possible with us."795

The State Department permitted this matter to subside until the following spring.

May 13, 1935—The State Department advised Bullitt in Moscow of a news article in the New York Daily Worker, which discussed a farewell banquet that would be given June 8, 1935, for American communists departing for Moscow as delegates to the Comintern Congress. We made no protest; but by July 8, 1935, it had been widely publicized that the Comintern Congress would soon convene in Moscow. Bullitt mentioned the matter to Litvinov and Stalin. Both of them made a joke of it—claiming to know nothing about the Congress and saying that Bullitt knew more about the Comintern than they did.54

July, 1935—Bullitt dispatched a report to Washington:

"... there has been no decrease in the determination of the Soviet government to produce world revolution. ..."55

"I have yet to converse with a single leader of the Soviet Union who has not expressed his belief in the necessity of world revolution."

"For example, a few evenings ago I said to Karl Radek that I hoped his communist friends at the meeting of the Third International would not behave in such a way as to break Litvinov's pledge to the President [Roosevelt]. ... Radek leaped to his feet with the most violent anger and shouted, 'We have lived without the United States in the past and we can continue to live without the United States in the future and we shall never permit you or anyone else to dictate to us what we shall do in Moscow.' Upon his departure, Mikhailsky, one of the oldest of the Bolsheviks ... said, 'You must understand that world revolution is our religion and there is not one of us who would not in the final analysis oppose even Stalin himself if we should feel that he was abandoning the cause of world revolution. ...'796

"It is the primary object of the Soviet Foreign Office to maintain peace everywhere until the strength of the Soviet Union has been built up to such a point that it is entirely impregnable to attack and ready ... to intervene abroad. ...

"The key to the desire of the Soviet government to be present at all possible conferences and to have a finger in every pie is its desire to prevent any real agreement among the States of Europe. ..."57

"It is, of course, the heartiest hope of the Soviet government that the United States will become involved in war with Japan. If such a war should occur it would be the policy of the Soviet Union to remain outside the conflict. ... To think of the Soviet Union as a possible ally of the United States in case of war with Japan is to allow the wish to be father to the thought. The Soviet Union would certainly attempt to avoid becoming an ally until Japan had been thoroughly defeated and would then merely use the opportunity to acquire Manchuria and Sovietize China."798

In open and flagrant violation of Litvinov's pledge to Roosevelt, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International was held in Moscow, July 25 to August 20, 1935, and the communist plans for fomenting revolution in America were candidly discussed.50

August 25, 1935—We made a formal...
written protest. The Soviets rejected our protest before reading it—announcing, however, that they would read it.\footnote{60}

We made no further protests, and Litvinov closed the matter with a blunt remark:

"The Soviet Government would not in any way restrain the activities of the Communist International in the United States or the Soviet Union or of American communists connected with the Communist International in the Soviet Union.\"\footnote{61}

To double the insults against us, the Kremlin held the Sixth Congress of the Communist International of Youth in Moscow, September 25 to October 11, 1935. Again American delegations attended, and again the communist program for overthrowing the American government by force and violence was candidly discussed.\footnote{62}

But this time we didn’t even protest.

Aside from a few minor matters such as the continued harassment and surveillance of our embassy personnel in Moscow and the secret arrest and imprisonment of American citizens in Russia, the year 1935 ended without further incident in the strange record of American-Soviet relations.

* * * * *

Part V

**RECIROCITY?**

Before extending diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union on November 16, 1933, Roosevelt had been urged to get from the Soviets iron-clad agreements on four major matters: (1) debts which Russia owed us; (2) activities of the American Communist Party; (3) activities of the Comintern in Moscow which directed communist activities in the United States; and (4) the religious and legal rights of American citizens in the Soviet Union.

On point No. 1, Roosevelt got no promises; and by January 31, 1935, our government gave up—without formal protest or public announcement of disappointment—all hope of settling the debt question.

On point Numbers 2 and 3, the Soviets did make Roosevelt specific promises, but the activities of the Comintern in Moscow and of the Communist Party in the United States were openly intensified immediately after Roosevelt recognized the Soviets.

The first 25 months of our formal relations with the Soviet Union brought us nothing but defeat, humiliation, open insults, and contemptuous repudiation of solemn promises; but the eagerness of our government to get along with the Soviets was limitless.

January 10, 1936—Molotov, in a public speech, made a vague, generalized remark:

"... The policy of rapprochement between the USSR and the United States of America ... [had] enormous significance from the point of view of the preservation of general peace.\"\footnote{63}

The government and the press of the United States seized upon this as a friendly gesture and blew it up as proof that we were going to get along all right with the Soviet Union.

But William Bullitt, our first ambassador to Moscow, warned: "We should not cherish for a moment the illusion that it is possible to establish really friendly relations with the Soviet government, or with any communist party or communist individual."

The second American ambassador to the Soviet Union, Joseph E. Davies, arrived in Moscow on January 19, 1937.

Although Ambassador Davies’s stay in the Soviet Union spans the awful period of the purge trials in 1937 and 1938, Davies’s reports on the Soviet Union were the most optimistic and complimentary ever made by an American diplomatic representative there. Davies reported that the Soviet Union would do more for the United States than for any other country.\footnote{65} He believed that the danger of communist interference in the internal affairs of the United States had become largely academic. His only basic criticism of the Soviet Union was couched in these words:

"The pity of it all is, that one sees these wonderful things corroded, disgraced, corrupted and defiled by a ruthless, mistaken zeal for the betterment of humanity, which is nothing other than a terrible tyranny.\"\footnote{66}

June 5, 1938—When Molotov was having a farewell interview with Ambassador Davies, Stalin personally and surprisingly showed up to make a proposal for the settlement of the old debts and claims due the United States.\footnote{67} Stalin’s proposals weren’t half as good for the United States as the last excessively liberal American offer which had failed in 1935; but Davies requested permission to bring Stalin’s proposals personally to Washington. Molotov stipulated that negotiations should not go through usual diplomatic channels. Therefore, these negotiations, like the original talks between Roosevelt and Litvinov, were conducted in private, and no record was made of them. Davies was authorized to convey to the Soviet officials that "Pres-
ident [Roosevelt] and the Secretary of State were gratified at this gesture of friendship and the manifestation of good faith on their part to compose the differences and misunderstandings with reference to the debt settlement...."76

The debt question, however, was never settled.

From the beginning, our embassy in Moscow had to deal with difficulties, harassments, and insults which Cordell Hull characterized as "not common to any other civilized nation, nor even... uncivilized nations as a rule."76

For example, as soon as the Soviets were recognized, Roosevelt started plans for constructing the American Embassy building in Moscow. Bullitt obtained specific promises from Stalin himself as to the location of our embassy. These promises were rudely broken without explanation.

Soviet authorities bluntly refused to keep a promise to supply our embassy with enough paper rubles at a fair rate of exchange to cover minor expenditures of American personnel there.

The Soviets installed secret microphones and tapped telephones in the American ambassador's office, and we made no protest. The Soviets' examination of the baggage of arriving and departing members of our embassy staff was excessive and inconsiderate; and efforts were made to levy export duties on articles purchased in the Soviet Union.

The Soviets' expanding rearmament plans resulted in demands for American war materials which Soviet industry could not produce. They especially wanted naval vessels—specifically, battleships—to be built in the United States or to be shipped as parts for assembling in the Soviet Union.79

Yet, Soviet orders in the United States for small amounts of recently-developed materials were obviously attempts to copy trade secrets.

Hence, private American business firms—as well as subordinate officials in our State and Navy Departments—felt that it was unwise to do business with the Soviets.79

The Soviets bitterly denounced the United States government, and America generally, for refusal to cooperate. President Roosevelt stepped in and expressed hope that the Russians would be able to purchase a battleship in this country.

This matter came to a head on June 8, 1938, when the Secretaries of State and Navy sent a joint letter to Roosevelt, pointing out that high-ranking officers in our own government were opposed to permitting a battleship to be built in the United States for the Soviet Union, and asking for a definite policy decision.73

Roosevelt gave his answers in brief marginal notations on this letter. He wanted to "give all help" to the Soviets, and ordered the Navy to cooperate with naval architects and shipbuilders to that end.

By the end of 1938, the Navy and American shipbuilders, carrying out Roosevelt's orders, had drawn up plans for a super battleship which we were ready to build for the Soviets. Roosevelt sent a secret mission to Moscow to show the plans to the Soviet government.73

The Soviets rejected the plans; but after the Stalin-Hitler friendship pact of August 23, 1939, Stalin sent a special naval mission to the United States to negotiate for the construction of battleships and destroyers. The Soviet agents met the same obstacles with American businessmen and subordinate officials in the Navy and State Departments as before. President Roosevelt was still favorably disposed to supplying the Soviet Union what they wanted; but for one reason or another, they never did get the battleships they desired.71

During the Soviet-German pact, an American vessel, the City of Flint, was captured by the Germans in the Atlantic and taken to the northern Soviet port of Murmansk. The Soviets detained this ship and prevented its captain from communicating with the American government. The Soviets would not tell our ambassador why they were holding this American ship, nor would they permit him to communicate with the ship's captain and crew.73

When the Soviet Union attacked Finland and bombed the city of Helsinki, President Roosevelt appealed to both Finland and Russia to refrain from ruthless bombings. The Soviets did not reply to the appeal.74

From the beginning of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, foreigners in Russia were harassed, persecuted, jailed, murdered—in secrecy and in contemptuous violation of all the canons of decency respected by civilized people.

Religion being considered an evil in communist dogma, religious worship in Russia—on the part of foreigners and Soviet citizens—was subject to the most vicious official persecution.

We knew all of this; and this was one of the main reasons that Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover had characterized the Soviets as political gangsters and refused to recognize them as a legitimate government.

Litvinov, in his memorandum to Roosevelt, November 16, 1933, had assured Roosevelt that the legal and religious rights of American citizens and the Soviet Union would be respected.75

But this promise—like all the others—was broken from the moment it was given.

We winked at this condition, just as we had tried to overlook all the other Soviet lies and broken promises.

As late as September 20, 1937, when Stalin's purge trials were reaching a climax of indecency, and foreigners in Russia were being subjected to indescribable brutalities, Joseph E. Davies reported from Moscow:

"Fortunately thus far during the purge, no American citizens have been arrested."76

During the last three months of 1937, however, our embassy in Moscow was continuously but futilely trying to protect American citizens arrested in the Soviet Union. In all cases, the Soviets failed to notify us of the arrests, and held the Americans incommunicado, our embassy finding out about them indirectly. Our embassy officials were not even permitted to communicate with the imprisoned Americans.77

Our embassy never knew whether it had a record of all such arrests or not. It did find out about 134 specific cases, and sent formal notes to the Soviet government. The notes were not answered. In one case, more than a year lapsed before the Soviet government notified our embassy of the death of one detained American national "in one of the northern regions of the Soviet Union."

If our embassy were able to effect the release and deportation of an American citizen within a year, it complimented itself that its efforts had been "crowned with success."

Laurence A. Steinhardt arrived in the
Soviet Union as the American ambassador on August 10, 1939. Steinhardt was the first ofour ambassadors who tried to establish the principle of reciprocity in our relations with the Russians. He recommended that we treat them the way they treated us.

Roosevelt said that we could not require their “downright rudeness” in kind, but that “we should match every Soviet annoyance by a similar annoyance here against them.” We have never yet done this, however.78

The volume of State Department documents which have been used for this series of programs on early American-Soviet relations ends with the year 1939. Similar official documents on our subsequent relations with the Soviets have not yet been published.

Anyone can get this volume which I have used by ordering it from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Its full title is Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers: The Soviet Union, 1933-1939. It is officially known as Department of State Publication 4539.

It is 1034 pages long, and is fairly well indexed. It was published by the State Department on February 15, 1952. It costs $3.75 in buckram binding.

You might be able to borrow the book from your local library.

You can get a good official State Department summary and review of the book by ordering two issues of The Department of State Bulletin: (1) Volume XXVI, Number 673, dated May 19, 1952; and (2) Volume XXVI, Number 674, dated May 26, 1952.

These bulletins are for sale (20¢ each) by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. They also may be available in your local lending library.

The official State Department book on which this series is based is available in the
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Part VI

THE PRO AND THE CON

"Should America break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries?"

On May 13, 1954, Senator William Jenner, on behalf of himself and Pat McCarran, Senator from Nevada, laid before the Senate of the United States a formal resolution calling upon our government to break off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and her satellite states.79

* * * * *

In the tradition of Facts Forum, let’s briefly examine both sides of this controversial subject, reviewing first the arguments of those who think that we should break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries:

* * * * *

After every futile conference with the communists, diplomats of the Western world—instead of admitting their own stupidity in being drawn into such humiliating diplomatic defeats—sound off about the worth of such conferences, claiming that they show the communists up before the world as unwilling to negotiate in good faith and work honorably for peace.80

Yet, since 1917, we have known that the communists are hoodlums who will not negotiate in good faith and work honorably for peace.

Roosevelt had to know that the communists were gangsters, in that midnight hour of November 16, 1933, when, in his private study, he and Litvinov drank a toast in 3.2 beer to celebrate his one-man, autocratic, secret decision to reverse the established policy of the United States and embrace the Soviet tyrants as brothers by extending to them the recognition and good wishes of this nation.81

The communists had pleaded with us, wheedled, and begged for our recognition, because they desperately needed it. Yet, within hours after Roosevelt’s act of extending recognition, the communists began their undisguised, contemptuous, and flagrant violations of all the promises which they had made in order to secure our recognition.82

They harassed and insulted our diplomats in Moscow. They secretly arrested, murdered, imprisoned American citizens inside Russia, and they enormously increased their fifth column activities inside the United States, using the Soviet Embassy in Washington and the Soviet consul posts as centers for the direction of their espionage, sabotage, and propaganda activities, taking advantage of diplomatic immunity to bring into the United States literally thousands of communist spies, saboteurs, and agitators, and tons of communist literature.83

With a shameful spinelessness, we have for 21 years tolerated communist insults and treachery, keeping ourselves constantly in the position of begging them to negotiate with us and settle our differences in good faith.

It is only during the past few years that we have even been using strong language about their behavior.

When Eisenhower talks about a modus vivendi, peaceful co-existence with the Soviets, he is parroting the same kind of hopeful nonsense that Roosevelt talked when he recognized the Soviets in the first place.84

Communists are murderers, liars, traitors, kidnappers, agitators, saboteurs. The only way you can have peaceful co-existence with people like that is to exclude them from decent society.

Withdrawal of recognition would be the first overt act — as distinguished from talk— since 1933 to show that our nation genuinely disapproves of communism and regards it as a criminal conspiracy instead of a legitimate government.

There has not been one occasion dur-
ing the past 37 years when there was any logical indication that we could enter into negotiations with communists with reasonable expectation of achieving anything that was good for the United States of America.

There is not now and there never has been any possibility that formal diplomatic relations between our country and communist countries could result in any good to the United States.54

Breaking off diplomatic relations with all communist countries, however, would immediately achieve many great benefits for America.

First of all, we would close up all of the communist embassies and consular posts, thus eliminating them as important centers of communist espionage, sabotage, propaganda, and agitation.59

We would get rid of the throngs of communist spies and agents now in the United States under the protection of diplomatic immunity; we would inspire some real hope in the genuine anti-communists throughout the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain; and we would express the moral indignation of a religious people against the godless atheism of communism.

At present, even our top leaders have no idea where we are going or what we are going to do. We are just waiting and drifting, hoping against hope that something will turn up. That was the Truman - Acheson - George Kennon policy; and it is the policy of Eisenhower and Dulles.

We can do nothing in the United Nations, because even the so-called non-communist countries (like India, Burma, England) will not go along with us; and the communist nations could wreck any UN plan that would hurt the communists.63

We have tried to go around the UN. We set up NATO and involved ourselves in a frightful number of other treaties and commitments. But here again, we can do nothing without the wholehearted cooperation of nations which simply won't cooperate.

Withdrawal of American recognition from all communist countries would clearly draw the lines. Any genuine anti-communist nations which wanted to dovetail their national policies with ours and follow our leadership could. Those which want to sit on the fence could sit there.

But we could have a policy.

Since 1933, the only understandable policy we have had with regard to the communists is the one Roosevelt announced when he said that if we give them everything they want and ask nothing in return, we can probably get along with them.66

As we are now going, we are headed for war—at a time and on the terms that the communists decide on.

Withdrawing American recognition from all communist countries could prevent that disaster. We would be free to build up our own strength to such a point that the communists would never dare to touch us.

Then, as time passed, the vast communist empire would disintegrate. It is an evil, slave system which will begin to fall apart the moment it can no longer use and manipulate us to hold it together.  

That was one side of the question. But there is, of course, an opposite side — the views of those who think we should not break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries.

Here are those arguments:

** Breaking off diplomatic relations with communist countries would reflect a head-in-the-sand attitude, a foolish pretense that because we do not recognize the communist nations, they do not exist. The fact is: they do exist.

A considerable portion of the world is communist, and as a member of the world community, we must make every effort to settle our differences. We cannot do that by ignoring them.67

Obviously, there is no possibility of any sudden, global solutions by negotiation, but there are specific international situations in which useful ends can be served by practical arrangements to which both sides agree, even though the readiness to agree may be for differing and conflicting reasons.67

The outcome of World War II left us seriously involved with the Soviet government in a number of questions vital to the future of our civilization. Neither nation can now extract itself from the unhappy intimacy this involves.

Just as the Soviet Union and the United States are both too great to destroy each other except at exorbitant mutual cost, so they are also too great to ignore each other with impunity. The interests of world peace require that they communicate with each other, and neither can be insensible to the indirect effects of what the other does.

The Soviets have made every effort to divide and weaken the nations of the free world. It becomes ever more important, therefore, that we thwart them in this effort by maintaining a firm mutual understanding with our allies on our policy toward the Soviets. We could not do that by suddenly breaking off diplomatic relations with communist nations — abruptly embarking on a rash new policy that none of our allies could approve.67

Breaking off diplomatic relations with the Soviets and their satellite countries would mean an irreparable rift among the free nations. Our European allies, watching the Russian situation at close range, have detected a significant change in Russia since the death of Stalin.66

Under Stalin, Russia was a true dictatorship. Today, it is not. None of the present leaders holds Stalin's unchallenged power or has his status in the
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Enclosed is five dollars to cover five introductory subscriptions to Facts Forum News...

Mrs. Virginia Leavit
3734 Charleston, Houston 21, Texas

...I am state chairman of the D.A.R. National Defense Committee this year, and I am suggesting to all our Connecticut Chapter chairman that they read Facts Forum News or listen to your programs in order to be well-informed in their duties during this crucial period...I am also loaning my copies of Facts Forum News wherever they can do the most good...

Grace Le Kenyon
36 Sherman St., Bristol, Conn.

Your program is the most important and unusual on radio. I never miss it. I hope all Americans hear it...

L. Cable Wagner
202 Walnut Ave., Sidney, Ohio


eyes of the Russian people. Russia now has a very difficult problem of adjustment to the new type of leadership, and Russia's leaders will hardly want to complicate their internal uncertainty by ventures abroad.

For these reasons and others, Russia is eager for peace and will make concessions to get it. She cannot do so if we refuse to negotiate with her on diplomatic levels.

Negotiation means compromise. It does not mean appeasement. There are certain fundamental issues which neither the West nor Russia will compromise. But in between, there are many issues on which both sides may find it better to agree than to disagree. The opportunity for peace will come from exploring this area of possible agreement.

The European viewpoint is not well understood in the United States. Europeans believe that the United States does not share their view about the necessity of sincere negotiations with Russia—that we continue in a hostile and rigid posture which has outlived its usefulness, which makes an approach to peace impossible, and which may precipitate war. Talk of breaking off diplomatic relations with communist nations serves only to strengthen these misgivings.

We simply cannot ignore Europe's wishes in this matter, because it is ridiculous to assume that we can go it alone, or always make Europe go our way.

Many Americans, of course, do not regard Russia as a normal nation, capable of conventional international relations, but only as the seat of world communism. Their personal war is not with Russia as a nation, but with communism—which, to them, is synonymous with irredeemable evil.

These people forget that however much we may dislike communism, there are millions throughout the world who do not regard communism as evil or hold it responsible for the terrors of the Stalin regime. Communism, like all ideas, is a thing of the mind and spirit, and things of the mind and spirit have never in all human history been eradicated by force.

Bad ideas must be fought with better ideas, bad systems by demonstration of better systems—a long process and a discouraging one, perhaps, but the only one that promises world peace. We would not make our system or our ideas sound any better to people in communist countries by removing all normal contacts with them. On the contrary, we would admit, in effect, that we are not diplomatically strong enough to meet with them and work out our problems; that we do not have real confidence in our own system.

We must continue to be patient, to seek every avenue of negotiation and discussion, through continued diplomatic relations and through the United Nations. Breaking off diplomatic relations with communist countries would destroy the United Nations. Without the United Nations, international tensions would soon stretch to the breaking point. And that point would be the beginning of World War III.

* * * * *

There, in quick review, are two sides of a Facts Forum question:

"Should America break off diplomatic relations with all communist countries?"

That is a question for all Americans.

* * * * *
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VOGELER OPPOSES TRADE WITH REDS

Robert Vogeler, an American business man who was held captive for 17 months in communist-controlled Hungary, appeared recently with his wife on Facts Forum's State Of The Nation program with Victor Lasky and Hardy Burt.

Subjected to a Moscow-type trial, Mr. Vogeler was forced to "confess" to being a spy for the United States Government and sentenced to 15 years in solitary confinement. He lost 60 pounds and was held incommunicado for the entire detention period.

To accelerate the release of Americans imprisoned by the communists, Mr. Vogeler said it is his opinion that all trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites should cease.

As a means of arousing all nations to an awareness of these communist-held prisoners, Mr. Vogeler stated, "Every time our UN delegate gets up on his feet, he should bring to the attention of the world the fact that communists are holding American boys captured in Korea—400 to 900 prisoners—somewhere in Red China and also are holding more than 5,000 American citizens behind the Iron Curtain. That should be brought out at every occasion whenever the Russian representative gets up and makes those speeches about brotherly love, peace for the world and so forth.

"I do not believe the Red Russians will permit peaceful co-existence. From the very fundamentals of the Soviet philosophy, there can be no co-existence with anyone because they are dedicated to bring about a change in existing philosophies by force if necessary."

A complete transcript of this interest-packed interview with Mr. and Mrs. Vogeler may be obtained without charge by writing to Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas.

UN DISCUSSION FIRST IN FILM SERIES

Facts Forum's new Answers For Americans film series was ushered in by the thought-thrusting topic, "How Successful Is the United Nations?", suggested by Frederick L. Manley, Sr., 2911 Chippewa St., New Orleans, Louisiana.

For his question, Mr. Manley was awarded a $100 U.S. Savings Bond following the initial telecast July 25 in the WJMR-TV studios at New Orleans.

Mr. Manley paints himself an avid Facts Forum Answers For Americans fan, having been a long-time radio listener and never missing the program on TV.

He expresses an earnest appreciation for the high plane of fact presentation the program provides and adds, "As far as I'm concerned, Answers For Americans is essential viewing for the armchair diplomat."
Should Diplomatic Relations With Russia Be Suspended?*

This question was analyzed on Facts Forum's Answers For Americans program by a panel of three experts: Prof. Charles Hodge, professor of international politics at New York University; Mr. Devin Garrity, president of the Devin-Adair Publishing Company; Prof. John K. Norton, Ph.D., of Columbia University Teachers College. Featured guest on the program was Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski, Republican from Wisconsin, member of the House Armed Services Committee and former director of the World League To Stop Communism. Hardy Burt served as moderator.

What Are the Advantages Of Continuing Diplomatic Relations With Russia?

(Question submitted by Mrs. Myles Jackson of Cookston, Minn.)

Rep. O'Konski: There would be no advantage to the United States; every advantage to Soviet Russia. I believe even if we will have to suspend diplomatic relations with Russia, so why not now?

Prof. Norton: Probably we will eventually have to cut off diplomatic relations with Russia, but not now. To withdraw at this moment would be very easily used by Russia against us to further divide the Free World. In any case, I think there should be some very vigorous restrictions put upon the Russians who are in this country. I think the restrictions under which our diplomats operate in Moscow should be rigidly applied to those who represent the USSR in Washington. There would be a real advantage in having a listening post in Moscow because that would be the one opportunity we'd have of knowing something about what is going on.

Prof. Hodge: I say now is not the time to sever diplomatic relations with Russia. The way I look at it, diplomacy is a two-way street. We don't happen to have any speed limits, and we don't have adequate traffic control. Nevertheless, I think it's an essential device for trying to work out of the Third World War. We get a listening post in Moscow and a psychological gain—you can at least occasionally see the American Flag behind the Iron Curtain. Also, it's important to our Intelligence Work. Another thing, painful though it may be, it's essential to American relations with our Allies.

Mr. Garrity: I think diplomatic relations with Russia should be suspended and the sooner the better. I don't agree that this is diplomacy at all. I think it's war—only cold war. The idea is to keep it cold and not get into the hot stage. By continuing to treat Russia as an equal, by continuing to recognize their regime which is not representative of the people, we are causing trouble in Russia and their satellite countries to say, "What's the use? America recognizes these people who are our enslavers." The sooner we get rid of them the sooner those people can develop an underground that will overthrow the present regime.

What Are the Disadvantages Of Continuing Diplomatic Relations With Russia?

Rep. O'Konski: The disadvantages are very clear. I think we should put our diplomatic representation strictly on a reciprocity basis. The last figures I had were that the Soviet Union permits only 32 Americans in the American Embassy while the Soviet Embassy and Soviet agents in the United States total around 400. There's absolutely no excuse for that kind of discrepancy. If the Russians allow us 32 American representatives in Moscow, we should allow them 32 representatives in the United States. The Americans in Russia are restricted as to what they can do, what they can see; they're constantly under observation. We should handle Soviet Union representatives in the United States on the same basis—restrict their travel and activity, keep them under surveillance at all times. Soviet Embassies are spy centers, focal points for treason. We gain absolutely nothing by leaving them unregulated as they are at the present time.

Prof. Hodge: We have treated the Russians as they've treated us regarding the consulates. You may remember they forced us out of Vladivostok after the war retaliated by squeezing the consular representation in this country. We have to recognize that every embassy anywhere in the world today is a center for espionage. We are no exception. One of the most important differences in our foreign policy situation concerns the matter of information. The Russians get it; we don't. It has been amply proved that they'll still transfer their spies to this country irrespective of the diplomatic set-up.

Mr. Garrity: I don't believe it's been amply proved at all. Suppose that for a year or two prior to the invasion of Europe, General Eisenhower had been able to direct the invasion right from headquarters in Berlin, the very center of the enemy. Wouldn't that have been a great advantage? That's exactly the way the Russians are today in Washington. Right in the very heart of this country they have an embassy of trained saboteurs who are in constant touch with 25,000 hidden members of the Communist Party in the United States. It is as if we had had 25,000 trained underground workers for our army in the center of Berlin when we were invading Germany. This is a cold war. The Russians are definitely out to destroy us and as soon as we act in our interests, the better off we're going to be. To act in our interests, we should suspend relations with Russia. I think every day we delay we're losing.

Prof. Norton: I don't think it's as clear as that. It's relatively easy to get information from a free society such as ours. That's inherent in a free society. As a matter of fact, as soon as our people invent a new military instrument of some type, it's immediately announced in the newspapers. I'm not saying whether that should be or not; the fact is, it is. If we were cut off from the embassy in Moscow, we'd have absolutely no contact with that regime. I doubt very much if they get any more from America from being recognized and having an embassy here than they would get if they did not have the one embassy in Washington.

Rep. O'Konski: Suppose we suspend relations with Russia. You still have the Russian satellite countries—Communist Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland—represented in the United States so that they can carry on the objectionable activities through those embassies if we closed down the Russian Embassy. By itself, the suspension of relations with the Soviet Union will not accomplish very much. It has to be a general program in that direction or it will not serve its purpose. I feel that we should start severing our relations with the Soviet satellite countries because they definitely do not represent the people of those countries. I feel we did a grave injustice in recognizing them in the first place. Then we should have to work in the direction of what I think eventually will have to come—suspension of relations with the Soviet Union.

Prof. Hodge: Under the conditions of the war, as the war unfolded, it was impossible to avoid recognition of the Soviet satellite countries.

* The topic, "Should Diplomatic Relations With Russia Be Suspended?", was suggested by Mr. Henry Wall of Hillsboro, Kansas, who was awarded a $100 U.S. Savings Bond for his acumen in submitting the question.
If the United States Decided to Terminate Diplomatic Relations With Russia, What Possibility Is There of the Rest of the Free World Following Suit?
(Question submitted by Messrs. Michael Miller of the Bronx, N.Y., and Joseph F. Slenatt of Baltimore, Md.)

Prof. Hodges: I take the position that practically no country would follow us at this time in severing relations. In the first place, there’s a big economic problem. Our Allies have to live economically, and part of that economic living comes from behind the Iron Curtain. Whether you make it or not, it’s true of the British and the French and so on. Now, you have to offer an alternative, a real alternative, which will make up for a political gesture. Political gestures are cheap if you’re sitting on top of the world with the highest standard of living. At least two billion dollars’ worth of trade would have to be made up by us, and you know what’s happening down in Washington to President Eisenhower’s very modest trade liberalization. With that economic problem, you’ve got a terrific fire on your hands!

Prof. Norton: There is little possibility under present conditions of getting the other countries of the Free World to go with us. Whether we like it or not, the pressure is in the direction not of withdrawing recognition of Russia at this time but in the direction of recognizing Red China. Breaking diplomatic relations would give the USSR a wonderful propaganda opportunity. Breaking relations would be folly. I say it would tend to divide the Free World further which, of course, is the key Russian objective. This would only further isolate us, and I say we should not do it.

Rep. O’Konski: I don’t think we’d get very much help from the other countries of the world in terminating diplomatic relations with Russia, but we should start looking out for ourselves. We have given away 50 billion dollars of the taxpayers’ money all over the world trying to help other countries. Where were they when we were in Korea assuming 95% of the load? They wanted us to go into Indo-China, but they wouldn’t help us. In other words, we’ve definitely got to question whether our money is paying off.

What Can Be Done to Improve Relations Between the Soviet Bloc and the United States?
(Question submitted by Mr. L. B. Krismet of Maysville, Ky., and Mrs. G. T. Hulit of Nashville, Tenn.)

Prof. Norton: Nothing can be done on a straight basis of honest negotiations so long as the present regime holds in Russia. They don’t want to negotiate, and they won’t. The best thing we can do is improve our relations with the rest of the world and build up our own strength. The only thing that Russia recognizes is strength. If we bargain with strength—military strength, economic strength, unity and good relations with the rest of the world—we can do something with them.

Prof. Hodges: I think we have to work from situation to situation. I know that sounds evasive, but we don’t seem to have a national policy. It’s bi-partisan blundering, and I don’t think we should try to pin this on either party. I’d like to give you a Lincoln statement. He said, “If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.” I think that’s the dilemma which hasn’t been answered by the Democrats or the Republicans. We do not have an adequate foreign policy, leadership which would enable us to draw the Free World with us and thus avoid the uncertainty and the frictions.

Rep. O’Konski: You can’t have good relations with Soviet Russia. There is nothing we can do that would make good relations with Russia. The only way we could have good relations with Soviet Russia would be to go to all these conferences they want, give them everything they want, and sign everything they want us to sign.

TOLSTOY FOUNDATION LIFTS IRON CURtain FOR ESCAPEES

Freedom from the shackles of Soviet tyranny is the haven offered by the Tolstoy Foundation to those who manage to escape through a hole in the Iron Curtain, explained Countess Alexandra Tolstoy, Foundation president, who appeared on Facts Forum’s State Of The Nation broadcast with General Albert C. Wedemeyer.

“I think 99 per cent of the Russian people would run away from Russia if they could,” declared Countess Tolstoy, daughter of the famed Count Leo Tolstoy. “Since the end of the war, the Tolstoy Foundation has brought over 14,000 escapes from communist-dominated areas to the United States alone. There are terrible border barriers put up by the communists, and it is getting more and more difficult to flee from the Soviets in Europe and Asia.”

Besides 15 offices abroad, the Tolstoy Foundation also has the Tolstoy Farm in this country where escapees are rehabilitated and indoctrinated in the American way of life. Also a camp for children is provided, and a home for the aged is now being built.

Countess Tolstoy stated there is little danger of spies entering the United States under the guise of being anti-communists because a careful screening process ferrets out espionage agents from groups of escapees.

According to General Wedemeyer, chairman of the board of the Tolstoy Foundation, “Those of us who live in this wonderful land of ours, the United States, do not realize the suffering, the degradation experienced by people in communist-dominated countries. I have known Countess Tolstoy for some years and have always admired her as a great humanitarian, and I certainly want to assist Countess Tolstoy and her organization in rehabilitating these unfortunate people who have suffered at the hands of oppressors in Europe and the Far East.”

SHOULD RUSSIA BE SEVERED?

If diplomatic recognition was withdrawn from Russia, Countess Tolstoy points out that the Tolstoy Foundation program of assisting escapees would not be affected at all.

Agreeing with Countess Tolstoy on this, General Wedemeyer adds, “I also think that if we were to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, it would have a very salutary effect upon the people behind the Iron Curtain and then among our Allies. If we were to sever diplomatic relations with communist countries, I think that the people behind the Iron Curtain would say, ‘Well, at last the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
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<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albertville</td>
<td>WAUV†</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>8:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander City</td>
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<td>Sun</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Wed</td>
<td>7:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Sun</td>
<td>9:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>12:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>13:00p</td>
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<td>Tues</td>
<td>8:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
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<td>8:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>WHHL†</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>9:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>WHRS§</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>6:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>WAPX</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>6:15p</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>WPXN</td>
<td>Sun</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call Letters</th>
<th>Days</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>WAVG</td>
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<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>KFHN</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>7:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>KXAR</td>
<td>Tues</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>KTMU</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>8:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>KARK†</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>9:45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>KMGN</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>6:45p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>KTOU</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>7:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>KWAT</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>7:30p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
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<th>Days</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>KAFY</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>5:50p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>KIEM</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>11:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>KDAC</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>6:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>KXLY</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>12:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>KHJ†</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>5:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>KOCS†</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>6:30p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>KAPP†</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>To be announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>KFXX</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>8:00p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>KGFB</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>8:00p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>WDBH</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron River</td>
<td>WIRK</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>WDMJ</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petoskey</td>
<td>WPHG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>WSGW</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MINNESOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>KAYS*</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainerd</td>
<td>KLLZ</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge</td>
<td>KBDU</td>
<td>1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveleth</td>
<td>WVEE</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus Falls</td>
<td>KGDE</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>KRVZ</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>KSTP*</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MISSISSIPPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>WMPA</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biloxi</td>
<td>WYMI*</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>WMBJ</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clariday</td>
<td>WROX</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>WAVE</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>WCMA</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>WNAG</td>
<td>1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>WFOR</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McComb</td>
<td>WPAX*</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starkville</td>
<td>WSSO*</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MISSOURI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
<td>KFVS*</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannibal</td>
<td>KWMO*</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City</td>
<td>KJJO*</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joplin</td>
<td>KFJL*</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>KMUS*</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkville</td>
<td>KIRX</td>
<td>1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>KLWT*</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville</td>
<td>KNIM*</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>KXEO</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>KNEM*</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>KFQG*</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Genevieve</td>
<td>KSGM*</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>KVIC*</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MONTANA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>KGHL*</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>KXLA*</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>KXLF*</td>
<td>1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendive</td>
<td>KXGN*</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>KXGA</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>KXLJ</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>KXXO</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>KFRN*</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>KJLP</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>KXLL*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>KGXJ*</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NEBRASKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Island</td>
<td>KEGI*</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>KHAS*</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>KLIN*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCook</td>
<td>KBRL</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>KFAB*</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsbluff</td>
<td>KNEB*</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NEW MEXICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>KQBE</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>KPBM*</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>KCAU*</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs</td>
<td>KWKE</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>KORE*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portales</td>
<td>KENM*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>WJHN</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghampton</td>
<td>WKOP*</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>WWJF*</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>WWCX</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Worth</td>
<td>WFTX</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>WCNO</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>KKNB*</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>WCNZ</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>KFAB*</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>KOKC*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portales</td>
<td>KENM*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocosa City</td>
<td>WHHB</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>KSAT*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>KSJT</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>KSHC</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>KTVL*</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>KSIO*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>KYMA</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PENNSYLVANIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>WPAU*</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>WULJ</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>WMMX</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghampton</td>
<td>WKPQ</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>WRET*</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>WSBE</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>WHTF</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>WJSN</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>WOLI</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamokin</td>
<td>WSJL*</td>
<td>1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport</td>
<td>WLLI</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>WXVI</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RHOE ISLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>WRIN</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>WNBC</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>WNOW</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SOUTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiken</td>
<td>WAKN*</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnwell</td>
<td>WBCU*</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>WAGA*</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>WMAC*</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>WMYD*</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>WCLT</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>WBFC*</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsville</td>
<td>WBHS*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullins</td>
<td>WJAY*</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>WKDK*</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg</td>
<td>WWND*</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
<td>WYTC*</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>WSFA*</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>WJOP</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walterboro</td>
<td>WAMD*</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SOUTH DAKOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadwood</td>
<td>KSDK*</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>KORP*</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>KIOH*</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>KFAT</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

NOTE: ANSWERS FOR AMERICANS has heretofore been available only to stations of the NBC network. It is now available to all stations. Check the radio and TV logs in your local newspapers for this program.

(Continued on Page 21)
## FACTS FORUM RADIO SCHEDULE - continued

**TENNESSEE**
- **Athens**: WLAG† 1450 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Chattanooga**: WAGC† 1450 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Memphis**: WDMI 1310 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Nashville**: WSM† 1560 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Knoxville**: WVLK† 1250 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Johnson City**: WJHL† 910 Mon 10:15 p.m.
- **Cleveland**: WJTV† 1290 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Maryville**: WRCA† 1450 Mon 7:30 p.m.

**TEXAS**
- **Abilene**: KWWC 1340 Sun 6:20 p.m.
- **Alice**: KRED 1200 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Alpine**: KYIF 1260 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Amarillo**: KVLC 1240 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Beaumont**: KFBM 1280 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Brownsville**: KFKA 1230 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Galveston**: KLED 1210 Mon 4:00 p.m.
- **Shreveport**: KOLP 1290 Sun 3:00 p.m.

**VERMONT**
- **Burlington**: WPTV† 1240 Sun 1:30 p.m.

**WASHINGTON**
- **Everett**: KKCQ 1350 Sun 8:20 p.m.
- **Seattle**: KOMO 1260 Fri 7:30 p.m.

**WEST VIRGINIA**
- **Bluefield**: WGOY† 1240 Mon 9:20 p.m.
- **Charleston**: WCAC 1400 Sun 8:00 p.m.
- **Clarksburg**: WHAR 1340 Tues 10:20 p.m.
- **Huntington**: WPLH† 1450 Mon 9:30 p.m.
- **Montgomery**: WMOM† 1340 Mon 9:30 p.m.
- **Morgantown**: WJHR 1220 Mon 10:20 p.m.
- **Parkersburg**: WJTL 1000 To be announced
- **Wheeling**: WBRW† 1450 Mon 9:30 p.m.

**WISCONSIN**
- **Eau Claire**: WBIZ 1400 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Green Bay**: WPJG† 1440 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Janesville**: WCLP† 1230 Mon 9:20 p.m.
- **Lacrosse**: WLCX† 1400 Mon 9:30 p.m.
- **Madison**: WMPF† 161.1 Sun 9:00 p.m.
- **Rhinelander**: WBPR† 1240 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Rice Lake**: WJMC† 1350 Mon 7:30 p.m.
- **Richmond Center**: WRCO† 1450 To be announced

**WYOMING**
- **Casper**: KVQO† 1300 Mon 7:15 p.m.
- **Lander**: KOY† 1200 Mon 8:30 p.m.
- **Torrington**: KGO5† 1490 Tues 7:30 p.m.

---

### LETTERS FROM READERS

(Continued from Page 18)

Mr. Kohlberg and Rabbi Schultz are rendering a priceless service because from personal knowledge I can tell you that they are doing more to stop the curse of anti-Semitism than anyone.

Mr. Kohlberg and Rabbi Schultz have pleasing, sincere voices and with their vast fund of knowledge obtained through their channels of research, they should have regular programs over radio and television so that the public can benefit thereby and at the same time counteract much of the leftist propaganda that is giving aid, comfort and encouragement to the world’s enemy—the communist conspiracy.

Again my thanks, I am proud to be a member of Facts Forum.

Sincerely and gratefully yours,

*Mrs. Edward Suchman*

233 N. Manhattan Pl., Los Angeles 4, Calif.

---

**FACTS FORUM NEWS, August, 1954**
FACTS FORUM TELEVISION SCHEDULE

NOTE: ANSWERS FOR AMERICANS has heretofore been available only to stations of the ABC network. It is now available to all stations, but our schedule is not yet complete. Check the television log in your local newspaper for the ANSWERS FOR AMERICANS telecast.

Watch your local newspapers for any change in the scheduling of FF programs. Please notify the FF office of such changes.

ALABAMA
Decatur WMSL TV 23  Sat 7:30 p
Mobile WOAB TV 48  Fri 7:00 p
Montgomery WCOV TV 20  Mon 9:30 p
WCOV TV**  20 *

ALASKA
Anchorage KFIA TV 2 *

ARIZONA
Phoenix KPHO TV 5  Sun 10:00 p

ARKANSAS
Fort Smith KFSA TV 22  Wed 9:00 p
Texarkana KCNC TV 6  Sat 9:30 p

CALIFORNIA
Fresno KMJ TV 24  Sun 5:00 p
San Diego KFSI TV 10  Sat 7:00 p
San Francisco KFMB TV**  8  Sun 1:30 p
San Luis Obispo KVEC TV 6  Wed 7:00 p
Stockton KTVU TV 36  Tues 9:30 p

COLORADO
Grand Junction KFJX TV**  5  Sun 9:00 p

CONNECTICUT
Waterbury WATR TV 53  Sun 5:30 p

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Washington WTTG TV 5  Sun 7:30 p

FLORIDA
Fort Lauderdale WFTL TV 23  Tues 8:00 p
Fort Myers WINK TV 11  Sun 9:30 p
W. Palm Beach WIRK TV 21  Sun 7:00 p

GEORGIA
Columbus WRBL TV 4  Fri 9:30 p
Macon WNEX TV 47  Sun 6:30 p
Rome WROM TV 9  Sun 9:30 p

HAWAII
Honolulu KGMB TV 9  Sun 5:30 p

ILLINOIS
Bloomington WBLN TV 15  Wed 8:30 p
WBLN TV**  15 *

INDIANA
Lafayette WFMV TV 59  Sun 8:00 p

IDAHO
Boise KIDO TV 7  Sun 11:00 p

IOWA
Des Moines KGTU TV 17  Fri 7:00 p

KANSAS
Pittsburgh KOAM TV 7  Thurs 8:30 p

LOUISIANA
Lake Charles KTAC TV**  25  Tues 7:00 p
Monroe KNOE TV 8  Sat 5:30 p

MASSACHUSETTS
Pittsfield WMGT TV 74  Fri 7:30 p

MICHIGAN
Ann Arbor WPAG TV 20  Fri 8:00 p
Detroit WJBK TV 2  Sun 12:00 p

MISISSIPPI
Jackson WTVJ TV 25  Tues 6:00 p

MISSOURI
Kansas City KMBC TV 9  Tues 12:30 p
Springfield KYTV 3 *

MONTANA
Butte KXLJ TV 6  Wed 7:00 p

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Manchester WMUR TV 9  Sun 9:30 p

NEW MEXICO
Roswell KWSV TV 8  Sun 2:30 p

NEW YORK
Elmira WSYT TV**  24  Sun 6:30 p

NORTH CAROLINA
Winston-Salem WTVD TV 26  Sun 9:30 p

NORTH DAKOTA
Fargo WDAY TV 6  Sun 4:00 p

OHIO
Steubenville WSTV TV 9  Sat 6:30 p
Zanesville WHZ TV**  50 *

OKLAHOMA
Lawton KSWO TV 7  Thurs 7:30 p
Oklahoma City KMTV TV 19  Wed 9:00 p
Tulsa KCEB TV**  23 *

OREGON
Portland KPTV TV 27  Sun 11:00 a

Pennsylvania
Chambersburg WCHW TV 46 *
Easton WGLV TV 57  Thurs 9:00 p
Johnstown WARD TV 56  Sun 3:00 p
Lebanon WLRK TV**  15  Sun 4:30 p
Reading WEEU TV**  33  Tues 9:30 p
Scranton WARM TV 16  Thurs 10:00 p
York WNON TV 49  Sun 7:00 p

SOUTH CAROLINA
Greenville WGLV TV 23  Sun 2:00 p

TENNESSEE
Knoxville WTSM TV 26  Thurs 9:00 a
Johnsville WJHL TV 11  Tue 6:00 p
Nashville WISX TV 8  Sun 5:00 p

TEXAS
Amarillo KFDA TV 10  Thurs 9:00 p
Corpus Christi KBDO TV 22 *
El Paso KTSM TV 9  Sat 6:00 p
Fort Worth WRAP TV 5  Sun 1:00 p
Lubbock KLBK TV 12  Sun 11:15 p
Midland KMID TV 2  Wed 7:30 p
San Antonio WOAI TV 5  Sat 1:00 p
Tyler KETX TV 19  Tues 8:15 p
Waco KANG TV 34  Sun 3:00 p
Westlake KTXL TV 5  Wed 9:15 p
Wichita Falls KWTX TV 6  Tues 9:30 p

VIRGINIA
Norfolk- Hampton WVEC TV 15  Sun 5:00 p
Norton WVEO TV**  27  Wed 7:30 p
Roanoke WSLS TV 10  Sat 2:30 p

WASHINGTON
Spokane KXXL TV 4  Sun 6:30 p

WEST VIRGINIA
Fairmont WJBF TV 35  Thurs 9:30 p
Parkersburg WATP TV 15  Wed 5:30 p

WISCONSIN
Neenah- WKNM TV 42  Mon 8:00 p

WYOMING
Cheyenne KFBC TV 5  Sun 6:00 p

*Schedule not yet received.
**Answers For Americans.

FILM LIBRARY

A wide variety of timely and pertinent subjects are maintained in the FACTS FORUM library of 16mm prints, available to churches, schools, civic clubs and other groups without cost.

Such groups may add zest to their discussion programs through the use of FACTS FORUM films, a complete listing of which appears on page 28 of this issue. Requests for additional copies of this list or shipment of films should be addressed to FACTS FORUM, Dallas, Texas.
Senator Sparkman, vice-presidential candidate in 1952, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He has been in Congress for 18 years and has also served as United States delegate to the United Nations.

**Roundup**

Should the United States withdraw from the UN if Red China is admitted? How adequate is the present administration's foreign policy? Will foreign aid be continued? These were among the many questions aimed at Senator John J. Sparkman, Democrat of Alabama, by Reporters Andrew F. Tully, Jr. of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, and Edward J. Michelson, of the Boston Herald and Traveler. The program was moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh.

**QUESTION (Michelson):** Senator William Knowland, Republican majority leader of the Senate, has declared that if Red China were admitted to the United Nations, he would resign as floor leader and lead the fight for American withdrawal from the UN. What is your position on this?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** I certainly am not in favor of the United States withdrawing from the United Nations. I rather think that Senator Knowland and a good many others have been going at this backwards. As I said on the floor of the Senate, why this defeatist attitude assuming that Red China is going to be admitted to the UN? My contention is that if we put up the same good leadership we put up during the Democratic administrations when some 200 motions were made to admit Red China to the UN, Red China will not be admitted. Why should we all of a sudden decide we are going to lose?

**QUESTION (Michelson):** What about Winston Churchill's contention that Red China's admission to the UN is inevitable?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** England recognized Red China in January of 1950 and has argued ever since that Red China ought to be treated like any other nation and is entitled to admission.

**QUESTION (Michelson):** If we decide to withdraw from the UN, assuming that Red China gets in, how would we go about it? Is there anything in the UN Charter that has to do with withdrawal? Is there any legal procedure involved?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** I don't know. There has never been a nation that withdrew, but I assume any nation can withdraw simply by announcing that it will no longer continue to send a delegation or to make appropriations. There certainly is a provision in the UN Charter for a nation to be kicked out if it doesn't pay its assessed share, and I think all we would have to do is announce that we were no longer putting in our allotment.

**QUESTION (Tully):** Senator, you have criticized the Republican Administration's foreign policy and have stated that it has driven our friends away from us. Who is responsible for this?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** The Republicans are paying the price for having made foreign policy a campaign issue in 1952. They promised a new, dynamic foreign policy; and they have been trying ever since to make the American people think they have a new, dynamic policy. Today, more than at any time in recent years, we need to devote our attention and interest toward trying to rebuild friendships.

**QUESTION (Tully):** What, specifically, has the Administration done wrong in foreign policy?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** The first thing was the dramatic announcement that had no substance about "unleashing", as the press put it, Chiang Kai-shek. I believe the President made that point in one of his first addresses to Congress. He said he was no longer ordering the Seventh Fleet to protect the communists. What has happened? The next thing was the truce in Korea.

**QUESTION (Tully):** Why, was the truce in Korea wrong?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** I didn't say it was wrong, but it was entered upon with fanfare and flurry as if the future of the world was secured by that when it was nothing more than we could have had at any time. Had the Democratic Administration put the same truce into effect, they never would have heard the last of it.

Following that, the so-called "New Look" came out, and we announced to the world that we were withdrawing two divisions from Korea. Immediately that released the pressure against the communists in that part of the world and made it possible for them to transfer that pressure down to the Indo-China border.

Things were being done on a budgetary basis. Those two divisions from Korea were going to be demobilized. Our Air Force was cut down, and pilot training was slowed down for a year.

Then came the movement toward Indo-China when it was announced there would be "instant and massive retaliation." Following that they said Indo-China was so important we would not sit by and see it lost. Certainly the inference was given that we would move into Indo-China if we had to. Secretary of State Dulles, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said the Red Chinese had intervened in Indo-China right up to the trigger point where it almost called for us to go in on our "instant and massive retaliation."

When we began to hear from England and France that maybe we were moving too fast, Secretary Dulles made a hurried trip over there to talk to them. He said he was going to get an alliance, but he didn't get it. And we were pushed out on a limb. I think the Kremlin realized it was a bluff and called our hand.

**QUESTION (Tully):** Do you pin the blame on President Eisenhower?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** The President of the United States is the number one person in setting our foreign policy, and the Secretary of State is his alter-ego in carrying it out. These two would primarily be to blame.

**QUESTION (Hurleigh):** You mentioned Secretary Dulles' suggestion that Communist China's action in Indo-China could possibly trigger another war in our own troops. Do you suggest that Congress had some restraining influence on Secretary Dulles or the Administration?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** I think undoubtedly it did. We know there was a great deal of objection raised when it was suggested through the press of the country that we were very near intervening. Criticism has been voiced often from both sides of the table, Democrats and Republicans alike.

**QUESTION (Tully):** What do you think should have been done about Indo-China?

**SEN. SPARKMAN:** I would never have lost the close cooperation of our Allies as we did. I would have exerted every effort to keep them with me. I would have exerted all the influence necessary to bring France around to the idea of complete independence for the Indo-China states and the idea of a training program where the plentiful supply of manpower in Viet Nam could have been utilized. I would have been willing to go even further and would have adopted a plan something like the
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1st Award

FOR BAN ON COMMUNIST PARTY

To the Louisville Courier-Journal:

Should Communism be outlawed by an act of Congress? One can ask with no less sanity, should an organized enemy of our form of government and way of life be permitted to function behind the protection of our laws? An affirmative answer falls little short of blasphemy; for our entire governmental structure rests on God-like precepts.

Our Founding Fathers framed the Constitution so that individuals might live and think freely. Communism exists only to destroy this principle by enslaving all men. "Outlaw the party, and drive Communists underground," proclaim some experts sincerely; but how much further underground can Communists go than when they infiltrate our institutions by intrigue and pretense?

Individuals suffer punishment for traitorous acts in times of war. By what right should Communists be allowed to crucify mankind from within the godless sanctuary of their legalized party and under the guise of wanting peace?

Ralph W. Black
P. O. Box 245, Sierra Madre, Calif.

2nd Award

HOLDS GOP RESPONSIBLE FOR McCARTHY METHODS

To the Dallas Times Herald:

Badly alarmed GOP leaders are exerting heavy pressure for cessation or curtailment of the McCarthy-Army televised public hearings.

This is understandable. The spectacle has been completely unedifying. But it also has been highly educational. We believe the public has learned a great deal from the hearings about Sen. Joseph McCarthy's "methods." We believe that the public also has learned from Army Secretary Stevens' own lips an inkling of the cowardly extent to which the administration, in the past at least, has gone to appease McCarthy. We believe that a true and undoctored picture is taking shape in the public's mind on the "mess" that still exists in Washington.

Naturally, the GOP does not like it, but it will have to take it. As the party in power, it will have to accept responsibility for its mistakes and correct them or suffer the consequences.

Ervin M. Lane
910 Grant St., Dallas, Texas

3rd Award

INFORMATION

To the Wall St. Journal:

Certain columnists and commentators manage to keep their left-wing standing by the derogatory use of the term, "informer," to stigmatize anyone who has broken cleanly with Communism and has been of tested, priceless service in rooting out subversion. Whittaker Chambers expressed in "Witness" his emotional conflict about what it would mean to be called an "informer," when he was preparing to come forward—and I have watched Elizabeth Bentley recoil at this label by an irresponsible newspaperman. On the other hand the FBI and Congressional investigating committees which understand the invaluable contribution by sincere ex-Party members always refer to them as "informants."

It is significant how a choice of words can reveal one's stand on a vital issue. Regarding those people who prefer the term of opprobrium for a Bella Dodd or Louis Budenz, it may be said, "By their semantics, you shall know them."

Patricia McDonough
25 Monroe Place, Brooklyn 2, New York

4th Award — Token

NATIVE ASIAN ARMY COULD STOP COMMUNISM

To the Grand Rapids Herald:

Facts Forum asks, "What should be U.S. policy in Indo-China?" Internationalists and Communists, with their smoke-screen propaganda argument, "Shall American divisions go to Indo-China?" know beforehand the answer! American man-power will not be liquidated battling Orientals half-way around the world!

An Indo-China native army (half-million) trained as recommended by Van Fleet, "25 divisions for the cost of one," with Americans for trainers, not jungle fighters, with an Asian Anti-Communist Alliance including South Korea, Formosa, Japan, Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Malaya, Australia, New Zealand, France, Turkey, and England, will stop communism in its tracks!

Kipling wrote: "To walk with kings nor lose the common touch." Our leaders have lost such. They must make situations, not allow situations like tides, to lead them. We are losing the cold war—being led like lambs toward
eventual financial and military disaster and disintegration of this republic.
F. J. Toohey, Major USA (Ret.)
Route 3, Rockford, Michigan

5th Award — Token
WANTS ALL TO KNOW
To the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:
I sport a "Don’t blame me" sticker on my car. I want everyone to know I was not to blame for getting that quarrel some mess in Washington.
As long as we have this President, I am with him, as all the Democratic senators are. He has not been able to depend on the senators of his own party in putting over one single bill.
It’s his own party who is fighting him; I refer to the TV. The whole thing is designed to promote one man politically but it might get out of hand, and I think it has.
We have had no constructive legislation, just playing the fiddle while Rome burns.
Ann Henderson
2244 W. Magnolia, Fort Worth, Texas

6th Award — Token
S AND N
To the Baltimore Evening Sun:
I cannot let your editorial "Report Card Report" go unchallenged.
You say: "Let’s have no more hysterical assertions that S and N type of report card is an important feature, is in itself a form of collectivism. It was established by the Fabian Socialist educationalists and its aim was to keep the children of a class all on a level in respect to their ability.
It was established originally for the purpose of demoting the bright children and promoting the backward children. Just as all socialist movements do, it levels off social conditions.
I am afraid your sentence “let’s have no more hysterical assertions” will touch off another round in the report card fight. It is like setting a spark to a fuse as far as I am concerned—hence this epistle.
Mrs. Florence D. Watkins
York Road near Warren, Cockeysville, Md.

7th Award — Token
NEED PATRIOTS
To the Nashville Tennessean:
The issue of McCarthyism continues to be one of widespread current discussion. Most people either line up with McCarthyism or against it. Personally, I have in the past blown both hot and cold for McCarthy, and am lukewarm to cool at this moment.

Tomorrow? Or next week? McCarthy, in my mind, may be either a first-class citizen or a despised heel. But this I do believe: Whether it be McCarthy, Dies, Jenner, or some other, we always need in our government a person or a group of persons who will approach fanaticism in their patriotism. Not that this person or group should have much power, but the loudness of their yells would both direct public attention to, and restrain guilty persons from, unlawful doings.
Harold F. Polston
219 Blue Hills Dr., Nashville, 10, Tenn.

8th Award — Token
INCONSISTENCY AND U.N.
To the Dallas News:
Henry Cabot Lodge has correctly declared that Red China, because of its crimes, is unfit for membership in the United Nations.
On the other hand, Russia, because of its crimes against individuals, nations and the world, is likewise unfit for U.N. membership. But Russia is a U.N. member. If crimes against humanity can keep Red China out of the U.N., how much more inconsistent is Russia’s membership in the U.N., especially since the benign influences of the U.N. have failed to convert Russia to a decent attitude toward the rest of the world.
R. D. Thurston
102 S. Graves St., McKinney, Texas

9th Award — Token
WEIRD MELODRAMA
To the Dallas News:
This country has just closed the strangest chapter in its history, a weird melodrama more unbelievable than anything ever written by Poe or Dante.
Week after week, all over the country, the air has been pregnant with the voices of lawyers in hot debate, or the monotonous drone of endless questioning, while in the background the melancholy voice of that droll, sad child of old Wisconsin could be heard, diligently insulting the witness, insulting the interrogator, insulting those who are far off and insulting his own office as Senator.
If the voting judgment of this nation as a whole ever sinks to the level now indicated in Wisconsin, we are through! Henceforth our course will be erratic and downward.
J. Wesley Edwards
Sunset, Texas

10th Award — Token
COMMUNIST MENACE
To the Philadelphia Enquirer:
Do we really want to rid ourselves of the Communist menace in America?

If so then why don’t we roll up our sleeves and go get them?
Senator McCarthy and a few other brave men have tried to do this, but instead of getting cooperation, it seems that the "heat" is turned on them. That was the case in 1938 when Congressmen Martin Dies of Texas told FDR there were 2000 Commies in Government.
The "guns" were turned on McCarthy the same way during both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. It doesn’t make sense to me.
C. A. Nolan
R. R. 2, Seymour, Indiana

11th Award — Token
IKE’S TAX PROGRAM
To the Dallas News:
I heard a discussion of the pros and cons of Ike’s tax revision program.
It seems to me neither side touched directly on the root cause of extravagance and waste in government. I think that all these hidden taxes are at the root of our trouble. One doesn’t form the attachment for dollars he never had in his pocket that he does for those he has. The same is of course true of withholding taxes. It’s easier and less painful for the taxpayer, and for that reason more conducive to waste and extravagance.
What makes it possible for the government to spend all these billions abroad, or to grant all the subsidies and parities? It’s because we little guys from whom most of the tax money comes anyway do not directly feel the pinch and pain of its extraction. If we did we would stop it.
Leslie A. Shaw
122 E. Ave., 45, Los Angeles, Calif.

FACTS FORUM NEWS, August, 1954
How Can We Avoid World War III?

This question, foremost in the minds of all peace-loving people, was discussed on
Facts Forum's ANSWERS FOR AMERICANS program by the following panel: Dr. Sidney
Hook, well-known author who is associated with many cultural and educational enter-
prises; Prof. Charles Hodges, professor at New York University and foreign affairs
expert; Mr. Devin Garrity, noted publisher.

Special guest on the panel was Dr. Carliss Lamont, philosophy lecturer at Columbia
University. He was the director of the American Civil Liberties Union from 1952 to 1954.
The program was moderated by Hardy Burt.

Is There Any Possible Way to Establish Friendly, Peaceful Relations With the Soviet Bloc?

(Question submitted by a number of people including John Speed of Sioux City, Iowa, and
Mrs. Oliver Reed of Kent, Wash.)

Lamont: I certainly do think we can establish peaceful relations with the
Soviet Bloc or, as I would prefer to say, the Communist Bloc, since I don't think
that Communist China is under the control of Soviet Russia. We have had
peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union for 37 years, and I believe that
we can continue it. Now I would make five main points here.

First, we must have general disarmament including the destruction of all
atom and hydrogen bombs and including
an agreement in which all of the
powers agree not to send across
any frontier any arms whatsoever.

Second, we should restore normal East-West trade. When goods go across
boundaries it is less likely that soldiers
will go across.

Third, we should continue to work
through the United Nations, and we
should have Communist China come in
as a member.

Fourth, we should continue the meth-
od of conference and discussion which
is the method of reason and even try to
get a Big Three Conference between
Churchill, Eisenhower and Malenkov.

Fifth, we should renew the cultural and travel relations between these dif-
ferent countries in these different blocs
so that the people will get to know each
other better.

Hodges: I think we have a perfectly splendid program in Dr. Lamont's five-
point outline. In fact, that is just exactly
what the United States, Great Britain and the West have been trying to do
since the close of the war. They have not chosen the role of aggression. In this
same period we have seen our Allies release 600 million people from colonial-
ism and at the same time we've seen the
Soviets take over 600 million under their
sway. I think the Soviet rulers are in
the grip of a dilemma. It's a problem
of security. In the first place, they want
to know how to defend the workers' fatherland—the Russian patrimony. In
the second place, they want security for the
Communist Party. That's the diffi-
culty.

Garrity: I think it's possible to es-
ablish friendly, peaceful relations with
Russia. I agree with Dr. Lamont, but
the five platforms I would erect couldn't be more at variance with his. In the first
place, I think that World War I and
World War II were mistakes. I think
World War III would be an even
greater mistake, and I think if we go in
again this time to eliminate evil-doing
from the rest of the world, we're going
to lose the United States of America as
a free sovereign republic. Therefore, I
say that we can co-exist with Russia. I
think the way to do it is to be very
realistic, to realize that there are not
enough Americans to go around the
world to police it in a sort of contra-
movement against Russia and to recog-
nize the fact that our Western Hemis-
phere is the thing we'll fight for and
nothing else.

First of all, I would sever all rela-
tions with Russia and Russian satel-
ites.

Second, I would cut off all aid to
countries that are now trading with Rus-
sia and divert that aid to people who are
willing not to trade with Russia, prin-

cipally Latin American countries and free
countries such as Turkey and Pakistan
who might be friendly with us on a no
quid pro quo basis.

Third, I would declare the Western Hemisphere to be completely out of
bounds to Russian communism in any
manner whatsoever. I would re-im-
plement the Monroe Doctrine which for
many years has helped us out and which
is just as valid today as it ever was.

Fourth, I would make treason of the
Rosenberg-Hiss type a capital offense.

Fifth, I would make a fortress-America
which in no way would be an ag-
gressor against the rest of the world.
We are now almost faced with becoming
an aggressor against Asia, killing and
slaughtering thousands of Americans as
well as thousands of Asiatics. In that
way, it's suicide to me.

Hook: The voices of appeasement of
Dr. Lamont and the isolationism of Mr.
Garrity speak the same language. There
is a Chinese proverb which tells us that
no man can have more peace than his
neighbor will allow him. In the Ameri-
can idiom we say, "It takes two to keep
the peace but only one to break it."

The Soviet Union has been engaged in a
campaign against the United States
and the Western World for many years.
This follows not so much from the facts
of geography but from what we might
call the geography of their minds.
They are convinced that the two sys-
tems, that of the West and the East,
are incompatible and that in the long run
war is inevitable. That's the statement
of Lenin; that's the statement of Stalin.
Co-existence will endure until they are
strong enough to launch that war which
will put an end to capitalism—democra-
cy as we call it. Now, I regard the Bol-
sheviks as in the grip not of a dilemma,
Prof. Hodges, but in the grip of an
ideological obsession. They're fanatics.
The only way to tame fanaticism is fear
of failure. Consequently, we must be
strong enough to detest the Russians
from risking an all-out war.

Second, we must do everything to
keep them militarily weak by fanning
the desires for national freedom and
for political freedom which exist in the
seething caldron behind the Iron Cur-
tain.

Third, we must introduce a campaign
for disarmament, an effective campaign
with international control which the So-
viet Union has rejected.

Fourth, we must also gratify the na-
tional aspirations of subject people
through the world to break with coloni-
alism and introduce social reforms, not
only for their sake but in order to pre-
vent the Soviet Union from exploiting
the situation.

Finally, when we have convinced the
Western world to adopt this program,
when we have convinced the public
opinion that we are in favor of an in-
ternational disarmament program with
an international police force, then we
should proclaim that as soon as the So-
viet Army crosses a frontier we, the
UN and the United States, shall consider
that act as a declaration of war against
us.

Garrity: You linked the position of
Dr. Lamont and myself. I would like to
link your position with that of General
Willoughby who recommends that a
very definite demarcation line be drawn
between the Soviet world and the West-
ern world and that the minute the So-
viet or communist armies step across
that line a scorched earth and a reign of
horror be let down so that it would
be physically impossible for people to
cross that line. I don't see any differ-
ence between the two or any chance of
realizing it.

Hook: Well, we must hope to realize
it. I don't accept General Willoughby's
proposal in the form in which you have
stated it. It isn't so important to have
friendship so long as we have peace.
If we have peace, then in time we can
establish a basis for friendly relations.

Will the Fact That Both Sides Possess the H-Bomb Prevent the Outbreak of World War III?

(Question submitted by Arthur Keller of Union City, N. J., and Mrs. Leila Ward of Reading, Pa.)

Garrity: I think that it will not pre-
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vent the outbreak of World War III, but it may very well prevent the use of the atom and hydrogen bombs in World War III by the same token that the awful and frightful poisonous gases which had been invented were not used in World War II.

**Lamont:** I'm glad to agree with Mr. Garrity on this point. The atom and hydrogen bombs have made the situation terribly dangerous for all parties concerned. The Third World War will show that all men are "cremated equal," and I say that the Soviet Union has already been shown that such a war would be disastrous and is willing to make reasonable compromises.

**Hook:** Unfortunately, the hydrogen bomb does not make war impossible. I do not believe that without effective disarmament, not merely on hydrogen and atomic bombs but on conventional weapons as well, we can avoid war.

**Hodges:** I don't think the fact that both sides have the H-bomb will prevent a Third World War. Even if you get rid of the H-bomb, the Soviet armed strength has been moving ahead steadily, whereas we've made two cutbacks. One disastrous cutback was after the war—one of the most stupid blunders in history; the other cutback is on this "New Look," a tremendously important situation.

### How Can We Avoid World War III?

**Hook:** First, develop preponderant strength. Second, try to keep the Communist Bloc weak by encouraging national and political aspirations. Third, gratify the desires to liberate themselves from colonialism of the peoples of the world—introduce social reforms. Fourth, insist upon a strong international disarmament program.

**Lamont:** I gave five points to start. I just want to stress what Dr. Hook said on liberating peoples from colonialism. That is exactly what we have not done in Indo-China. We should have been out of Indo-China long ago and then this crisis would not have occurred. In general, the way to keep on peaceful procedures is to continue the method of negotiation and compromise through the United Nations and elsewhere.

**Garrity:** I think we must be realistic and must realize how far we can go as Americans, 160 million of us, and go no further. I would say we can successfully, during our lifetime and possibly during our children's lifetime, defend the Western Hemisphere. I know that Russia is out to conquer the world, and we don't belong in Asia with our few small forces sacrificing American boys for European colonialism.

**Hodges:** It seems to me we have to face the fact that the most you can get out of this discussion is an armed truce. And with that I'm glad to settle.

---

### Senator Knowland Interviewed

On a recent Facts Forum program the following thought-provoking questions concerning foreign policy were among those posed to Senator William F. Knowland, of California, the Republican majority leader, by Andrew F. Tully, Jr., of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, and Philip Dodd of the Chicago Tribune. The program was moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh.

**QUESTION (Tully): Senator, do you think that a partition of Viet Nam is the only way out at this point?**

**Sen. Knowland:** It may be the only way out in the eyes of the French. It certainly, in my judgment, will be considered throughout the Far East as a considerable victory for communism in that area of the world, and that fact should not be glossed over.

We are not active participants in the fighting in Southeast Asia, and consequently we do not have the voice in the final decisions that will be made. We can hardly, under those circumstances, tell the French that they can't sign such an agreement, even though we may regret that such an agreement has been forced upon the French.

Somewhere, someday, the Free World is going to have to draw the line, or we are going to see, piece by piece, Asia, the Middle East, or Europe, taken over by international communism. We may come to the point in this process where we find ourselves as an isolated island in an otherwise totalitarian world; and I don't think that is in the best interests of our own security as a nation or the best interests of the freedom of our people, nor is it in the best interests of maintaining a free world of free men.

Consequently, I don't believe that we can constantly retreat before these further communist aggressions without ultimately leading to disaster for the free people of the world.

**QUESTION (Dodd):** You mentioned drawing a line. That's been discussed for a long time. Saying that Japan, the Philippines, Formosa and South Korea are on our side of the line, do you think that line should penetrate Southeast Asia, including Indo-China?

**Sen. Knowland:** I think it would be highly disadvantageous to have all of Southeast Asia—India and Pakistan—go into communist hands. The island nations of Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia and also Australia and New Zealand, in order to survive economically, have to trade with part, at least, of the mainland of Asia. If all of the mainland of Asia is behind the communist Iron Curtain, then the communists will use that trade as a very effective weapon.

They will, for instance, in my judgment, offer great advantages to the Japanese if they will come and trade with them fully. When the Japanese economy gets well geared so that they are totally dependent upon their trade with China, then the communists will ruthlessly cut them off unless the Japanese do certain things, such as getting a coalition government containing communists.

**QUESTION (Tully):** Do you think Japanese trade with Red China can be avoided?

**Sen. Knowland:** I think that it can be avoided for a time; but there have to be alternatives to it, if the Japanese are expected to live without that trade.

**QUESTION (Tully):** Such as trade with the Western World, you mean?

**Sen. Knowland:** There has to be trade with the Western World, and there certainly have to be kept open the avenues of trade to the Southeast and to the non-communist nations of Asia. But if all of them go behind the Iron Curtain, then the problem of Japan becomes most difficult.

**QUESTION (Dodd):** Jumping to the other side of the world, Senator, do you anticipate a special session of the Senate this fall to deal with the question of German rearmament?

**Sen. Knowland:** That some steps will have to be taken relative to Western Germany if E.D.C. is not ratified, I
think, generally accepted on Capitol Hill.

For a long time most of our responsible military people have testified before Congressional committees that we are not likely to have an effective system of defense against communist aggression in Europe unless Western Germany is in the picture.

There has been a considerable dragging of feet by France and Italy on this question of ratification of E.D.C. We've about come to the end of this foot-dragging process.

The alternative is that Western Germany must be able to regain her sovereignty and to make a contribution in some other way; and that, I believe, will have to be done.

Whether that will take a special session of Congress or whether it could be done by executive action following consultation has not yet been determined.

**QUESTION (Hurleigh):** And now, Senator Knowland, here are three prize-winning questions from our listeners. First, is the issue of McCarthy and McCarthyism splitting the Republican party in two?

**SEN. KNOWLAND:** I would say no to that question.

**QUESTION (Hurleigh):** Do you agree with Sir Winston Churchill that it is possible to live in peaceful co-existence with communism?

**SEN. KNOWLAND:** I don't believe that ultimately the world can live in peaceful co-existence with communism any more than a person can live in the same cage with a tiger who may at the moment be peaceful because he is digesting his last meal but who has a great desire for meat, and when he has digested the last meal will get meat from any available source, which means the free world in this particular case.

So, unless there is a drastic change in the control of the Kremlin, and the government of the Soviet Union, I think their ultimate objective is what it has been for the last 30 years, and that is the destruction of Western civilization and free governments and free peoples as we know them.

**QUESTION (Hurleigh):** Would not

---

**FACTS FORUM FILM LIBRARY**

A wide variety of timely and pertinent subjects are maintained in the Facts Forum Library of 16mm prints, available to any worthy organization without cost.

Order today and let the opinions of experts add zest to your next discussion or study group. Requests addressed to Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas, will receive prompt attention.

**Program No. and Topic**

**INTERNAL AFFAIRS**

(4) Should We Sell TVA to Private Industry?—Sens. Dirksen and Gore.


(19) Appointment of Earl Warren to Supreme Court—Press Interview.


(46) Interview of Postmaster Gen. Sumnerfield—Don Smoot.

**TAXES**


(14) National Retail Sales Tax—Mssrs. Stafford and Bayless.

(51) Eisenhower's Tax Program—Dan Smoot (Forum type).


(49) Social Security—Don Smoot (Forum type).

**GOVERNMENT**


---

our withdrawal from the United Nations means a virtual return to isolationism for the United States?

**SEN. KNOWLAND:** No, to the contrary, we conducted foreign policy before the United Nations was ever conceived. We shall conduct foreign policy long after it is gone.

While I would regret to see this nation withdraw from the United Nations, I would even more regret to see the admission of communist China, because I think that would destroy the entire moral foundation upon which the United Nations was founded, and would in itself destroy the organization and its purpose.
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(Continued from Page 23)
plan we used so successfully in Greece. It could have been done back about six or eight months ago. It is probably too late to do it now.

QUESTION (Michelson): How will the Democrats vote on the foreign aid program? How many curbs will be placed on Britain, France or Italy with respect to their relations with the Iron Curtain orbit?

SEN. SPARKMAN: I think the Democrats will strongly support the foreign aid program. We always have.

The House has inserted the provision in its bill that the portion of aid going to European Defense Community countries would, for the fiscal year 1954-1955, go only to those countries who had ratified the treaty. The Senate meanwhile is considering rewriting this, but the result will probably be pretty much the same.

QUESTION (Tully): Do you think the Democrats will continue to support the Eisenhower Administration in its foreign policy?

SEN. SPARKMAN: Yes. I think so. I believe strongly in bi-partisanship when it comes to foreign policy and also to our national security and defense measures. If we can get cooperation from the Republicans, we will be glad to cooperate. However, we are going to point out some of the mistakes this administration has been making and some of the weaknesses.

QUESTION (Michelson): What do you think about the Geneva Conference?

SEN. SPARKMAN: I am reminded of something General Marshall said several years ago, something I agree with—wherever there is a conference table, the United States ought to be the first one there, and the last one to leave.

FACTS FORUM POLL
Closes August 10

Yes No

1. Can internal communist infiltration bring us under Soviet domination without war?

2. Is NATO fulfilling its purpose in the free world defense pattern?

3. Should American manpower be used to fight communism on foreign soil?

4. Does the Voice of America hurt communism?

5. Should America stop all aid to nations trading with communist countries?

6. Should McCarthy be replaced as head of the committee investigating communism?

7. Are Americans more afraid to voice their political views than in the past?

8. Should the U. S. trade Chinese students here for American prisoners in China?

9. Should the U. S. continue to give aid to India?

10. Should any branch of government be exclusively self-regulating?

11. Is Ike correct in promoting freer trade and forsaking protectionism?

12. Shall the U. S. break off relations with the Soviet Union?

Name No. and St. City and State

Unfortunately, many persons who voted the July poll did not sign their names and, therefore, were not sent August poll cards. Be sure to sign your poll card and thus be assured of receiving subsequent poll card mailings. If you are not already receiving poll cards regularly and would like to, simply send your request to Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas.
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August 19, 1954

Mr. Stuart W. Conner
One Bruce Street
Nashua, New Hampshire

Dear Stuart:

Thank you for your very helpful letters of the 10th and 11th. I have gone over the thing and endeavored to incorporate all of your suggestions. I have also rearranged and rewritten it in an effort to make it more readable. Enclosed is a copy of the new draft.

Edward M. Good

Two things have had to be omitted. First, I find I was misinformed about the vote on the Smith Act. There was no recorded vote in the Senate. I have endeavored to find some instance of criticism of the Act, but have not succeeded. Second, your reference to the March 5, 1941 Daily Worker. I examined the Daily Worker and find that neither O'Connell nor Murray has his name on the list. I cannot understand why the California Committee should be in error on this.

In preparing this second draft, I have rechecked the source material for every statement made. We have copies of all of the hearings mentioned and photostats of the newspaper comments and reports on the various speeches.

Before Mr. D'Ewart left for Montana, we prepared a rough first draft of a booklet similar to the Pepper booklet, but emphasizing the employment of pro-Communists in Congress. The National Committee is laying stress on the "Red Web in Washington" and we would take advantage from that. He is going to discuss it with one or two friends and decide if we can finance a mass distribution of such a booklet.

Then we wish to give this narrative material to a view of our trusted newspaper friends, as background for editorial comment during the campaign.

Third, we hope to have someone of good repute tour the State (or perhaps two persons) and address gatherings, using this material for their speeches.
August 12, 1954

Mr. Conner
2 - 8/19/54

Next week I am going to take advantage of your introduction
to Mr. Steele and go over this material with him, if he has
time. I have not been able to leave this office during the
day while the session was still in progress. I will tell
him about our tentative plans, and I know we will benefit
from his comments and advice.

Our thought now is that Mr. D'Ewart will make only passing
references to his opponent's character, but that he will
attack his voting record. Others can carry the ball on
the other aspects.

We do appreciate your help, and will keep you informed of
our plans and welcome your advice.

Sincerely yours,

Gilbert Leander

two changes have had to be made. First, I found I was mis-
understanding your vote on the Smith Act. You voted for the
Senate. I have endeavored to find some

instance of your vote on the House. You also have not succeeded
as far as your reference to the ouster of Delegate O'Connell
is concerned. I believe the ouster was not because of the fact
I named a newspaperman. I name no one on the list. I cannot understand
why the Callot committee should make it is error on this.

In preparing the second draft, I have been concerned with
material for every aspect of the newspapers and the
community newspapermen and producers of the newspapers

and newspapers on the various committees.

Before Mr. D'Ewart tells for Montgomery, we prepare a	
twice draft of a pocket similar to the paper pocket, but
which gives the employment of the newspapers in the

the National Committee is saying a lot on the west coast. He
in

We will be prepared with two lines and one picture on the

two pictures, and no mention of the last picture.

Thrice we hope to have someone of good ability from the

newspaper front. We have complete

material for their speeches.
One Bruce Street  
Nashua, New Hampshire  
August 10, 1954

Mr. Gilbert LeKander  
Secretary to Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart  
Old House Office Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Gil:

It was nice to have your letter upon my return to the office yesterday after several days away. I hope the delay has caused no inconvenience. It gives me great pleasure to help Mr. D'Ewart in the coming campaign in this manner.

It is my impression that the narrative of information you sent me, which is enclosed, is a fine job. For one not experienced in the field of reporting subversive activities you did a good piece of work. It should astound the people of Montana. It impressed me and quite a lot of the data was known to me previously.

It seems to me that you have in no manner overstepped accuracy or gone beyond the bounds of reasonable interpretation of Senator Murray's activities. Two things stand out in my mind in dealing with this type of situation: accuracy in reporting, and accuracy in interpretation. The former I cannot check, but am sure you have been most careful on this point, and the latter you have adhered to carefully it seems to me.

Yes, I hope to be back in Montana for good before January 1. My plans call for the great day to be in early December. By then, let us hope, another staunch American will have unseated in the Senate a man whose motives and activities are subject to substantial question.

Following are my suggestions relative to the narrative:

1) Generally speaking, when reporting this type of activity, it is a good idea to include the specific date of the occurrence whenever the date is available and the year and month
in instances where the exact date is unknown. It adds specificity, clarity and exactness to the data and generally gives the impression of concise, fully documented reporting. My suggestion is that you insert the dates of Senator Murray's affiliation with the various organizations in each instance, at least as to the year involved, even if this might prove that the most of his affiliation was some time ago. If you leave it out, he will attack the omission and your motives for leaving out the dates, I suspect.

2) First page, paragraph one and two: The use of the word "subversive" in connection with the list of organizations cited by the U. S. Attorney General gave us reason to choose our words most carefully in the early days of our investigation here. The list is commonly referred to as being the "Subversive List", but only a relatively few of the organizations on the list were described by the Attorney General as "subversive". Even the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" by the House Un-American Activities Committee refers to many of the organizations as having been cited as subversive when actually they were cited by the Attorney General as communist. The word "subversive" has more serious implications than the word "communist". This is not splitting hairs either, inasmuch as the leftwingers immediately pick up this point when the terminology is used innacurately.

None of the organizations listed on page one have been cited by the Attorney General as "subversive". I checked this matter carefully against Department of Justice data. You probably relied on the "Guide to Subversive Organizations", as I've done in the past, to my regret.

My suggestion is that you delete the word "subversive" underlined in red in paragraph two and substitute the words, "communist fronts", or more accurately simply delete the word "subversive" and leave the wording as it is except for that. In paragraph one, where the narrative is more general in nature, I think the word "subversive" is all right.

3) Page one, list of organizations: #2 should be the National Council of American Soviet Friendship, I believe, although I see your point in leaving off the word "national" since Murray's affiliation was with the Massachusetts Council. If this point bothers you, it is my suggestion you list the organization as the National Council on page one and explain in the body of the narrative that the Massachusetts Council is the Massachusetts branch of the National Council.
4) Page two, paragraph one: Perhaps you would want to include here the additional data that the Attorney General has cited this organization, the American Slav Congress, as a Communist organization.

5) The use of the word subversive in the last line of paragraph two, page two, is OK in this connection it seems to me.

6) Page two, third paragraph: is a description of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and page three, paragraph three is also a description of the outfit. My suggestion is that these two descriptions be grouped together rather than separated. The latter description is accurate as written.

7) Page two, paragraph three: It seems to me that beyond question the use of the word "subversive" here is fine as a direct quotation.

8) For your information the U. S. Department of Justice is currently presenting evidence to the Subversive Activities Control Board in Washington, D. C. for the purpose of establishing the Communist control in the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship so that the Subversive Activities Control Board will issue an order compelling the organization to register as a Communist organization. If the Board's order is in the next few months, use of the Board's decision might be used to dramatize this affiliation on Senator Murray's part. If the Board decides the organization does not have to register, I would suggest you delete from your material all references by the Attorney General to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

9) Page two, last paragraph: My suggestion is that you delete the underlined words "under the Fifth Amendment" and substitute wording such as "claiming his privilege against self incrimination under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution". The wording would be more accurate from the legal standpoint and possibly a little more hard hitting.

10) Same paragraph: Possibly you might add an additional sentence to the paragraph indicating Edwin S. Smith now is engaged in importing and distributing newphotographs and publications from behind the iron curtain (Time magazine 6/1/53 page 20)
11) Although you may not need or want the information, if my memory serves me correctly Herbert A. Philbrick, a man of outstanding character, patriotism and judgment who for nine years was a confidential informant of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Boston area, has valuable data concerning the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship. As I recall, he participated in a solicitation of funds for that outfit in Boston, along with other Communist Party members, and when the funds were collected they were turned over to Communist Party officials at Communist Party headquarters in Boston. That would show the Communist nature of the Council in the area in which Senator Murray's affiliation occurred. I can secure the data from Philbrick if you want it, but I won't ask him for it unless I hear from you. If you want it I think it would be necessary to tell him for whom it is desired and for what purpose. I can vouch for his complete discretion and reliability in such matters and am sure he would be delighted to give us the data accurately.

12) Page 4, paragraph 1: Bella V. Dodd is mentioned in circumstances which intimate Communist connections on her part. Dr. Dodd was a member of the Communist Party from 1943 to 1949 and from 1946 to 1948 she was a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, the Party's highest governing board. In 1949 she left the Party completely however. Therefore my suggestion is that if Senator Murray's affiliation with the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was during the abovementioned periods of Dr. Dodd's Communist Party membership, that you describe Dr. Dodd as a former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, its highest governing board in the U.S. If Senator Murray's affiliation was at some other time, probably it would be better to delete Dodd's name and simply say "along with Vito Marcantonio and other left-wingers".

13) Page 5, second paragraph: You might want to add that the International Workers Order has been cited by the Attorney General as a Communist organization and that the New York Insurance Department has taken the organization to court and the New York courts ordered it disbanded and its business is now being handled by the New York Insurance Department. This because of its Communist connections.

14) Page 4, last paragraph: The Attorney General has also cited the Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago as a Communist organization.
15) Page four, second paragraph: You may or may not want to add that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was described by the Attorney General as a communist organization, which it was. Incidentally on page one the word "or" replaced the word "for", the latter being correct. I am referring to the name of the organization.

16) Page five, paragraph two: It is suggested that the location where Senator Murray spoke to the International Workers Order group be set forth, as well as the date of his speech.

17) Page five, last paragraph: My suggestion is that the location of the Fifth Congress of Youth, of which the present senator was a sponsor, be stated, as well as the date. Of course it is essential that you have documented the description of the Congress as one of the most influential front organizations ever set up, but I'm sure you have this information or it would not appear in the narrative.

18) Page six, paragraph two: The word "subversive" is not accurate here. Actually the Attorney General described the organization as Communist and my suggestion is to change this in the narrative.

19) Page six, paragraph three: Same situation with regard to the use of the word "subversive". It should be Communist, inasmuch as that was the correct terminology used by the Attorney General.

20) Page six, paragraph four: Here my suggestion is that you again briefly describe the publication, Soviet Russia Today. It could simply be referred to as a Communist propaganda magazine and no one could challenge that statement.

21) Page six, paragraph four: Suggest that here you mention the date and location of the dinner Senator Murray sponsored.

22) Page seven, paragraph four: In the last sentence it might be better to use the phrase "as to whether or not he was a Communist Party member" at the point where I have marked it in red.

23) Page seven, last paragraph, last line: Here also it is my suggestion that wording be used to show he refused to testify as to whether or not he was a Communist.
24) Page eight, second paragraph: It might be well to substitute the words "when asked" for the words underlined in red.

25) Page eight, third paragraph: It would be more accurate to say subcommittee for the last word in the paragraph.

26) Page nine, first paragraph: Here also it should be subcommittee.

27) Page nine, third paragraph: Same situation here.

28) Page ten, between last paragraph and the paragraph above, do not forget to complete the above paragraph.

29) Page eleven, second paragraph: The number of convictions under the Smith Act is much higher than eleven now. 115 have been arrested and indicted under the Smith Act as of today, but I do not have the number of convictions. A telephone call to the office of Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III at the Department of Justice would give you a current figure to use, but the number is climbing every few weeks. At any rate there is a larger number available to use here.

30) Page eleven, second paragraph: It is important to state that the crime of which the Communists thus far tried under the Smith Act were convicted was the conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. Specifically the indictments were for conspiracy rather than for advocacy and this is a sore point with the Communist Party.

31) Page eleven, fourth paragraph, last sentence: I would be hesitant to use the phrase "by Marxist philosophy". In all probability this would embroil Mr. D'Ewart in an argument over Marxist theory and there is nothing the left wingers delight in more than such a fracas. Although Lenin did make the remark which we previously discussed indicating that socialized medicine was a door to complete socialism, it is my honest opinion that such a statement does not rest upon Marxist theory or philosophy. It was simply a statement of belief by the world's number one Communist of the time, but I cannot correlate the remark with Marxist theory. As far as I am aware of the Marxist doctrine, and I have a working knowledge of it, but am no expert, there is nothing in the doctrine which can accurately be used as the basis for that description of bills that Senator Murray has supported.

However, there may be something else in your mind on this point and if there is it might be a good idea to let me know about it so that we could reconsider the point from another angle. Although I do not
like to appear negative on the point, the only basis I now visualize for the statement does not quite hold up under close examination and while I don't like to counsel to not use every avenue of attack, it would be too bad to leave our defenses down.

If you would like to make use of Lenin's statement and do not want to contact Mr. Walter S. Steele, publisher of the National Republic, 511 Eleventh Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., who has a literal translation of the statement from the Russian, I would be glad to get the translation from him for you. Here again I will do nothing unless you request it, however. Mr. Steele is completely trustworthy in matters of this nature and completely sympathetic to Mr. D'Ewarts side of this campaign.

For the success of the coming campaign I would suggest you contact Mr. Steele for advice of two kinds: first, for further information on Senator Murray's activities; second, for astute advice about using this type of data in a major political campaign. Mr. Steele is a high type person and in my estimation one of the top handful of men in the country on this type of work. His files on subversive activity are excelled by no private files in this country and he is consulted by Congressional Committees and government agencies doing this type of work constantly. I cannot recommend Mr. Steele too highly.

On page one of the narrative I have indicated in the margin before each listed organization a "C" or "not". This means that the particular organization is listed by the U. S. Attorney General as a communist organization, or is not listed by him at all, as the case may be.

Probably there might be other questions that will arise that I could help you with from time to time. I would be delighted to assist in any manner possible. Do not hesitate to send a short note with a question, no matter how trivial it might seem. When dealing with this type of activity there is no margin for error. Any misstep is so multiplied and blown out of proportion by the left wing element that it might be fatal. No matter how small or large the assignment, just give me the word and you will have my assistance immediately. August 15 to 22 is my vacation, but any other time you will receive a more prompt answer than this.

With my best wishes for a successful campaign,

Sincerely,

Stuart W. Conner
Mr. Gilbert LeKander  
Secretary to  
The Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart  
Old House Office Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

August 11, 1964

Dear Gil:

Since receiving your letter I have increased my efforts to locate further information concerning Senator Murray and have come up with a few additional items which I will enclose in a separate memorandum.

In addition to the information in the memo, it has come to my attention that Senator Murray is mentioned on page 115 of the 1947 Report of the California UnAmerican Activities Committee. Unfortunately my files do not include a copy of the 1947 California Report, but you could secure one from Mr. Walter S. Steele whom I mentioned in my letter yesterday, the House UnAmerican Activities Committee, the Library of Congress, etc.

Concerning the "Daily Worker" paragraph in my memorandum, it would be essential that you view the statement in the "Daily Worker" both to verify that Senator Murray's name did actually appear there and to determine the nature of the statement. Conceivably it might not be an item of information that it would be wise to use. You could secure that copy from Mr. Steele, the Library of Congress or conceivably the House UnAmerican Activities Committee.

Re the Congressional Record paragraph in my memorandum, in that case you would of course want to go directly to the Congressional Record of that day to verify this data. Owen Lattimore is the significant item there. What was the Senator doing introducing such a person's writings into the Congressional Record? Mr. Ben Mandel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee staff could give you a good thumbnail description of Lattimore. He is of course now under indictment for perjury, but there has been a lot of setbacks for the government in the case. During the course of the IPR hearings
testimony was received that the Soviet intelligence people in Moscow considered Lattimore as one of their people. However before using this description of him I would first check with the staff or chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

I would be most grateful if you would send me copies of all publications and press releases Mr. DiEwart makes public concerning Senator Murray. The material is needed for my permanent files.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Stuart W. Conner
JAMES E. MURRAY

In 1948 Senator Murray was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
(Report of the California Un-American Activities Committee for 1948, page 324)

On March 5, 1941 the "Daily Worker", official organ of the Communist Party, featured a full page statement defending the Communist Party. Among the signers of the statement appeared several Communists and fellow travellers and also the names of James E. Murray and Jerry O'Connell. (It is to be noted that this was during the period of the infamous military pact between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany that enabled the Nazis to safely begin their conquests. Many members of the Communist Party left the party when Hitler and Stalin entered into this unholy agreement, but note that at this time when they were leaving the Communist Party, Senator James E. Murray was defending it in a statement appearing in the official Communist organ in this country. (Within parenthesis is editorializing))
(Report of the California Un-American Activities Committee for 1948, page 377)

On January 24, 1947 Senator James E. Murray had printed in the appendix of the Congressional Record, as an extension of his remarks, an article, "Asia and the State Department" by Owen Lattimore.
(Transcript of the testimony taken at the hearings by the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee relative to the Institute of Pacific Relations, pages 3666 and 3667)
In 1948 Senator Murray was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
(Report of the California Un-American Activities Committee for 1948, page 324)

On March 5, 1941 the "Daily Worker", official organ of the Communist Party, featured a full page statement defending the Communist Party. Among the signers of the statement appeared several Communists and fellow travellers and also the names of James E. Murray and Jerry O'Connell. (It is to be noted that this was during the period of the infamous military pact between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany that enabled the Nazis to safely begin their conquests. Many members of the Communist Party left the party when Hitler and Stalin entered into this unholy agreement, but note that at this time when they were leaving the Communist Party, Senator James E. Murray was defending it in a statement appearing in the official Communist organ in this country. (Within parenthesis is editorializing))
(Report of the California Un-American Activities Committee for 1948, page 377)

On January 24, 1947 Senator James E. Murray had printed in the appendix of the Congressional Record, as an extension of his remarks, an article, "Asia and the State Department" by Owen Lattimore.
(Transcript of the testimony taken at the hearings by the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee relative to the Institute of Pacific Relations, pages 3666 and 3667)
One Bruce Street  
Nashua, New Hampshire  
August 23, 1954

Mr. Gilbert LeKander  
Secretary to  
Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart  
Old House Office Building  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Gil:

It was good to get your letter of the 19th.

It was surprising to learn of the inaccurate reporting by the California Committee concerning the article in the March 5, 1941 Daily Worker. The very real possibility of such errors is what prompted me to suggest the original article be reviewed however. Such an error, if repeated by a candidate, could be flung back in his face so viciously as to cause real harm to his campaign. We can't be too careful in a matter like this. Possibly the California Committee got the list of signers assigned to the wrong article. If so Walter Steele could no doubt produce the article that properly referred to Senator Murray.

A couple of small corrections that you might want to change:

Page one, number 6 - could have an (*) after it.
Page two, first line of last paragraph - the full title is National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
"council " was omitted in the draft.

Although this suggestion may not be appropriate since I am not certain of all the uses to which the draft will be put, it is possible that if it is to get wide general circulation, it might be a good idea to leave off the copies distributed, the portion in parenthesis in this copy. In other words if Mr. D'Ewart's critics did not have the exact location of the various items of
information labeled for them they would have a much more difficult time answering them. It is essential that you folks know exactly where they are, but nothing is to be gained by letting the opposition know. In my opinion this would apply only to the portion in parenthesis since the public should know the data comes from official records, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee records, Daily Worker, etc., but not necessarily which volume or page.

Your indication that Mr. D'Ewart himself would go easy on use of this material and leave it up to others seemed to be good political sense to me. The use of someone to tour the state and address gatherings making use of the material sounds politically good too. Also your statement that such a person would be someone of good repute. That is absolutely essential in my estimation. Most likely you did not have in mind ex-Communists and for what it is worth I would suggest that the type of person you need should not be an ex-Communist, but a completely reputable individual. There is one pitfall which you might fall into if you were not looking for it and that would be the utilization of someone who is not discriminating and judicious in his anti-Communist speeches. There are persons who make much of being anti-Communists who really aren't qualified in spite of years of such efforts and who have by their indiscretions opened themselves to criticism.

My training and experience has given me quite a lot of acquaintance in the field and if you wanted my comments on anyone you were considering using, either from Montana or from elsewhere, I would be happy to tell you what I know or don't know about any specific individuals.

Another unsolicited observation: possibly it might be of help in countering Senator Murray's influence in labor to split away part of labor by the maneuver of setting up a Veterans for D'Ewart Committee. If such a campaign which would be geared to the patriotism of veterans would ever be contemplated, I'm sure the Young Republicans could be relied on to provide local chairmen around the state and here too possibly my acquaintance with veterans, attorneys and others all over the state might be of some help. At any rate whatever I can do will be done eagerly.

Sincerely yours,

Stuart W. Conner
DENVER, Aug. 24—Following President Eisenhower’s statement today on signing of legislation to oust the Communist Party and to prohibit Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, the Administration has determined to protect themselves and their institutions against the political ramifications of the law, which, purporting to be a political measure, is actually a conspiracy bill, designed to destroy the entire form of Government.

The American people, like the fundamentalism that is determined to accomplish this in strict conformance with the Constitution of justice, fair play and the Constitution of the United States.

They realize that employ- ment in any other manner would react unfavorably against the innocent as well as the guilty, and that the judicial proceedings of our courts, like the Administration bill that the Administration would have to be designed in just this spirit and with just these pullings.

41 Top Reds Indicted

The new law which I am signing today includes one of the most important measures ever made by this Administration to support existing statutes in defense of national security. Under this new law, the laws against subversion, sabotage and espionage. The new law has been designed in just this spirit and with just these pullings.

In addition to the foregoing measures enacted by the Eighty-third Congress, the bill which I am signing further carries out an important recommendation by the President of the United States, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.

The Congress has passed a bill providing for the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and I am certain that it will be enacted into law. This act includes those who have made false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States, and those who have been convicted of making false statements regarding the payment of money by the United States.