

TREASON

IN

Washington

EXPOSED

BY

**SENATOR McCARTHY**

This book contains the super-sensational speech by Senator Joe McCarthy made on the floor of the United States Senate. This speech will go down in history as one of the ten most courageous speeches ever made in Congress. Newspapers were afraid to quote it for fear of revenge reprisals from unseen forces.



# Treason In Washington

*Compliments of  
Ron Gostick -*



EXPOSED BY

*Senator McCarthy*





*United States Senator Joe McCarthy*

This manuscript reprinted in the U.S.A., 1950  
by the Christian Nationalist Crusade

The contents of this book, as pertains to Senator McCarthy's speech, have been quoted verbatim as he delivered his speech on the floor of the United States Senate. This reprint is without the Senator's consent or knowledge on the assumption that all speeches made in the Senate are public property.



## INTRODUCTION

In the United States there is an underground machine for the purpose of assassinating the character and reputation of anyone who fights Communism effectively. This machine is composed of such individuals as Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Edward R. Murrow and numerous unidentified personalities connected with metropolitan newspapers and radio news-casts. Some of these individuals actually pose as anti-Communists. They even attack Communism with their lips, **but** they never fail to assassinate the character of individuals who have been effective in their opposition to Communism.

Among those who have been completely or partially liquidated by their conspiracy are the following: Former Congressman Martin Dies; expert investigator Robert Stripling; expert investigator Dr. J. B. Matthews; U. S. Congressman John E. Rankin; former Congressman J. Parnell Thomas (imprisoned on a technicality); Father Charles E. Coughlin; Merwin K. Hart; Upton Close; Gerald L. K. Smith and numerous others. Although many of these men are still active in the fight against Communism, they have been smeared, misrepresented, made to look ridiculous in certain quarters, and millions of dollars have been spent to cripple their usefulness.

Supporting the smear and character assassination machine have been powerful organizations including the pro-Communist Lawyers Guild; the Communist-controlled Writers Congress; and the left-wing Jewish Anti-Defamation League. Major Robert H. Williams (Military Intelligence-Retired) recently revealed that the Anti-Defamation League had made itself one of the most effective instruments in the world Communist offensive to be found.

These forces, organizations and individuals are now in a campaign to destroy Senator Joe McCarthy. His speech contained in this book is one of the most sensational ever delivered by any man, anywhere. It accuses! It indicts! It documents! It proves points! It demonstrates beyond doubt that Stalin's pals have been manipulating the policy of our State Department.

Even so, this speech was not quoted generously in the

newspapers. Its most vital paragraphs were omitted. Why? The late Harry Hopkins, who exercised a Rasputin-like influence over the White House, boasted shortly before he died, by saying: "I have a man on every newspaper in America."

If the time ever comes that enough statesmanship in either of the old parties develops to go to the bottom of this super conspiracy, America will be shocked beyond description to learn how many people have been functioning wittingly or unwittingly through cupidity or stupidity in this subversive apparatus. The time has come for America to awaken before it is everlastingly too late.

GERALD L. K. SMITH

Mr. President, first I should like to pay tribute to 13 people who have been of unlimited help to me in this matter, and without whose night and day work it would not have been possible to assemble the facts which have been assembled to date. If the work is effective in accomplishing what we hope it will, the thanks of the Senate should go to those people, who are my staff.

I shall be glad to yield freely during the speech. However, I crave the indulgence of Senators not to ask me to yield until I have reached the point of presenting certain documentary evidence in the Lattimore case. I believe that questions asked of me before that time would be premature. Therefore, I shall decline to yield until I have presented certain documentary evidence in the Lattimore case.

Mr. President, before going into matters which I think might be of interest to the Senate in the Lattimore, Jessup, Service, and Hanson cases, I thought it might be well to clear the air and record in regard to two matters.

As the Senate knows, there has been considerable criticism by a number of well-meaning people of the naming of names in public before the individuals have had an opportunity to be heard.

It might be well, therefore, to briefly cite the record as to why names have been named in public rather than in private. On the 20th of February, as the Senate will recall, I gave to the Senate in some detail 81 cases of individuals whom I stated the files indicated ranged all the way from being bad security risks to very dangerous individuals.

At that time I pointed out that perhaps some of those individuals would be able to produce facts to offset the effect of the material in the files and show that they were actually loyal employees. I stated in effect—and while I have not had an opportunity to check the number of times in the record, my office tells me that I did so over a dozen times—that I would consider it extremely improper and unfair to name names in public before the individuals had a chance to appear in executive session.

The leader of the majority [Mr. Lucas], however, on five separate occasions demanded that the names be publicly named. His first demand was on page 2043 of the Record. Again on page 2046, he had this to say:

I want to remain here until he names them. That is what I am interested in.

Again on page 2049, he said:

Will the Senator tell us the name of the man for the Record? We are entitled to know who he is. I say this in all seriousness.

Again on page 2053, he said:

The Senator should name names before that committee.

Again on page 2063, he said:

Why does the Senator refuse to divulge names before the Senate?

The very able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Withers] also on almost countless occasions asked me for the names, stating on page 2063:

Does the Senator realize that I, like all others, am curious to know the names? When the Senator gives the cases, the people and the country at large are entitled to know who they are.

At that time, in answer to the urging of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Kentucky, I stated that I would not give the names in public unless a majority of the Senate demanded that they be made public, and this is all a matter of record.

After the subcommittee had been appointed and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] made chairman, he saw me on the floor of the Senate and stated that a public hearing had been scheduled, and asked if I would be ready to appear and testify. At that time I urged that the hearings be in executive session, and reminded him of the statements which I had made on the Senate floor.

He informed me that the first hearings would be public, and that later we would go into executive session. Later I was informed by the press that the Senator from Maryland had made the statement that I could present my cases as I saw fit. I again contacted him and told him that if that were the case, I thought the names should be given in executive session, but was again informed that the first hearings would be public.

I then contacted my colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] and told him that while I thought this might be good politics for the majority members of the subcommittee because of the position in which it would place me, it was so unfair to some of the individuals who might be able to produce evidence giving them a clean bill of health, that something should be done.

The Senator from Iowa informed me there was nothing that he or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] could do because the Senator from Maryland had made the announce-

ment that the first hearings would be open, and it was not even brought to a vote, inasmuch as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Green] so obviously went along with him. I do not like to take the time of the Senate on this point, but so much has been said about it in the press that I think the Record should be made absolutely clear.

At the time of the first public hearing, after I had begun to testify, and had already passed out to the members of the press the first case covering Judge Kenyon, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] then told me that if I cared to we would go into executive session. He, of course, knew full well that to go into executive session, so far as the Kenyon case was concerned, would be meaningless, after I had commenced the case and handed the evidence thereon to the press.

I had tried to make it clear that the Kenyon case was presented as one of a sequence which I had hoped to present the first morning, that is, if I had been allowed to proceed. I felt that it was important, not so much from the standpoint of Judge Kenyon but rather as a typical case, to show the complete incompetence of the loyalty board for the reason that in this case the files contained more than 28 documents showing membership in organizations listed as subversive or Communist front—that regardless of this, the loyalty board never even went through the motions of asking the judge for an explanation as to why she joined these organizations, which the Secretary of State himself had stated were evidence that an employee was a bad security risk.

After being held to the Kenyon case by what I considered rather petty bickering for 2 days during which, according to my staff, I occupied approximately 5 percent of the time, the committee adjourned over the week end and stated that Judge Kenyon would be called as a witness.

The chairman of the committee then magnanimously offered that the other cases which I was prepared to present the first day be given in executive session. I do not condemn or criticize the chairman for this maneuver. It was extremely clever. However, after presenting one case to show how the loyalty board worked, a case which happened to be a lady judge, it would seem unusual in the extreme that the committee retire into executive session to consider the cases of those

prominent State Department officials in whose activities the public was so vitally interested.

I might say that, while at the time I felt that the Senator from Illinois was wholly wrong in demanding the names be made public and while I originally was very much disturbed by the very clever maneuvering of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] in getting the names into public print, I am not too sure that perhaps some good has not been accomplished.

After all, an individual who takes a high Government position must realize that for the good of the country his actions and motives should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. After all, the aims and objectives of the group who have been formulating a rather disastrous far eastern policy should be subjected publicly to a cold and searching light. Therefore, I am not too sure that the Senate majority leader and the chairman of the committee may not have performed a service to the country when one insisted that the names be made public and the other maneuvered those names into the public press.

Incidentally, later today, I intended to discuss those who think we should write off this entire investigation because it might cause some suffering to the families of the betrayers of America, while at the same time forgetting the vast amount of suffering of the families of the hundreds of millions whom they have betrayed.

Again, Mr. President, I am going to take a very brief time to clear the air on another matter, which normally would not be considered of sufficient importance to be referred to, but it has received so much attention by the members of the committee and others that I feel impelled to mention it.

Since my Lincoln Day speech, there has been confusion in the minds of some as to the figures used. At every meeting, or in discussing the matter with the press, I used both the figure 205 and also the figure 57. It might be well briefly to review the situation to which each of those two figures apply, especially so in view of the fact that there have been those who have argued that my use of two different sets of figures proves that my information in regard to bad security risks, fellow travelers, and so forth, is false. As to the 57, I said:

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who appear to be either card-carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party.

Now as to the figure 205. I shall first read to the Senate a letter written by the then Secretary of State, Byrnes, at the

inception of the so-called loyalty program. This letter was written to Representative Sabath and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 1, 1946, on page A4892. The letter, which deals with the number 205, reads as follows:

Department of State,  
Washington, July 26, 1946.

Dear Adolph: I have yours of May 24 expressing your concern with respect to certain allegations made on the floor of the House to the effect that "hundreds, if not thousands, of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership." Such statements are incorrect—

I am reading from Secretary Byrnes' letter. I should point out that at that time Secretary Byrnes was under rather heavy criticism from some of the more left-wing elements who claimed that he was indiscriminately firing people because of their left-wing leanings, and this letter appeared to be in answer to that. He said:

Such statements are incorrect and do a grave injustice not only to the employees of the Department but to Government employees as a whole, the great majority of whom are loyal American citizens. I therefore welcome this opportunity to answer your specific questions in the order in which they are presented.

(1) Pursuant to executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, etc. Of these 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 284 cases—

I believe this is a misprint; I believe it should be 285, but I am not sure—  
by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

(2) Of the 284 individuals who have been the subject of adverse recommendations as indicated in (1), above, the services of 79 have been terminated.

Senators will understand the Secretary was referring to the board which the President had appointed to screen the State Department employees, and recommend who should be discharged because of their disloyalty or because they were bad risks.

(3) Of the 79 actually separated from the Service, 26 were aliens and therefore under "political disability" with respect to employment in the peacetime operations of the Department. I assume that factor alone could be considered the principal basis for their separation.

(4) With respect to the 79 thus separated, the following breakdown is submitted:

Aliens .....	26
Failure to comply with foreign-service regulations, such as citizenship for 15 years prior to foreign assignment and other reasons disqualifying the individual for service abroad.....	13
Close connections or involvement with foreign governments or their organs, past records indicating a high degree of security risk, etc.....	40
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>79</b>

The Department is equally concerned with disclosing subversive activities or associations of all kinds whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, in any employees present or prospective.

(5) Because of the security considerations involved in the mission of the screening committee, I do not feel at liberty to disclose publicly the identity of its membership. This committee, incidentally, has no power or authority to eliminate anyone from employment in the State Department. It simply makes recommendations which the Assistant Secretary for Administration may accept or reject in whole or in part in the light of all the relevant evidence.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that such is still the situation. The Loyalty Board of the State Department has no power whatsoever to discharge any employees, nor has the Review Loyalty Board of the Civil Service Commission. The Review Loyalty Board of the Civil Service Commission can do what they did in the Service case. They can pick up the ball and say, "We are not satisfied with the clean bill of health you gave this man. Send the case back to the Loyalty Board." Then the Loyalty Board is free to do as it sees fit, unless it is reversed, of course, by the Secretary.

I continue to read Secretary Byrnes' letter:

I hope what I have said above corrects any misapprehensions which you may have entertained as to the Department's personnel policy. Like any other administrative mechanism, it is not perfect. However, I am entirely clear that it has been fair to the Department's employees in its operation. It is my firm intention to see that it remains fair.

Sincerely yours,

James F. Byrnes.

I then pointed out at various meetings, either in speeches or in discussing the matter with members of the press, that out of the first group of 3,000 employees which was less than 20 percent of the total of the 16,000 who were working in the Department, 284 according to the Secretary's letter were found to be dangerous security risks. I called attention to the fact that for some unexplained reason the State Department insisted on keeping 205 of those whom the President's own security board—appointed for that purpose—named as dangerous security

risks. I further pointed out that while I did not have the exact figure on the number adversely ruled on by the subsequent screening of the balance of 13,000 employees of the State Department the modus operandi was the same in subsequent cases; namely, first the security board investigating and, apparently, doing a fairly good job of investigating, and then placing its finger upon individuals that are dangerous from the security standpoint and the State Department discharging a few and retaining the rest. Just so there can be no future doubt or mistake about these figures, let me repeat the figure 205 was used in connection with the Secretary of State's letter to the effect that they were not discharged even though the security board labeled them as dangerous security risks.

As I have said previously, I do not know how many of those individuals are still in the State Department. How many of those names appear in the list I gave the Senate committee I do not know, but we can assume that it is that sizeable number.

The figure of 57 referred to what I called individuals who appeared to be either members of the party or certainly loyal thereto.

Since my Lincoln Day speaking tour, during which I made the statement that I had the names of 57 individuals who were either members of or at least loyal to the Communist Party, a great number of phrases have been interchangeably used, such as card-carrying Communist, fellow traveler, disloyal people, and bad-security risk. Which of those phrases is properly applicable to each of the cases I gave the committee, only complete and painstaking investigation will tell.

A new phrase, however, which might well apply to some of the most dangerous individuals in our State Department—that is, from the American point of view—is bad-policy risk.

By "bad-policy risk," I mean individuals who influence or shape official United States policy, which forwards the interests of totalitarian communistic half of the world at the expense of the free God-fearing half of the world. Whether the individual acts thus because of disloyalty or merely because of stupidity is sometimes relatively unimportant.

The question which I feel should concern the Senate and the country infinitely more than the question of whether any of the particular individuals named have actually paid their dues and carry a Communist Party card, is the question of

whether or not—either because of design or for any other reason—they are actually devoted to the interests of this the Nation which has given them the high positions which they hold.

The more deeply I delve into this subject, the more I am convinced that two distinct but at the same time interlocking areas of operations are almost completely controlled and dominated by individuals who are more loyal to the ideals and designs of communism than to those of the free, God-fearing half of the world. I refer to the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and to the Voice of America.

Let me make it clear that in referring to those two divisions, I do not include all of the employees. I realize full well that of the thousands of employees in the State Department, all but a small percentage are honest and loyal Americans. But that small percentage can and has been doing almost untold damage. The State Department is the lifework of most of those employees. They have given to it years of service, unquestioned loyalty; and they have served it with great pride.

In the far-flung places of the world, those loyal men and women have spent their lives and exercised all their ingenuity to give to their department and their Government every possible bit of information and advice they consider useful.

Career employees of the State Department, by virtue of their long residence in every foreign country on the globe and their close association and, many times, friendship with citizens and officials of those countries, have had access to, and have reported on, every phase of economic and political affairs in the nations to which they are attached. Those are the real experts of the State Department.

It is a tragedy when we find the advice and experiences of such outstandingly able employees stored in a multitude of steel filing cabinets and disregarded, while the Department of State's closed corporation of untouchables call upon pro-Communist idealists, crackpots, and, to put it mildly, bad security risks to advise them on American diplomatic policy.

Two weeks ago I presented to the foreign relations subcommittee some documentation on a Mr. Owen Lattimore. I referred to Mr. Lattimore at that time as a bad security risk. That was at the public hearing. I should have also referred to him by the additional and more appropriate designation of "bad policy risk."

Subsequently, in executive session, I told the subcommittee that I thought this man was one of the top Communist agents in this country. Today, I intend to give the Senate some documentation to show that he is a Soviet agent and also that he either is, or at least has been, a member of the Communist Party.

I realize that this is an extremely shocking statement.

The State Department publicly labels this man as its outstanding authority in the Far East. He is also, and I believe rightly so, described as the architect of our far-eastern policy. Therefore, a charge that this man is an agent of Russia and a member of the Communist Party is one that can be made only after the most deep and painstakingly thorough study. If lightly made without adequate proof, it would be irresponsible to a most alarming degree. On the other hand, any one in the important and responsible position of a Senator who had such information and failed to make it known to the public would be guilty of worse than treason.

Some time ago I worked on the so-called 5-percenter investigation, where I had the honor of serving with the most able Democratic chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Hoey], as well as with other members, both Democrats and Republicans, who in my opinion operated in a completely nonpolitical manner. Since that time, certain loyal and disturbed Government employees apparently have felt it their duty to give me information in regard to individuals and activities which they consider dangerous to this Republic of ours.

The increasing pile of evidence which I have accumulated since that time in regard to individuals holding high positions in our Government—and with apparently not even the remotest sense of loyalty or responsibility to this Nation—has created in me a deep and disturbing fear as to the final result of their activities.

Let us take the case of Owen Lattimore, for example. When his activities first were brought to my attention, the first reaction was, "Why not take this to the President or the Department of Justice?" However, I then recalled two rather famous cases. First, the Hiss case, in which even after a complete exposition of his treasonable acts by the House Un-American Activities Committee, the president shrugged it off with wisecracks, apparently honestly feeling that the only purpose of the committee in exposing traitors high in Government was

to hamper him politically. That attitude, the Senate will recall, the President retained even after Hiss' indictment, when the resident referred to this as a red herring. This, of course, could mean only one thing to me—namely, that taking a case of the same or even more serious nature to the President would result in the same red-herring treatment.

The next question which occurred to me was of course, "Why not go to the Justice Department?" While we have a new Attorney General whom I personally like and respect, I could not help but remember that at the time of the Service case, we also had an apparently able Attorney General. It will be recalled that in that case the FBI, after months of painstaking work by scores, or perhaps hundreds of agents, developed what J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Department, publicly referred to as "a 100-percent airtight case" of espionage and treason.

J. Edgar Hoover, as everyone knows, is not known for overstating his case. I am sure we all agree that he is the ablest law-enforcement officer in this Nation and, I think, in the world. When he stated that after the tremendous amount of labor put into that case, it was a 100 percent airtight case of treason and espionage, I believe most of us would be willing to rely on his judgment on the case.

Strangely, however, after the arrest of six suspects in that case of treason, there was an unusual sequence of events, resulting in a most fantastic finale. The curtain was rung down when a young Department of Justice attorney disposed of Hoover's six 100-percent airtight cases of treason with a statement to the effect that he could cover all of the facts in that case in less than 5 minutes, and then proceeded to assure the court that there was not the slightest indication of disloyalty.

Obviously, with that treatment by the administration of the carefully investigated and developed case which the head of the FBI called a 100-percent-airtight case of treason, I felt that the Department of Justice was not the correct place to take what I consider an even more dangerous case.

The next question is, Where should it be taken? The answer, I think, is inescapable: to the 140,000,000 American people. That is where I have been taking it, and where shall I continue to take the cases of those whom I consider a danger and threat to this Republic.

When I commenced this work, I realized the fact that the

odds were greatly against bringing it to the successful conclusion of cleaning out that small but dominant percentage of disloyal, twisted, and, in some cases, perverted thinkers who were rendering futile the Herculean efforts of the vast number of loyal Americans in the State Department who have been even more deeply disturbed than I have been at the way the world is being rapidly delivered to communism.

In discussing this matter with some of my friends before launching upon this project, they pointed out to me the apparent futility of the task, and that the road has been strewn with the political corpses of those who have dared to attempt an exposure of the type of individuals whom I intend to discuss today.

They pointed out to me the obvious fact that those in this Nation who are part of a Communist world-wide conspiracy would stop at nothing in order to attempt to discredit and hamper any effort toward a long-needed housecleaning.

This has been amply proven over the years, and certainly to some additional extent over the past 4 or 5 weeks. In fact, the word has gone out that if only this investigation can be caused to fail, if in this case those who may exert efforts to make it succeed can be sufficiently smeared and discredited, then no one will dare to probe into such devious and smelly passages until it will be too late.

However, over the past few weeks tens of thousands of disturbed American people have written urging that this housecleaning—perhaps I should say rodent-destroying—task be continued. This has given me even greater and renewed confidence in the good common sense and inherent decency of the 140,000,000 people who make up this Nation.

Many of those people have expressed a deep concern for fear that I may quit this fight. I want to assure them now that, in the words of John Paul Jones, "I have just begun to fight."

In connection with the Lattimore case, I have here several documents which might be of some interest. I also have the name of a witness which I am turning over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This witness has been used by the Justice Department as a Government witness in another matter. The Department has trusted his veracity and publicly indicated confidence in his truthfulness.

This man will testify substantially as follows:

That he has been a member of the Communist Party for a number of years; that he was high up in Communist circles; that his party work required that he know the members of the party so that he might distinguish between Communists who were subject to party discipline and the loyal fellow travelers over whom the party had no discipline.

He will testify that it was part of his job to have this information—not, Mr. President, as you understood, on every one of the 50,000, or 60,000, or 70,000 Communists in the United States, but on the important ones who were relied upon to do the important work for the party.

He will further testify that Owen Lattimore was known to him to be a member of the Communist Party, a member over whom they had disciplinary powers.

I have before me another document, the original of which is being given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I quote the pertinent parts from this affidavit:

I met and got to know Owen Lattimore in the spring of 1936 in Moscow when he and E. C. Carter were very obviously receiving instructions from the Soviet Government concerning the line which the Institute of Pacific Relations ought to follow. I would be willing to so testify if subpoenaed. However, I request that my name be not publicly used at this time, but you do have my permission at this time to quote what I have said and give a copy of this to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I have another statement which I had a great deal of difficulty getting. I had no difficulty obtaining the information from this man, but he was extremely reluctant to sign a statement, fearing that his job might be endangered if he did so. He also stated that he had been reading about how the committee was operating and seemed to feel that if he were subpoenaed and gave testimony which was damaging to anyone charged with communistic activities or of being bad security risks, and so forth, he would be given too rough a time by the committee. We tried to reassure him as much as possible and finally obtained this statement. He gave his consent to his name and this statement being given to the FBI. We had to promise him, however, that his name would not be given to the committee. We had to further promise him that in making known the contents of his affidavit it would not be done in such a fashion that he could be identified.

This affidavit ties Owen Lattimore in so closely with John S. Service and the Amerasia case that before giving the contents of the affidavit I feel it necessary to cover the facts in

that case. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the case of John S. Service as I presented it to the Foreign Relations Subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the case was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Service

This case is that of John Stewart Service.

This man is a foreign service officer of the Department of State and at the moment is in Calcutta, India, where he is helping determine the all-important policy of our Government toward India.

The name of John Stewart Service is not new to the men in the Government who must pass on a governmental employee's fitness as a security risk.

When Mr. Peurifoy testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee he said that Service had been cleared four different times.

It is my understanding that the number has now risen to five and I earnestly request that this committee ascertain immediately if Service was not considered as a bad security risk by the Loyalty Appeal Board of the Civil Service Commission, in a post audit decision, handed down on March 3 of this year.

I understand that this Board returned the file of Mr. Service to the State Department with the report that they did not feel that they could give him clearance and requested that a new board be appointed for the consideration of this case.

To indicate to the committee the importance of this man's position as a security risk to the Government, I think it should be noted that he is one of the dozen top policy makers in the entire Department of State on far-eastern policy.

He is one of the small, potent group of untouchables who year after year formulate and carry out the plans for the Department of State and its dealings with foreign nations; particularly those in the Far East.

The Communist affiliations of Service are well known.

His background is crystal clear.

He was a friend and associate of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, the Communist chairman of the editorial board of the infamous Amerasia.

Half of the editorial board of this magazine were pro-Communist members of the State Department and the committee is in possession of these names.

On June 6, 1945, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after an exceedingly painstaking and careful investigation covering months, arrested Philip J. Jaffe, Kate Louise Mitchell, editor and co-editor of Amerasia; Andrew Roth, a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve stationed in Washington; Emanuel Sigurd Larsen and John Stewart Service, who were employees of the State Department (this is the same John S. Service to whom I have just referred and who is presently representing the State Department in Calcutta, India); Mark Julius Gayn, a magazine writer of New York City, who is about to leave for Russia. They were arrested on charges of espionage in connection with the theft of the following Government

records: 360 classified documents from the State Department, including some top secret and confidential classifications; 163 prepared by ONI; 42 prepared by MID; 58 prepared by OWI; 9 from the files of the War Department.

Some of the important documents picked up by the FBI at the time of the arrest were as follows:

First. One document marked secret and obviously originating in the Navy Department dealt with the schedule and targets for the bombing of Japan. This particular document was known to be in the possession of Phillip Jaffe, one of the defendants, during the early spring of 1945 and before the program had been effected. That information in the hands of our enemies could have cost us many precious American lives.

Second. Another document, also marked top secret and likewise originating in the Navy Department, dealt with the disposition of the Japanese fleet subsequent to the major naval battle of October 1944 and gave the location and class of each Japanese warship. What conceivable reason or excuse could there be for these people, or anyone else without authority to have that information in their possession and at the same time claim freedom of the press? That was the excuse they offered. They stole this document for no good purpose.

Third. Another document stolen from the Office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship was a secret report on the Far East and so stamped as to leave no doubt in anybody's mind that the mere possession of it by an unauthorized person was a clear violation of the Espionage Act. This was not an antiquated paper but of current and vital interest to our Government and the Nation's welfare.

Fourth. Another document stolen was from the Office of Military Intelligence and consisted of 22 pages containing information obtained from Japanese prisoners of war.

Fifth. Another stolen document, particularly illuminating and of present great importance to our policy in China, was a lengthy detailed report showing complete disposition of the units in the army of Chiang Kai-shek, where located, how placed, under whose command, naming the units, division by division, and showing their military strength.

Many of the stolen documents bear an imprint which reads as follows:

"This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 United States Code 31-32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law."

Despite the very small circulation of 1,700 copies of this magazine it had a large photo-copying department. According to Congressman Dondero, who sponsored the resolution for the investigation of the grand jury, this department was working through the night, in the small hours of morning, and even on Sundays. It could reproduce the stolen documents—and undoubtedly did—and distribute them into channels to serve subversive purposes, even into clenched fists raised to destroy our Government.

In June 1944 Amerasia commenced attacks upon Joseph C. Grew, who had during his stay in the State Department rather vigorously

*Grew  
CO  
Mansel*

opposed the clique which favored scuttling Chiang Kai-shek and allowing the Communist element in China to take over.

Larsen, one of the codefendants in this case, subsequently wrote a lengthy report on this matter. I would like to quote briefly from parts of that report:

Behind the now famous State Department espionage case, involving the arrest of six persons of whom I was one, an arrest which shocked the Nation on June 7, 1945, is the story of a highly organized campaign to switch American policy in the Far East from its long vested course to the Soviet line. It is a story which has never been told before in full. Many sensational though little explained developments, such as the General Stilwell affair, the resignation of Under Secretary Joseph C. Grew and Ambassador Patrick Hurley and the emergence of a pro-Soviet bloc in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, are interlaced with the case of the six, as the episode became known.

It is the mysterious whitewash of the chief actors of the espionage case which the Congress has directed the Hobbs committee to investigate. But from behind that whitewash there emerges the pattern of a major operation performed upon Uncle Sam without his being conscious of it. That operation vitally affects our main ramparts in the Pacific. In consequence of this operation General Marshall was sent on a foredoomed mission to China designed to promote Soviet expansion on our Asiatic frontier. It was a mission which could not but come to grief and which may yet bring untold sorrow to the American people.

How did it happen that the United States began to turn in 1944 upon its loyal ally, the Chiang Kai-shek Government, which had for 7 years fought Japan, and to assume the sponsorship of the rebel Communist regime which collaborated with the Japanese during the period of the Stalin - Hitler Pact? How did it come to pass that Washington since 1944 has been seeking to foist Communist members upon the sole recognized and legitimate government of China, a maneuver equivalent to an attempt by a powerful China to introduce Earl Browder and William Z. Foster into key positions in the United States Government? How did it transpire that our top-ranking military leader, General Marshall, should have promoted an agreement in China under which American officers would be training and equipping rebel Chinese Communist units at the very time when they were ambushing our marines and when Communists the world over were waging a war of nerves upon the United States?

Whose was the hand which forced the sensational resignation of Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and his replacement by Dean Acheson? And was the same hand responsible for driving Ambassador Patrick Hurley into a blind alley and retirement?

In describing the arrest, Larsen had this to say about his arrival at the office of the United States Commissioner:

"There I found myself sitting next to John Stewart Service, a leading figure in the pro-Soviet group in the China Section of the State Department, and to Lt. Andrew Roth, liaison officer between the Office of Naval Intelligence and the State Department, whom I also knew as an adherent of pro-Soviet policies. Both of them were arrested separately the same night in Washington."

Larsen then goes on to describe John Stewart Service, John P. Davies, Jr., and John Carter Vincent as the pro-Soviet group in the China section whose views were reflected by Amerasia and whose members were in close touch with Jaffe and Roth. In connection with this, it will be remembered that John Service, as Stilwell's political adviser, accompanied a highly secret military commission to Yenan. Upon the return of this mission, you will recall that Stilwell demanded that Chiang Kai-shek allow him to equip and arm some 300,000 Communists. Chiang Kai-shek objected on the grounds that this was part of a Soviet plot to build up the rebel forces to the extent that they would control China. Chiang Kai-shek promptly requested the recall of Stilwell and President Roosevelt relieved Stilwell of his command. It was at this time that Service submitted his Report No. 40 to the State Department, which, according to Hurley, was a plan for the removal of support from the Chiang Kai-shek Government with the end result that the Communists would take over.

The espionage cases apparently had their origin when a British intelligence unit called attention to material being published in Amerasia which was embarrassing its investigations.

Preliminary investigations conducted at that time by OSS disclosed classified State Department material in the possession of Jaffe and Mitchell. The FBI then took over and reported that in the course of its quest it was found that John Stewart Service was in communication from China with Jaffe. The substance of some of Service's confidential messages to the State Department reached the offices of Amerasia in New York before they arrived in Washington. One of the papers found in Jaffe's possession was Document No. 58, one of Service's secret reports entitled: "Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—Decline of His Prestige and Criticism of Opposition to His Leadership."

In the course of the FBI investigation Amerasia was revealed as the center of a group of active and enthusiastic Communists or fellow-travelers. To give you a better picture of Amerasia, it perhaps should be mentioned here that Owen Lattimore was formerly an editor of Amerasia, and Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a writer for the Daily Worker, was the magazine head. Mr. Jaffe incidentally was naturalized in 1923 and served as a contributing editor of the Defender, a monthly magazine of International Labor Defense, a Communist organization, in 1933. From 1934 to 1936 he had been a member of the editorial board of China Today, which was a publication of the pro-Soviet American Friends of the Chinese People. At that time he operated under the alias of J. W. Philips. Under the name of J. W. Philips, he presided in 1935 over a banquet at which Earl Browder was a speaker. He also lectured at the Jefferson School of Social Science, an avowed Communist Party institution. He was also a member of the board of directors of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship. The New York Times, subsequent to his arrest, referred to him as an active supporter of pro-Communist and pro-Soviet movements for a number of years.

According to an article in Plain Talk magazine Jaffe has been a liberal contributor to pro-Soviet causes and that on one occasion he reserved two tables at a hotel banquet held to launch a pro-Communist China front in the name of "The fifth floor, 35 East Twelfth

Street," which happens to be the national headquarters of the Communist Party.

I realize that this history of Jaffe's activities is unnecessary for most of the Members of this investigating body, but I feel that the record should be complete so that anyone who reads it will understand the background of the individual to whom his four codefendants had been delivering secret State and War Department material. His co-editor, Miss Mitchell, gave a party for John S. Service when he returned from China. Service had previously attended a special press conference held by the Institute of Pacific Relations, in which he supported the position of the Chinese Communists.

Larsen had this to say about his codefendants:

"I knew Jaffe and his group as the editor of a magazine which had almost semi-official standing among the left wingers in the State Department."

The night Kate Mitchell was arrested, she had in her possession, according to Congressman Dondero, a highly confidential document entitled: "Plan of Battle Operations for Soldiers," a paper of such importance that Army officers were subject to court martial if they lost their copies.

Congressman Frank Fellows, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which investigated the grand jury which failed to indict Service, wrote a minority report in which he stated:

"The author of the resolution under which this committee assumed jurisdiction stated upon the floor of the House, 'The President authorized the arrest to be made and the arrests were forbidden by the State Department.'"

Under Secretary Joseph C. Grew very urgently insisted upon a prosecution of the six individuals who were picked up by the FBI on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage. He thereupon immediately became a target in a campaign of vilification as the culprit in the case rather than the six who had been picked up by the FBI.

Lieutenant Roth wrote a series of articles for a New York paper and published a book in which he vigorously attacked Grew for his opposition to the Communist sympathizers in the State Department insofar as the far-eastern policy was concerned.

Under Secretary Grew, after a lifetime in the diplomatic service, resigned and President Truman announced that Dean Acheson would take over the post of Under Secretary of State. \* \* \*

"During my conference with Mr. Jaffe in October," Larsen said, "he dropped a remark which one could never forget, 'Well, we've suffered a lot,' he said, 'but, anyhow, we got Grew out!'"

In regard to the legal handling of this case, the following is found in Plain Talk in an article by Larsen:

"While public attention was largely focused upon extraneous issues, the espionage case itself was following a special course behind the scenes. It appeared that Kate Mitchell had an influential uncle in Buffalo, a reputable attorney by the name of James M. Mitchell, former president of the New York State bar association. Mr. Mitchell was a member of a very influential law firm in Buffalo—Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth. The New York City

correspondents of that law firm include the most redoubtable Col Joseph M. Hartfield, extremely well known and extremely influential in Government circles in Washington. Colonel Hartfield, who is regarded by some as one of the most powerful political lawyers in the country, made at least four trips to Washington where he called on top officials of the Department of Justice in the matter."

In that connection I would like to quote again from Congressman Dondero's talk on the House floor, in which he stated:

"I have heretofore charged and reiterate now that the court before whom these cases were brought was not fully informed of the facts. A summary of the court proceedings has been furnished to me, which shows no evidence or exhibit obtained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation presented to the court. Jaffe's counsel told the court that Jaffe had no intention of harming the Government, and United States Attorney Hitchcock told the court there was no element of disloyalty in connection with the case. If that is the fact, may I respectfully ask what purpose did these individuals have in mind in stealing these particular files?

"Had this same thing happened in certain other governments, these people would undoubtedly have been summarily shot, without a trial. Let us not forget we were still at war with Germany and Japan when these files were stolen, and Jaffe, in whose possession they were found had been for more than 10 years a leader and heavy financial supporter of Communist propaganda causes, according to the FBI."

As I stated above, after the grand jury failed to indict Mitchell, Service, and Roth, the House passed a resolution in which it directed the Committee on the Judiciary—

"To make a thorough investigation of all the circumstances with respect to the disposition of the charges of espionage and the possession of documents stolen from secret Government files which were made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation 'against Philip J. Jaffe, Kate L. Mitchell, John Stewart Service, Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, Andrew Roth, and Mark Gayn,' and to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems necessary."

This committee then confirmed a report of a theft of a vast number of documents from the State, War, and Navy Departments, which ranged in classification all the way from top secret to confidential. This committee report indicates that a number of the members of the grand jury voted for the indictment of Service and Mitchell on the espionage charges, but that the required number of 12 did not so vote.

It will be noted that the committee was not appointed for the purpose of passing upon the guilt or innocence of the espionage suspects, but was appointed for the purpose of investigating the way that the case was handled and to make recommendations. The committee did not in any way question the theft of the documents. However, it seemed to place a great deal of stress upon the fact that the documents might not be admissible in evidence because of the method of obtaining them.

For example, on page 5, the report states as follows:

"4. Many of the identifiable documents might have had their evidential value destroyed by reason of the possibility of the court's sustaining the defendants' motions attacking the warrants of arrest.

"VI. Judicial decisions require scrupulous care to see that searches and seizures are reasonable. While search and seizure on arrest may be made without a search warrant, yet this is not so unless the warrant of arrest issued after 'probable cause' of guilt had been established by legal evidence."

On page 6, the following statement is made:

"If the warrant for arrest was not issued on 'probable cause' substantiated by facts, the evidence disclosed as a result of the search and seizure incident to the arrest based on such a warrant would be subject to suppression and, therefore, not usable as evidence of the crime for which arrest was made."

While I have not seen any testimony of any of the grand jurors, and do not know where it is available, this would seem to indicate that the committee felt that the grand jury was disturbed, not so much by the question of guilt or innocence of the defendants, but by the question as to whether or not the guilt or innocence could be proven they apparently feel that much of the material would not be admissible because of the method of search and seizure. The following comment will be noted on page 7 of the committee report:

"Most of the items seized at Jaffe's office were typewritten copies. Some of such copies were proved to have been typed in one of the Government departments. It may be fairly inferred that the originals of such copies were never removed but that copies were made at the department or agency where the original reposed."

This makes it very clear that the committee felt making copies of secret documents and then delivering the copies to unauthorized persons placed the crime in a different class from the delivery of the originals. It is rather difficult to understand this reasoning in view of the fact that photostats or copies of an important secret document would normally be of as much value to an enemy power as the originals. The committee further pointed out that additional reason for not finding the grand jury at fault is because any of the six can still be further prosecuted on the charge of espionage. The majority report makes some excellent recommendations, which the Secretary of State might well read. I especially call his attention to recommendations 1, 2, and 3, on page 9, which reads as follows:

"1. That the head of every department and agency of our Government see to it that more—much more—care be exercised in personnel procurement. That all those considered for Government positions in every echelon be investigated so thoroughly as to insure that no one be employed unless absolute certainty has been attained that nothing in the background, present attitude, or affiliations raises any reasonable doubt of loyalty and patriotic devotion to the United States of America.

"2. That the watchword and motivating principle of Government employment must be: 'None but the best. For the fewer, the better, unless above question.'

"3. That each and every present employee who fails to measure up to the highest standard should be discharged. No house divided against itself can stand."

One of the members of the six-man committee, Congressman Hancock, was prevented by illness from participating in the report. Two of the members of the committee wrote dissenting opinions, which meant that the decision to absolve the grand jury of responsibility was made by a 3-to-2 decision.

Congressman Fellows, in his dissenting opinion, made the following statement:

"Jaffe either took these documents himself or his confederates took them for him. And two of the documents found were 'top secret,' so marked and so designated. I can see no point in arguing that these papers may not have been of much value. The thieves thought they were. The Government agencies so adjudged them. And the facts show that the defendants could have had their choice of any documents they wished; they were given no protection so far as the State Department was concerned."

"This transaction, or rather a series of transactions involved, embraces the unlawful removal of 'top secret,' 'secret,' 'confidential,' and 'restricted' files from the Department of State, in our national Government. This is a very serious offense. In time of war, this is a most serious offense. When war is in progress, or even in time of peace, it is of little or no concern whether the files removed were 'originals' or 'copies,' the fact that information of either or any classification was removed from the secret files in the Department of State and was delivered to any individual, or group of individuals, who had no lawful right to receive the same, is the essence of the offense. When that very secret information was thus unlawfully revealed to others, no matter how the same was imparted to Mr. Jaffe, whether by an original, or by copy, or by any other method, the real damage has been done.

"There should not be any attempt made in the report to either minimize or acquit anyone from the magnitude of the act or acts committed. The report filed appears to be at least an attempt to either minimize or completely justify some of the unlawful acts which were undoubtedly committed.

"All those who participated in any way in the removal, or attempted removal, of these documents from the Department of State—or who copied such reports and thereafter delivered such copies to Mr. Jaffe, or to any other person, not lawfully entitled to receive the same, should be prosecuted, and all these participating, in any degree in the unlawful acts under investigation, should be immediately discharged from their positions in our Government. The report should speak strongly and without any reservation upon that subject.

"The questions here involved are so grave and the offense so great, that no effort should be made to protect or defend those who so offended, but the report should be made both firm and strong—to speak the truth—but to place the blame where the same rightfully belongs."

This is but a small portion of the pertinent background of service, but certainly, beyond doubt, it forever excludes this man as a security risk by whatever yardstick it is measured.

Again we have a known associate and collaborator with Communists and pro-Communists, a man high in the State Department consorting with admitted espionage agents, and I wish to say to this committee what I said on the floor of the Senate on February 20, 1950:

"When Chiang Kai-shek was fighting our war, the State Department had in China a young man named John S. Service. His task obviously, was not to work for the communization of China. Strangely, however, he sent official reports back to the State Department urging that we torpedo our ally Chiang Kai-shek and stating, in effect, that communism was the best hope of China.

"Later this man--John Service--was picked up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for turning over to the Communists secret State Department information. Strangely, however, he was never prosecuted. However, Joseph Grew, the Under Secretary of State, who insisted on his prosecution, was forced to resign. Two days after Grew's successor, Dean Acheson, took over as Under Secretary of State, this man--John Service--who had been picked up by the FBI and who had previously urged that communism was the best hope of China, was not only reinstated in the State Department but promoted. And finally, under Acheson, placed in charge of all placements and promotions."

Mr. Chairman, today this man, John S. Service, is a ranking officer in the policy-making group of "untouchables" on duty in Calcutta, India, one of the most strategically important listening posts in the world today and since the fall of China the most important new front of the cold war.

Five times this man has been investigated as to his loyalty and his acceptance as a security risk to the Nation.

What possible reason could there have been for even a second investigation of his record.

He was not an acceptable security risk under Mr. Acheson's "yardstick of loyalty" the day he entered the Government.

He is not a sound security risk today.

Mr. McCARTHY. In this connection, let me remind the Senate that the material involved in this case, the stolen documents, included the following Government records: 360 classified documents from the State Department, including some top secrets and confidential classification; 163 prepared by ONI, the Office of Naval Intelligence; 42 prepared by MID; 58 prepared by OWI; 9 from the files of the War Department.

It will be recalled that J. Edgar Hoover at the time said said this was a "100 percent airtight case against Service, Roth, and their co-defendants." Now here is the affidavit.

This affidavit is to the effect that the night before John S. Service, Lt. Andrew Roth and four codefendants in the Amerasia case were arrested, this man was at the home of Owen Lattimore.

He states that he was introduced to John S. Service and Lt. Andrew Roth. He states further that Roth, Lattimore and Service spent a great deal of time by themselves, discussing certain papers or manuscript. He states that their actions seemed strange at the time, and that at that time Lattimore stated that they were going over a manuscript. He states further that he went into another room in the house on a personal matter and that Roth followed him in and grabbed his—that is, Roth's—brief case, which most likely contained the documents or manuscript.

Then I have another statement gotten under almost the same circumstances, which is being turned over to the Bureau. Again there was great reluctance to sign the paper. In it substantially the same facts are set forth, except this man did not see Roth rush in to grab his brief case. He stated, however, that when he later asked Lattimore for an explanation, Lattimore stated that they had been declassifying secret documents in favor of some friends; that Lattimore further stated that this was a common Washington practice; that Lattimore further stated that Roth and Service were arrested because of a feud they had with some people in Washington. It must have been a rather serious feud with the FBI, I assume.

I have before me the photostat of another document. A copy of this photostat is also being forwarded to the FBI. This is a rather unusual document for a number of reasons. In order that the significance of this document can be fully understood, I beg the indulgence of the Senate while I briefly recite some history which is known to most of the Senators—the history of the official Communist Party line insofar as Chiang Kai-shek was concerned.

From 1931, when Japan seized Manchuria, until 1935, the Communist Party line was anti-Chiang. He was denounced repeatedly as a tool of Japan during that period of time.

In 1935 at the world Communist meeting in Moscow—I believe that was the seventh meeting of the Comintern—the so-called united front, or Trojan-horse policy, was adopted—a policy calling for the Communists to combine with the gov-

ernments in power and to get into strategic positions so that Moscow could control, or at least exert influence on, the governments in question. At this time, in 1935, as the Senate will recall, Chiang Kai-shek made an agreement with the Chinese Communists.

From 1935 to 1939 the Communist line was pro-Chiang Kai-shek.

In 1939, after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the Stalin-Matsouka Pact, the Communist Party line again became anti-Chiang Kai-shek.

As the Senate will recall, this continued until June 22, 1941, the day Hitler invaded Russia, at which time the Communist Party line again switched and was pro-Chiang Kai-shek.

This continued until 1943. The Senate will recall the Russian victory at Stalingrad in the early spring of 1943, and the reversal in the course of the war at that point, which up until then had been going rather badly against Russia. The Communist Party line again definitely became anti-Chiang Kai-shek.

If any particular day could be said to be the day when the party line changed, which cannot be tied down to a day, but, if it were possible to fix the day, it would probably be April 26, 1943—the day Stalin broke relations with the exiled government of Poland, which at that time had armed forces fighting with us in Italy. Undoubtedly, history will some day record that April 26, 1943, marked the beginning of World War III—the time Russia decided she was no longer in danger from Hitler and could pick up her temporarily postponed plans for world domination.

I mention this brief history of the shifting official Communist Party line toward Chiang because it is important to understand, and it should be kept in mind in order to grasp the full importance of this document.

This is a letter—there is nothing like a good filing system—dated June 15, 1943, which is when the line had again swung to anti-Chiang Kai-shek. This is a letter from Owen Lattimore, director of Pacific Operations, OWI. The odd thing is that he is writing to his boss in the Government service, telling the story to him, not writing to someone who is working for him.

Lattimore

The first paragraph reads as follows:

In your capacity as a member of our Personnel Security Committee there are certain things which you ought to know about Chinese personnel. It is a delicate matter for me to tell you about these things because of my recent official connection with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. For that reason I am marking this communication secret.

The reason for marking this document secret becomes abundantly clear as you read through it. In it he directs the recipient of the letter to get rid of all the Chinese in OWI who were loyal to either the Nationalist Government or Wang Ching-wei, who, as the Senate will recall was the Japanese puppet in China.

He then issues instructions that the personnel be recruited from the shareholders of the New China Daily News, a Chinese Communist paper in New York.

In the letter he condemns the other Chinese papers. He also points out that the Nationalist and Wang Ching-wei group are engaged in handing out carefully colored news and doctored editorial policies and are intensely jealous of and hostile to the New China Daily News which, so to speak, flaunts its sins by being so readable that the Chinese public in America buys it for its own sake.

He even admits that it would be rash to say that there are no Communists connected with the New China Daily News.

He then shrugs this off, however, by saying that these Communists are not "tied to the chariot wheels of Moscow."

Incidentally, at that time the only other New China Daily News was published in the Communist headquarters of Yenan. However, since the Communists have taken over China, there is, as far as I know, at least one New China Daily News in each of the larger Chinese cities which the Communists occupied.

Do Senators get the picture? At that time there was in New York a New China Daily News. There was also one in Yenan, Communist headquarters, and as the Communists took over China they established a new Chinese Daily News in each of the major cities of China.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator mention the name of Lattimore's boss?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I did not. I would rather not mention it. I should be glad to let the Senator see the letter, if he wants to see it. I shall tell the Senator why I would rather not mention the name. I do not have any documented material on this particular individual, except that he is mentioned in another affidavit which I shall cite. He is not now employed by the Government. I do not have enough information to decide whether or not he is a loyal American at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that if Lattimore was working for someone in the Government at that time, it could be found out?

Mr. McCARTHY. The letter is addressed to Mr. Joseph Barnes, Office of War Information, New York, N. Y.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Would not the regular thing be to insert the entire letter in the Record?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will allow me to proceed as I think I should, I would rather do it in that way. If the Senator from New Hampshire, or any of the other Senators, cares to read the entire letter, I shall be glad to let them do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it the Senator's intention to place the entire letter in the Record?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it is not.

Mr. TOBEY. I suggest that that be done. The quotation from it is taken out of context.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall refuse the Senator's request at this time. The letter is marked "secret," and it is my present intention not to put any secret documents into the Record, even though I think they might well be declassified in view of the fact that the purpose of marking it secret was, very obviously, so that the people would not know that Mr. Lattimore was saying, "Fire from the OWI any man who is loyal to Chiang, and hire individuals who are loyal to the Communist government."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. If the letter is marked "secret," I suppose that applies it toto. If the Senator is reading excerpts from

the letter, is he not violating his own principle, when the whole letter is marked "secret"?

Mr. McCARTHY. This will become abundantly clear as I proceed. Some of the affidavits in regard to certain individuals cover unusual personal habits, which I feel I should not attempt to make public on the Senate floor to the Nation. I do not intend to read those. I intend to read into the Record portions of the affidavits which I think are proper; and regardless of whether any Senator may disagree with me, that is the procedure which I intend to follow. The entire document is being made available to the FBI. I respect the Senator's thought, but I have been living with this problem a long time, and intend to develop each case as I think wise, regardless of whether some other Senator may disagree with me.

Mr. TOBEY. My only thought was that it is wholly inconsistent to take a paper marked secret and pick out certain things without placing the letter in the Record in toto.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish the contents of the letter, first. He then goes on to authorize the retention of a Dr. Chi and Mr. Chew Hong. He points out that Chi is loyal to him, Lattimore, and that Chew Hong is loyal to Chi. He then goes on to state that as long as Dr. Chi remains loyal to him—Lattimore—there will be no difficulty with either Chew Hong or Chi.

Perhaps some background on Dr. Chi would be of interest to the Senate.

Before Dr. Chi came to America he was president of Shansi Law College and was also commissioner of education in the Shansi Province.

In America, prior to being in the OWI, Dr. Chi was the editor of the Chinese Daily News in New York, the Chinese Communist daily. Dr. Chi is the father of Ch'ao-ting Chi who now awaits in China for passage to the United States as the official representative of the Chinese Communist government to the United Nations. Ch'ao-ting Chi, in the publication Pacific Affairs, for December 1934, writes an article for his good friend, the editor, Owen Lattimore.

Thus we have the picture of Lattimore using his high office in the OWI to shape the Communist line for China through

a Chinese Communist whose son now awaits being seated as a representative of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations; and it is important to point out that Lattimore's maneuver was based upon fraud and misrepresentation in his intended deception of his superior. We have here an excellent example of the far-flung Communist discipline so much insisted upon by Lenin.

In closing the letter he also urges the necessity for exercising pronounced agnosticism when any of our Chinese personnel are attacked—meaning, of course, after they have first gotten rid of those who are loyal to the Nationalists and Wang Ching-wei.

In the last paragraph he again urges the strictest confidence in acting on this letter.

The Senate will recall the date of this letter—June 15, 1943—a time when Chiang Kai-shek was our very badly needed ally in the Pacific; a time when the war was not going too well with us; a time when officially we were committed to all-out cooperation with Chiang Kai-shek. It was at this time that Lattimore sends this highly secret letter in which he twice urges the strictest secrecy be followed in getting rid of any Chinese who are loyal to our ally, Chiang Kai-shek, and the recruiting of personnel solely from the shareholders of the Communist New China Daily News.

I shall be glad now to yield to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. May the junior Senator from New York ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he has made available to the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate the information and the facts contained in his charges, a part of which, and only a part of which, is submitted here today?

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer is "No".

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin why the answer is "No"? When a committee has been set up by the Senate, of which the Senator of course is a distinguished Member, to investigate charges, why he should be unwilling to submit his facts to the committee created for the sole purpose of investigating these charges? It seems to me that is the place to which charges should be referred for investigation if

the charges are made in good faith, rather than to submit in this Chamber certain so-called evidence, selected to suit the purpose of the distinguished Senator, in order to provide a spectacle and a sensation for the press and the galleries. In the way the Senator from Wisconsin has chosen an accused man has no chance to answer. But in the special committee created by the Senate, the greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world, an accused person can make his reply. I should like to have an explanation of this from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator says that a man does not have a chance. There were men in China who did not have a chance because of traitorous acts of certain individuals. Some people shed crocodile tears for the suffering to which the families of traitorous individuals are bound to be subjected. They forget entirely about the families of 400,000,000 people who have been sold into slavery by these same persons who are traitors to this Nation and to 400,000,000 people who thought they could depend upon us, a great and good ally. I shall proceed, regardless of what the Senator from New York thinks or says, to develop these facts in detail before the American people.

I do not intend to discuss the activities of the subcommittee. I have told the subcommittee exactly where they can get the material necessary, and I hope the subcommittee will proceed with their staff, with the money which we gave them, to do the task which I have been trying to do with no staff whatsoever except my own.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator says he is developing his case before the American people. I would have no objection to that, if he would do more than make unsubstantiated charges.

Mr. McCARTHY. It makes no difference if the Senator has objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. When charges are made against the loyalty of a man he should be given an opportunity to answer those charges in the same forum in which the charges are made. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator why he is so delicate in refusing to yield to the request of the distinguished

Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] to give the full text of the information, when the Senator from Wisconsin has no hesitation whatsoever in coming before this body and before the American people and attempting to damn and blacken the reputation of many people who may be innocent.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator would like to know why some of these documents are not being made available to the press, if he will step over here I will show him part of a document which will make very clear to him why it would be completely unfair to make them available. Does the Senator care to step over? [Laughter.]

Mr. LEHMAN. I am delighted to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that they are guests of the Senate, and are not permitted to indulge in demonstrations of approval or disapproval.

(Mr. LEHMAN thereupon crossed the Chamber and approached Mr. McCarthy's desk.)

Mr. LEHMAN. May I see the letter?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator may step to my desk and read the letter.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to see it. The Senator invited me to come over to read the letter. I am here to read the letter. Will the Senator from Wisconsin let me see the letter?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator wish to come close enough to read it?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I would like to read the letter in my own way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator come here and see it?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would like to read it in my own way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator sit down?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say, Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield further at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield further.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly. I shall be glad to yield at any time, assuming that I have unanimous consent to allow

these speeches to be made, rather than questions being asked, without losing the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. In his colloquy with the Senator from New York, the Senator from Wisconsin stated that he intended to discuss in full detail, and in the way he saw fit, the activity of all the traitorous individuals. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he includes in that classification Judge Kenyon, Philip Jessup, Mr. Hanson, or Mrs. Brunauer.

Mr. McARTHUR. I shall spend considerable time today on Mr. Jessup, and I hope the Senator will remain in the Chamber. I think the American people will wonder why the Senator from Connecticut did not go into the matters in detail when Mr. Jessup appeared before the committee. I do not wish to be put in the position of getting into a personal argument on the matter in the Senate, because I do not believe this is the proper forum for it, nevertheless I was very much disappointed when I asked of the committee the right to cross-examine Mr. Jessup when he appeared before it. I told the committee that there were certain facts which I could develop through Mr. Jessup. The committee did not even give me the courtesy of an answer to my request. The committee did not even properly examine Mr. Jessup. After Mr. Jessup had finished with his statement all I heard the Senator from Connecticut say was, "I am very happy that you are a constituent of mine."

I might say that when Mr. Hiss had finished his formal presentation—a formal presentation much more colorful and much more appealing than Mr. Jessup's—before the House Un-American Activities Committee, if that committee had followed the same line which the Senator from Connecticut followed in regard to Mr. Jessup, Mr. Hiss undoubtedly still would be determining foreign policy in the State Department.

The Senator from Connecticut asked me another question. He asked me whether or not I intended to include Judge Kenyon in this discussion today. The Senator knows full well why the Kenyon case was presented. The Kenyon case was presented as the first in a sequence of cases. As I said at the time, it was presented, not because Judge Kenyon herself was important, but I knew that as we went through the various cases we would time and time again hear the statement, "Well, he has been cleared by the Loyalty Board." Therefore, I took a typical case to show just what being "cleared by the Loyalty

Board" meant. Unfortunately, it happened to be the case of a lady. I took a typical case in order to show just what it meant to be cleared by the Loyalty Board. It was a case in which the board had documentation with respect to 28 organizations which had been declared to be Communist-front organizations. They had not been declared to be Communist-front organizations by McCarthy, but they had been declared to be Communist-front organizations by the Attorney General, the House Un-American Activities Committee, the California Committee, the Coudert committee. I presented her case to the committee to show that 28 organizations, according to our exhibits, showed her name, and showed that she was a sponsor of the organizations. The committee did not even go through the motions of calling her and asking her, "Judge, why did you join? Were you a dope, or did you join purposely?" That was the importance of the Kenyon case. The Senator knows that. The Senator knows also that I have never accused Judge Kenyon of being a traitor. Whether she joined these organizations, as she said, because she may have been—I do not recall her testimony—I think she said she joined without knowing it, or without knowing something about them. I do not know what she said. However, so far as the Loyalty Board is concerned, if it did not know why she joined those organizations, it certainly should have found out before giving her a clean bill of health, especially in view of the fact that the Secretary of State had said that membership in even one of those organizations—not 28, but 1—was evidence that an individual was a bad security risk.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator now answer my question whether he regards Miss Kenyon, Mr. Jessup, Mr. Hanson, or Mrs. Brunauer as traitors to the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will remain on the floor—and I hope he will remain—he will hear in some detail exactly what I have to say about Jessup. Then the Senator may decide for himself whether Mr. Jessup is merely a stooge, who does not know what he is doing, or whether he has planned what he has done. I intend to come to that next. I do not intend to discuss the Jessup case until I reach it. I shall get to

it before the Senate adjourns tonight. So, if the Senator will wait, I shall get to that case.

I intend to discuss the Hanson case. I intend to point out the work Lattimore is doing in connection with Hanson's work. When I have finished, if the Senator has any doubt in his mind as to the facts in these cases, I shall be very glad to have him question me. However, I shall not discuss the Jessup case until I get to it. We have some extremely interesting documents in the Jessup case. Mr. Jessup will have some difficulty explaining some of them.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand, the Senator does not wish to state at this time his opinion as to whether or not Mr. Jessup is a traitor. With respect to Judge Kenyon, Mr. Hanson, or Mrs. Brunauer, does he care to give a direct answer to the question whether or not they are traitors within the classification which was referred to in the Senator's colloquy with the Senator from New York?

Mr. McCARTHY. If I were in a position to ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut, I would ask him whether he considers Mr. Lattimore a traitor.

Mr. McMAHON. Is that the Senator's answer to my question?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator will hear what I have to say about each of these individuals, if he will be patient and sit down.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If everything which the Senator from Wisconsin has stated about the persons regarding whom the Senator from Connecticut has inquired is true, and if everything he has stated proves interesting to the Senate and to the audience, can the Senator from Wisconsin tell us of what crime the persons are guilty under American law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of what statutory crime?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of what crime; yes. Of what crime are they guilty under American law?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall let the Senate decide that question. I am merely giving the facts as to these individuals. I am not in the Attorney General's office. When I get through I think the Senate will have just as good an idea as I have as to what crime they are guilty of. I have some more documents which shed forth light on that subject.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin, prior to making his charges public with reference to the cases of Judge Kenyon, Mr. Hanson, Miss Brunauer, and Mr. Jessup, and now Mr. Lattimore, consulted with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or divulged such information to them as he had in his possession.

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me say none of this information came from the FBI nor from any FBI agent. Let me further say to the Senator from Minnesota that if I had had any correspondence or any conversation with any members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation I do not feel called upon to give it to the Senator. Is that clear? The Federal Bureau of Investigation will have available every speck of evidence that I pick up. I do not flatter myself with the thought that I can do this more efficiently than the FBI. I think they have done an exceedingly fine job. I assume that practically all this evidence must also be in the files of the FBI.

The FBI has not gone over to the Justice Department and insisted upon his prosecution. Let me first say, whether they have done it or not I do not know. But I was brought up on a farm, and an old farmer said to me, "If a cat once drinks scalding water you have difficulty getting him to drink even cold water from then on." If the FBI starts developing a case on a man such as Lattimore, all one has to do is to look back and see what happened in a case such as that of Service, and one cannot be surprised at why they do not insist upon prosecuting Lattimore.

Let me say something about the Service case so the Senator can understand why perhaps the FBI has good reason to leave it to the Justice Department to decide upon when prosecution

shall be started. The Government attorney in the Service case was a young man named Hitchcock. Hitchcock quickly disposed of this case, which the FBI had worked up over months of detailed investigation. The case was worked up by scores of FBI men. This man Hitchcock then got up before the court and said, "I can dispose of this case in less than 5 minutes. There are no indications of disloyalty here." In other words, he could take all of J. Edgar Hoover's work and say, "He has nothing."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have this question. I gather from the Senator from Wisconsin that it is his opinion that the information he has now presented to the Senate was undoubtedly already in the files of the FBI, and therefore there was not any particular need for his immediate giving of that information to the FBI.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether it is there or not. I have a great deal of respect for the FBI. I sincerely hope and assume that they have done a much more competent job of investigating than I have. But on the assumption that they may not have all this information, every scrap of evidence I get is going directly to the FBI. When I say I assume they have it, I do not know. I hope they have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that the FBI has it. I have high regard for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I share the high regard in which the Senator holds that agency. I have extremely high regard for the head of the Bureau, J. Edgar Hoover, and I share the high regard in which the Senator from Wisconsin holds him. I should like to ask the Senator if the FBI has the information, or if he assumes it has it because it possesses, as the Senator says in his own words, better investigators than he, would it not be a dereliction of duty on the part of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution and to defend it, and to uphold the law of the land, if he were not to reveal or identify a traitor, since we have laws pertaining to traitors? I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will give us an answer as to whether or not he believes that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has been derelict

in his responsibility in the sense that he has not prosecuted what the Senator from Wisconsin calls a top Communist agent, an agent of Russia, who is or has been a member of the Communist Party, thereby making him obviously a traitor?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota knows the answer to that question. He knows that the FBI has no power to prosecute. He knows that the only function the FBI has is to gather evidence. He knows that the only individual who can decide whether to prosecute is the Attorney General. He also knows very well that if the Attorney General desired to prosecute one of these men high up in the State Department he would have to obtain the President's consent. Do not load this onto J. Edgar Hoover.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Not till I have completed my answer. J. Edgar Hoover did a phenomenal job in the Service case, and if the Department of Justice had done an equally good job, Service would not be in the Far East trying to turn the whole business over to Russia. Do not try to hide behind the skirts of the FBI. They have done a phenomenal job. If J. Edgar Hoover had control over the Department of Justice so the cases he prepared would be presented, then we would have a much cleaner Federal Government.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand it, then, the Senator from Wisconsin is saying that the distinguished, patriotic, and devoted American citizen, in the person of J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, is so anxious for his job that when a top Communist agent, a No. 1 traitor, is disclosed by the records of the FBI, the distinguished Director of the FBI would not resign and make public the information if the evidence is there to substantiate the charge? Does the Senator say that the Director of the FBI would protect the Attorney General and protect the President rather than the United States of America if he had the evidence to substantiate that a man is a traitor?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that the Director of the FBI has one job and that is to develop information, develop the case, and make it available to the Attorney Gen-

eral. There is no doubt whatsoever in the mind of the Senator from Minnesota as to that. Mr. Hoover is one of the few men left who are fighting energetically against communism, and there is nothing the Communists would like better than to get J. Edgar Hoover out of his job. I certainly hope the Senator from Minnesota is not urging that he resign. [Laughter in the galleries.] I think that if J. Edgar Hoover were to resign it would be a major catastrophe. So do not ask me those things, Senator. [Laughter in the galleries.]

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin did not mean to tell the distinguished Members of the Senate that the junior Senator from Minnesota is suggesting that the patriotic, loyal public servant, J. Edgar Hoover, resign. What the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to do at the moment is to interpret the remarks made by the junior Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, since he has seen fit to make this public declaration because of his loyalty to the Republic, which loyalty no one can question, whether he believes that J. Edgar Hoover would be less loyal if he had in his records the same information as to an outstanding public enemy, Soviet top-Communist agent. I remind the Senator that he assumes the FBI has the records and as he says better investigators than he is. In other words, does the Senator from Wisconsin feel that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would be so lacking in intestinal fortitude and patriotic devotion to public duty that he would not resign if he knew that the records of the FBI disclosed a top Soviet agent in the State Department who could not be prosecuted? Am I to assume by the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the Director of the FBI would be a party to a conspiracy to protect a member of the State Department? Am I to assume that the Senator from Wisconsin is the only man in the Government who has the courage to speak in behalf of the Republic? I shall not indulge in that assumption, Mr. President. I believe that if Mr. Hoover had the information he would be the first to call it to the attention of the people of the United States, and not wait till he could secure a public forum, such as the forum of the United States Senate, to make the charge.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota knows full well that the Director of the FBI has no authority whatsoever to call the attention of the public to things which are in his files. In fact, the Senator from Minnesota is one of those who has been urging that the files should not be made available to a committee in executive session. He certainly can not ask that the files be made available to the world at large. Certainly he cannot say that the fact that Mr. Hoover will not publish the files on the front pages of all the newspapers indicates disloyalty on the part of J. Edgar Hoover. There is something rather contradictory in the Senator's position, that is, that the files should not be made available to Senators such as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Green], but that J. Edgar Hoover is disloyal if he will not make them available to the world at large. I do not question the Senator's sincerity, but I do question the Senator's reasoning power on that point. [Laughter in the galleries.]

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that the Senator from Minnesota wishes to reciprocate in kind the observations the Senator from Wisconsin has made, in that the Senator from Minnesota does not question the sincerity of the Senator from Wisconsin, but does question the logic of the Senator from Wisconsin and the deductions which have been made by him.

Let us get clear.—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, under the rules, I shall not lose the floor by yielding to permit the Senator from Minnesota to make observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin requests unanimous consent that he not lose the floor when observations are made by other Senators. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish only to observe, first, that at no time have I said anything as to whether or not the President should open or keep closed the files. That matter

is not before the junior Senator from Minnesota. It is before a special committee of the Senate.

Second, I wish to observe that I do not care to have the Senator from Wisconsin twist my remarks, or interpret them in such a manner as to confuse their meaning. The junior Senator from Minnesota holds the Attorney General, Mr. McGrath, and the Director of the FBI, Mr. Hoover, in the highest esteem. The junior Senator from Minnesota believes in them, trusts them, pays tribute to their patriotic, loyal service. It is my position that if J. Edgar Hoover had the information which the Senator from Wisconsin says is available in the files, or which the Senator assumes to be available, Mr. Hoover, because of his patriotic devotion to his country, would have made the information public, would have called it to the attention, first, to the distinguished Attorney General, Mr. McGrath, then the President of the United States, and then to the attention of the people.

In view of the loyal service of Mr. Hoover and the loyal service of Mr. Richardson, head of the Loyalty Board, does the Senator from Wisconsin believe that either one of them would cover up the record of an alleged traitor—an allegation made on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin? Does the Senator from Wisconsin believe that Mr. McGrath, or Mr. Hoover, or Mr. Richardson would be part of a conspiracy to cover up for a "bad policy risk"—I quote now—"a top Communist agent," "a Soviet agent who is or has been a member of the Communist Party, and an agent of Russia?"

I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin answer whether he believes that Mr. Richardson and Mr. Hoover would be parties to such a conspiracy to cover up for that kind of a person in the employ of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let us take up the various questions the Senator from Minnesota has asked.

He has asked about Mr. Richardson. Personally, I do not know him, except I have had an experience at arm's length, without seeing him, during the past several weeks. As the Senator from Minnesota will recall, I made the statement before the committee, under oath, that the John S. Service case had been post-audited by Mr. Richardson's Loyalty Board. I pointed out that Mr. Richardson's Loyalty Board, on March 3, sent that case back to the State Department, saying, "Not only

are we dissatisfied with the clean bill of health you gave Service, but we want you to appoint a completely new loyalty board."

Mr. Richardson's top executive officer, when asked by the press whether or not I was telling the truth, said, "No; we have never heard of Service."

The Senator from Minnesota asks me whether Richardson would cover up anything. I know that his top executive, when asked about the facts I gave on Service, said, in effect, "McCarthy is lying. We never heard of Service."

Then something happened in the State Department. Apparently they became a little worried about the machinery which had been set in motion and about the fact that too many papers had been signed. So the next day they had to admit that I was right, and that on March 3, as I had said, the Review Board sent Service's case back.

So I wrote to Mr. Richardson and said, in effect, "Can you give us an explanation of this? Why does the head of the Loyalty Board tell the American people a deliberate untruth? Why they said there was nothing to my case on Service and why they said they had never heard of him, and yet the next day admitted that I was right in every detail.

What do Senators think his answer was? He said, "I had to say this because too many people were asking questions."

So, when the Senator from Minnesota asks me about what Mr. Richardson would cover up, my answer is, "I do not know."

As to J. Edgar Hoover, I think the Senator from Minnesota is doing a thing he certainly should not do, after serious thought, namely, attempting to convince the American people that J. Edgar Hoover condones what is going on in the State Department. It is **not** his task to approve or disapprove what the State Department does. The Senator from Minnesota knows, and I know, that J. Edgar Hoover has no power whatsoever to hire or fire anyone in the State Department. The Senator from Minnesota knows, and I know, that all J. Edgar Hoover's organization can do is to develop the facts. The Senator knows that if J. Edgar Hoover started making those facts available to the public he would not continue in his job for more than a moment.

Although I am sure the Senator from Minnesota does not want to see the services of Mr. Hoover dispensed with, yet I know there are in this Nation communistic and un-American persons who would like nothing better than to see Mr. Hoover retired to private life.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Let me say that the observation I am going to make, with the indulgence of the Senator from Wisconsin, is not based upon an attempt to heckle the Senator from Wisconsin.

What difference does it make whether one person thinks Mr. Hoover is doing the right thing or not; or what difference does it make whether Mr. Richardson, who is only one individual, is trying to do certain things or not? I think what we should emphasize is the protection of American rights. If I correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin, that is all he is trying to do; he would like to have removed from the Government service, no matter where, anyone who would not protect American rights.

The colloquy which has occurred between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Minnesota has been in regard to whether Mr. Hoover is doing the right thing or whether Mr. Richardson or someone else is doing the right thing. Should not the question be, Is the law being obeyed? After all, Mr. President, should we have a Government based upon what Mr. Hoover thinks or upon what someone else may think or upon what Mr. Richardson or I or the Senator from Wisconsin thinks; or should we have a Government of law? Therefore, should not the question be, Have any laws been violated? If so, let us prosecute or punish those who violate them.

We should not take up other matters simply because they are entertaining; we should not engage in colloquy simply because it is entertaining. It might entertain for the moment anyone who is listening, but that does not prove a thing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for giving the Senator from Minnesota that advice.

The Senator understands that no matter how intelligent or

unintelligent a question may be, when a Senator asks a question of me, I try to answer it. I am not accusing the Senator from Minnesota of asking an unintelligent question, but I gather that the Senator from New Mexico is criticizing me for yielding to permit the Senator from Minnesota to make an observation. I say that, rightly or wrongly, I feel that when I discuss a subject so important as this one, I should freely yield. Another Senator may think the Senator from New Mexico is not wisely taking up time. However, so far as I am concerned, I shall give the Senator from New Mexico all the time he wishes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, and I thank the Senator. In this particular instance, I am not criticizing either the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Minnesota; neither am I trying to heckle the Senator from Wisconsin or to keep him from saying anything about this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know the Senator from New Mexico is not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My point is, let us keep the record clear. The only way the American people will get any benefit from it is by a consideration of whether the law is being obeyed, not by a discussion of what the Senator from Wisconsin or I may think about some Government officials. What I think about some Government officials probably could not be said in polite society; and what the Senator from Minnesota thinks about some Government officials probably could not be said in polite society. However, it is basic, if we are to have a government of laws—not a government based on the ideas of the Senator from Wisconsin or of the Senator from Minnesota or of the Director of the FBI or of someone else—that the laws be obeyed. If the laws are obeyed, I think the people of the United States will have a better government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. Frankly, I feel very strongly that when any Senator rises on this floor and tries to indicate—of course, I may have misinterpreted the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota—that a man with the background of J. Edgar Hoover would condone what is going on, then I think I should make it as clear as possible that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has no power whatsoever over the situation, no function to approve or disapprove.

Mr. President, I have before me another affidavit.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have waited until the Senator finished with the letter from Mr. Lattimore, to ask the Senator a question about it, if he does not mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator that I am not through with the documentation on Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, the Senator from Wisconsin read from a letter dated June 15, 1943, did he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator fixed as April 26, 1943, the date when the party line changed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make that clear. I say that if we can fix any particular date, I think that would be it. Some persons say the party line commenced to change after the German surrender at Stalingrad. Others say that the time we can more definitely fix for it is the date when Stalin broke relations with the Polish Government-in-exile. However, I would say that April 26, 1943, is about as close as any date we can determine upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wished to ask the Senator whether he would make any comment on such papers as have been filed by General Stilwell, for example, about his relationship with Chiang Kai-shek, or by General Marshall and many other persons. I do not believe the Senator would question their loyalty, and I wonder whether he differentiates between them and Mr. Lattimore because of some other history or because of that individual date.

Mr. McCARTHY. I intend to dwell on this letter. I think Lattimore was as much responsible, if not more so, for Stilwell's activities in China as any other one individual. If the Senator will carefully study his record I am sure the Senator will believe that to be the case.

The Senator understands that it is impossible for me, with a limited staff, to present a court case here; but I am sure that if the Senator will sit here and will listen to the material which I am presenting, he will be convinced that the clique of Lattimore, Jessup, and Service has been responsible, almost completely—under Acheson, of course—for what went on in

the Far East, although there were other individuals taking part. If the Senator will wait until I have completed my remarks, then if he has any questions, I shall certainly try to answer them. However, I am reasonably certain that when the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have unlimited respect, sees this evidence, he will quite heartily agree with me.

Mr. President, I have before me an affidavit which is of interest, covering the testimony which will be given by a former general in the Red army, who has indicated his willingness to testify if subpoenaed. His testimony will be to the effect that while a general in the Red army, and while at Moscow, he was in close contact with a general, whom he names, who is named in the affidavit, who was one of the top generals in Soviet intelligence. This conversation was in 1935 or 1936. He was discussing with that top man of Russian intelligence the difficulty of getting good intelligence information from Mongolia and the Far East generally.

I may say incidentally this former Russian general states that he gave a statement to a Government investigative agent. Whether that was the State Department, or what investigative agency it was, I frankly do not know. The testimony will be that the thing that particularly disturbed Russian intelligence was that they had difficulty getting Russian agents into the Far East, because of the suspicion of the Japanese and the Chinese at that time. That, Mr. President, you understand, was 1935 or 1936. The testimony will be that the head of the Russian intelligence told this witness, this prospective witness, that they were having excellent success through the Institute of Pacific Relations, which the Soviet Intelligence, through Communists in the United States, had taken over. In connection with this, he particularly mentioned Owen Lattimore and another individual whose name the Senate would recognize, who is not at present connected with our Government. That name is also in the affidavit. The individual has not been connected with the State Department, but did spend some time with Lattimore in the OWI. I am not using his name on the Senate floor today, in view of the fact that he is not in the Government. But the entire affidavit is being turned over to the FBI.

This former Red army general will further testify that, at the time he was in Moscow, the name of Owen Lattimore meant

nothing to him, but that it was only after he reached the United States as a fugitive from Soviet persecution, and in the late thirties, that the significance of the Russian Intelligence became apparent to him. His testimony will further be that in the course of visits to other European capitals, he had received approximately the same information about IPR, and also about Lattimore, and the other, named as a Soviet agent in this affidavit.

I have before me another affidavit, which——

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to refer to another affidavit, first, so we may have both of them in mind. I have before me another affidavit, the original of which is being handed to the FBI. This affiant lives in China. While Lattimore was there the affiant was an editor of a newspaper in Tiensin and another in Peking.

He states that Lattimore was a leader in several pro-Russian student uprisings in China. He points out Lattimore's known connection with and control over the magazine Asia, which later became Amerasia. The Senate will recall that one of the editors of Amerasia was arrested and found guilty of conspiracy to steal secret documents from the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy. I refer to Jaffe. There is a rather humorous vein in this affidavit. He points out that Chiang Kai-shek was displeased with Lattimore, who as the Senate will recall, was sent by Roosevelt as an advisor to China. He was sent over there for 6 months. Chiang Kai-shek apparently did not want to hurt Roosevelt's feelings by requesting Lattimore's recall, so he handled this in an oriental fashion. He appointed Lattimore a Chinese official and sent him back to represent him in Washington. [Laughter.]

He points out that the Lattimore crowd was responsible for the indoctrination of Stilwell against Chiang Kai-shek. He will point out in his testimony that this was abundantly clear to anyone who lived in China.

The affidavit of this editor of a Chinese newspaper is I believe valuable principally to show Lattimore's leadership of pro-Russian Chinese student uprisings.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator mean to convey the impression that the Institute of Pacific Relations, in 1935 and 1936, was under Communist control?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me explain to the Senator. I was going to cover this later, but I will do it briefly now, and I will cover it more at length later. The IPR was established back in the early twenties by some outstanding men. It took some time for the Communists to gain control of it. There are 50 trustees on the board of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which it will be understood, consists of 10 councils.

Apparently the party has made no great attempt to place men upon that council, and so far as I know, of the 50, they have never had a membership of more than 10, or at most 15. In other words, the party has never had and it does not now remotely have control of the board of trustees. There is, however, the executive committee, which consists of 10 individuals. Those are members of the board of trustees, largely who live in and around New York. The party has made a tremendous effort either to get Communists, fellow travelers, or merely deluded liberals on that particular board. Three, four, or five members have been about the most they have had on the board, who actually have done a rather effective job of control.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was wondering whether the Senator could fix time, because if he would fix the time, for example, as 1935 or 1936, I should be glad to name for him people whom I am quite sure he would never call Communists.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, I can give the Senator the names of any number of outstanding men. As I said, on the board of trustees I think there has at all times been a sizeable number of outstanding men, and on the executive board there have also been some outstanding men.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was only hoping the Senator might indicate why, if the other 35 or so out of 50 distinguished people were not Communists, it proved that Lattimore was, because he associated with them, the heads of great American universities, prominent editors of newspapers, distinguished citizens of every type. They are not brought into this discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am not pointing out that Mr. Lattimore was a Communist, because he associated

with those men on the board of trustees. I am now reading an affidavit from a Red Army officer as to what his testimony will be in regard to information which he got from Russian intelligence. This is a part of the entire picture.

One of the recent activities of Lattimore, which I wish to point out to the Senate today, is a recent trip to Point Barrow, Alaska, in May of last year. He had two cameras with him on that trip, as did everyone else who went on the trip. Point Barrow is, as Senators know, the northernmost place in Alaska, and one of the main approaches to the American Continent near the Arctic. It would be interesting to know where the pictures are today which Lattimore took with those two cameras.

I think the committee might also try to investigate, to find out how that trip was arranged. In this connection I understand that in Professor Lattimore's home in Baltimore he has a room devoted to special photographic equipment. Understand, I have never been in the room, but that is my information.

I also discussed Owen Lattimore with Freda Utley who was formerly a member of the British Communist Party. Her husband was picked up by the OGPU and has apparently since died in a Siberia prison camp. She states that while she was not admitted to the secret meetings between the Russian Communist leaders and the IPR delegates, it was common knowledge at the institute where she worked, in the Russian Council of the institute, in Moscow, that the Soviet government was paying a large sum as its contribution to the Institute of Pacific Relations.

In regard to Lattimore, she states that at the time she met him in Moscow in 1936, in her opinion he was not yet a Communist, but that later when she knew him in Baltimore in 1940, he had definitely decided to throw in his lot with the totalitarian enemies of America and of freedom because he has become convinced that the Communists were destined to win.

She states further that a few months after she had gotten to know him in Moscow, she met him in London where he told her that he had almost lost his job as editor of Pacific Affairs because he had published an article by the Trotskyite, Harold Isaacs.

Keeping in mind that Pacific Affairs is a publication for 10 councils, the publication of which Jessup was editor being the publication for the American Council. I should like to call

the Senate's attention also to an article by Philip J. Jaffe, entitled "China's Communists Told Me," which appeared in the New Masses of October 12, 1937. It will be recalled that this is the same Philip Jaffe who recently was found guilty of conspiracy to steal secret documents from the State Department and the War and Navy Departments in connection with the Amerasia case.

In this article Jaffe gives considerable detail about his travels in China with T. A. Bisson and Owen Lattimore, giving details as to their stay at the Communist foreign office in Yen-an and being greeted on arrival at Yen-an, the Communist headquarters, by Agnes Smedley. Miss Smedley, it will be recalled, has been named by General MacArthur's Intelligence Service as "one of the most energetic workers for the Soviet cause in China for the past 20-odd years."

Let me make it clear: I do not claim the distinction of having exposed Lattimore. He has long since been exposed to the State Department. For example, on October 26, 1946, nearly 5 years ago, the Washington Times-Herald in an article entitled "State Department Sends Soviet Sympathizer as Aide," we find the following:

Another Red sympathizer, if not a Communist, Owen Lattimore, has been named Special Economic Adviser to Tokyo.

As the Senate well knows, the American Legion, through its Americanism Commission, for years, has been waging a gallant fight against odds in an attempt to maintain America as a free Nation.

In March of 1949 its subcommittee on subversive activities put out a document entitled "Summary of Trends and Developments Exposing the Communist Conspiracy." In this it listed a number of individuals as "unsuitable and inappropriate for Legion sponsorship." One of the names is Owen Lattimore. Certainly this was known to the State Department when they sent Lattimore to Afganistan on the Point IV mission. Also the fact-finding committee of the California Legislature on page 199 of its fourth report on un-American activities had the following to say: "Among the Communists and fellow travelers who have been writing books for public schools is Owen Lattimore."

I fear in the case of Lattimore, I may have perhaps placed

too much stress on the question of whether or not he has been an espionage agent. In view of his position of tremendous power in the State Department as the "architect" of our far eastern policy, the more important aspect of his case deals with his aims and what he advocates; whether his aims are American aims or whether they coincide with the aims of Soviet Russia. Therefore, forgetting for the time being any question of membership in the Communist Party or participation in espionage, I would like to deal briefly with what this man himself advocates and what he believes in.

It does not take any counterespionage staff to determine what he stands for. It does not take an investigative group to determine whether he favors communism over our form of democracy. All it takes is a detailed study of his voluminous writings.

We wonder why a man as brilliant as Lattimore would set forth his aims so clearly over a number of years—especially when he now denies those aims so loudly. I suppose, however, if we had the answer to that question, we would also have the answer to why Hitler wrote his *Mein Kampf* and why Stalin wrote his *Principles of Leninism*.

He is undoubtedly the most brilliant and scholarly of all the Communist propagandists, and also the most subtle of the evangelists who have deceived the American people about the Chinese Communists.

I might say that if we study him we cannot help but see that here is a brilliant individual. That is what makes him dangerous. If he were merely a dupe, such as are some of the persons he has been using, he would not be so dangerous to the Nation. Nevertheless, no one can read his books carefully without realizing that they are replete with pro-Soviet propaganda; twisted half truths about America; misinformation about the Chinese Communists; and historical distortions and omissions designed to trick the American public into support of policies advantageous to Moscow.

In a moment I shall give some quotations from Lattimore's books. But first I wish to emphasize the point that the administrations' disastrous far-eastern policy reflects point by point Mr. Lattimore's recommendations and advice.

In this connection the Senate will recall that when I gave

the name and some facts in the Lattimore case to the Foreign Relations Subcommittee in executive session, the State Department made the following statement:

He [Lattimore] has never been employed by or connected with the State Department, except once. About 5 years ago, and for a period of 4 months only, he was associated with a mission outside the United States.

Once thereafter, on a single day, although not employed or compensated by the State Department, he publicly addressed a group of State Department employees.

On another occasion, although not employed by the State Department, he took part over a period of 2 days in a citizens' roundtable conference, in the company of many distinguished Americans who likewise were participating in this discussion.

There was no other contact, association, employment or connection between the State Department and this individual in any manner or form, at any other time, save as mentioned above.

I call attention particularly to the all-inclusive language:

There was no other contact, association, employment or connection between the State Department and this individual in any manner or form, at any other time.

For that reason it might be well to give Lattimore's employment and contact with the State Department and other Government agencies.

In 1941 he was appointed by Roosevelt as adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. While I do not have any documentary proof as to why President Roosevelt picked Lattimore for this job, the best information available would indicate that it was largely on the recommendation of Henry Wallace. He remained with Chiang Kai-shek, however, only 6 months and was then sent back by him to the United States.

Shortly after his return to the States, he was put in charge of the Overseas Division in charge of Pacific operations of the OWI.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I had hoped I would have, for the benefit of the Senate today, some of the excerpts from the broadcasts which he beamed out to China and the Pacific. They were really "dillies."

In 1944 he and John Carter Vincent accompanied Henry Wallace on a tour of China, after which Wallace made his report to the State Department, recommending the torpedoing of Chiang Kai-shek.

Incidentally, in this connection the State Department issued a press release—and I have a copy of it in my hand—denying the existence of such a report and stating as follows:

The Department reiterates in the plainest language that it does not have in its files and does not know of the existence of any report of the nature suggested by Mr. Judd.

This was in answer to a demand by Congressman Judd that the report be produced from wherever it is and published.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor] subsequently proved conclusively that the State Department was again mistaken—if that is the correct term—in this connection. The Senator obtained from Wallace a summary of his report and, as will be recalled, made a report to the press.

Upon his return from this trip, Henry Wallace wrote a book entitled "Soviet Asia Mission," in which he pays tribute to Owen Lattimore for his invaluable assistance. He also points out on page 17 that the President—Mr. Roosevelt—"urged me to take Owen Lattimore with me, who, he said, was one of the world's great experts on the problems involving Chinese-Russian relationships."

This would seem to indicate that not only the State Department but the President have looked to Owen Lattimore as their adviser and expert on far eastern policy.

In 1946 Lattimore headed a special mission to Japan, again to make recommendations to Mr. Truman and the State Department.

In 1949 he attended the Indo-American Conference in New Delhi, India, according to a copy of the Indian News Chronicle. According to this newspaper and the Hindustan Times, our Ambassador to India also took part in this Indo-American Conference. This conference was jointly sponsored by the State Department and the Institute of Pacific Relations.

At the present time Lattimore is in Afghanistan. While the State Department denies he has any connection with it, the following information was obtained from the Library of Congress:

The Afghanistan Government asked the United States in December 1949 to send a preliminary mission to Afghanistan to investigate the possibility of economic development under United Nations technical assistance program. Owen Lattimore was selected to be the

head of this mission, which included a Mr. Caustin of the United Kingdom who is a member of the United Nations Secretariat; a Mr. Kirk of Canada, who is with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization; and a fourth member, an engineer, whose name is not known. The purpose of this mission was to pick out some key economic projects which might provide the basis for long-term assistance.

In other words, Mr. President, the Afghanistan Government asked this Government to send a preliminary mission there to investigate the possibility of assistance under our point 4 program. That is the program which Hanson is now planning.

For some time he has also served on a State Department lecture panel, his job being to properly indoctrinate other State Department employees. In this connection I call attention to an editorial written by Frank Waldrop which appeared in the Times-Herald of June 6, 1946.

Whether or not the Secretary of State will ever admit that Lattimore has a desk in the State Department is comparatively unimportant. The fact concerning which there can be no doubt whatsoever is the dominant influence of Mr. Lattimore over the formulation and implementation of the policy which has delivered China to Stalin. One can find in his books the clearest exposition of the theories and views which have been the basis for the administration's disastrous China policy and which are reflected in the white paper. Indeed the reports from its Foreign Service officials in China during the war, as given in the white paper, read like extracts from Lattimore's books. Lattimore's views are followed by the State Department insofar as the Chinese Communists are concerned. These Chinese Communists are represented by Lattimore and his friends in the State Department as "democrats," "liberal agrarian reformers," "progressives not under Moscow's direction," or, more recently, as "detachable from" Soviet Russia. We hear a new term for them every day.

The general drift of the line of propaganda put across by Mr. Lattimore in his writings is clearly shown by the following blurb on his book, *Solution in Asia*.

This is what the editor says about the book:

He shows that all the Asiatic peoples are more interested in actual democratic practices, such as the ones they can see in action across the Russian border, than they are in the fine theories of Anglo-Saxon democracies which come coupled with ruthless imperialism. \* \* \*

He inclines to support American newspapermen who report that the only real democracy in China is found in Communist areas.

Lattimore's admiration for Russian democracy is characterized by the following passage in the same book:

To all of these peoples (along the Russian frontier from Korea and Manchuria past Mongolia, Sinkiang, Afghanistan, and Iran all the way to Turkey) the Russians and the Soviet Union have a greater power of attraction. In their eyes—rather doubtfully in the eyes of the older generation, more and more clearly in the eyes of the younger generation—the Soviet Union stands for strategic security, economic prosperity, technological progress, miraculous medicine, free education, equality of opportunity, and democracy, a powerful combination.

The quotation appears at page 139.

That is Lattimore's description of Communist Russia. In "The Situation in Asia," Lattimore is engaged in "problems of policy," which—

are continuous, and stem out of each other at successive stages, in such a way that even when the same kind of policy is followed or proposed, it must adapt itself in details to the changing situations which it is intended to manage.

I have read from page 216.

To illustrate, Lattimore goes on to say:

American policy at the end of the war sought to slow down the rate of change in Asia and give priority to the political stabilization and economic recovery of Europe. Since then, however, in spite of American policy, the rate of change has been greater in Asia than the rate of recovery in Europe. We should, therefore, recognize the necessity of adapting our policy to the changing realities; and we can only do so by relaxing our pressure on Asia to subordinate its interests to our interests and those of Europe, and by increasing our pressure on Europe to join us in a policy of negotiating compromises on terms acceptable to Asia.

I have read from page 217.

This is a roundabout way of saying that, since the march of communism is irresistible in Asia, American policy should be to leave it alone, and then, through threatening to stop Marshall aid, to force European nations to do the same, that is, to negotiate compromises on terms which are acceptable to the Communists in Asia. In other words, it is a policy of appeasement of communism in Asia, which is to be jointly pursued by all nations under American leadership.

At page 43 Lattimore attacks what he calls "the grandiose and disastrous American attempt to determine the character and outcome of the Chinese Civil War." Does he mean the Marshall mission to China and the policy of forming a Kuomintang-Communist coalition? If so, Lattimore is for it. For he says that "this Marshall policy was a statesmanlike effort to secure for the United States a position of free maneuver." I have read from page 148. He blames the Marshall failure, and here he follows all standard Communist propaganda, on the assertion that "all during the period of his mission, the Kuomintang kept accumulating American supplies and American transportation kept moving Kuomintang troops into north China and Manchuria."

This is Communist propaganda, pure and simple. For it is by now generally known, and documented by the white paper, that no such thing happened, and that General Marshall himself stated in testimony before Congress that a ban was imposed on arms and ammunition shipments to China which was a virtual embargo. Moreover, Lattimore fails to point out that the Soviet troops in Manchuria were systematically preventing Chinese troops from moving into Manchuria, either by sea through the port of Dairen, or overland through the Great Wall pass Shan-haikwan, or by air to Mukden and Chankchun, while the Soviet troops were building up large Chinese Communist forces all over Manchuria. The tragic story is now presented in the document China Presents Her Case to the United Nations, which was laid before the United Nations General Assembly by the Chinese Government, November 25, 1949.

After stating that the Marshall mission "was a statesmanlike effort to secure for the United States a position of free maneuver"—that is, the mission to get the Chiang Kai-shek government to take in the Communists—Lattimore feels that the Truman doctrine is "the first damage to this position of maneuver," and he blames the Eightieth Congress for his assertion that General Marshall, was "blackmailed into destroying what remained of the position of free maneuver in China policy which he himself set up." This blackmail, of course, was the China Aid Act of April 3, 1948—and he makes this abundantly clear—which Lattimore wrongly describes as having been taken out from the money for the Marshall plan for Europe. In other words, he says that the attempt on the part of Congress to give

the \$125,000,000 aid to Nationalist China was blackmail.

The fundamental thesis of the book is the following statement:

Clearly, the Communist ascendancy had become so decisive that it could not be reversed (p. 151).

He goes on to spell out this assumption with some remarkable predictions of subsequent Soviet policies:

We must also abandon the stubbornly lingering delusion that we can somehow maintain footholds by supporting rump territories or rump government somewhere south of the Yangtse, or on the coast, or on the island of Formosa (p. 179).

This is Lattimore saying this should be the policy which should become the State Department policy. He says, "Don't think you can maintain a rump government beyond the Yangtse, don't think you can maintain one on Formosa."

Here he was prepared to write off free China in favor of the Communists, even if the Communists were still on the north of the Yangtse, or when they were controlling only one-third of China.

I might say that I dislike taking up so much time developing these quotations from Lattimore's works, but I think it is such an important part of the entire picture that it should be made a part of the Record at this time.

Lattimore's predictions regarding Soviet policy were accurate:

We shall soon have a government in China firmly established in the heart of the land and controlling practically the whole of its fringes. This Government will be recognized de jure and de facto by Russia. The new government of China will claim China's big five position in the United Nations, including the right of veto.

That prediction has not come true as yet, of course.

These lines were written a full year before the Communists took such steps.

Lattimore does not believe that anything should or could be done to arrest the march of communism in China and Asia. However, he is not advocating a policy of appeasement of Communist aggression. He believes that Communist rule is good in itself.

As Senators listen to this, I ask them to keep in mind Dean Acheson's speech before the National Press Club several months ago. This is what Lattimore says:

Throughout Asia today there prevails an atmosphere of hope, not of despair. There is not a single country in Asia in which people feel that we are entering an age of chaos. What they see opening up before them is a limitless horizon of hope—the hope of peaceful constructive activities in free (sic) countries, and peaceful cooperation among free (sic) peoples. There will be disillusionments along the way as these hopes unfold. They should not come from America, or as the result of American policy.

In other words, he says to America, "Keep your hands off."

A great part of Asia's hopes, however, will be fulfilled, and should be fulfilled with American cooperation. We have everything to gain by being on the side of hope (p. 238).

### Communists In Government Service

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a few questions?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question, certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator, first, briefly, what has been the connection of Mr. Lattimore with the State Department, and over how long a period?

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me state what his connection is as of now.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is information which I got from the research branch of the Library of Congress; I called the State Department, but I could not get this information there. The Library of Congress gave me this information: namely, that the Afghanistan Government asked the United States in December 1949 to send a preliminary mission to Afghanistan to investigate the possibilities of utilizing the point 4 program in that area; that Owen Lattimore was selected to head that delegation; and that he is in that area or has recently returned therefrom.

As to his previous connections, it is, I may say to the Senator, hard to put one's finger upon them. As I told the committee the other day he has a desk in the State Department. He has access to the files. Ever since President Roosevelt labeled Owen Lattimore as the outstanding authority, he has been recognized as the "architect"—that is not my phrase—of our far-eastern policy.

For example, when President Truman called in the press at

the time of the Japanese surrender he had on his desk only two books. One of them was Latimore's book from which I have been quoting.

So it is hard to put one's finger on the exact job he has. However, without any doubt, he has been formulating the policy.

Later I intend to cover in some detail the extent to which Secretary Acheson has followed the Lattimore line.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from the Senator that at this very moment Lattimore does have this duty to perform on behalf of the State Department in Afghanistan?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe he is on his way back.

Mr. DONNELL. At any rate he has been there until a very few hours before the present time; has he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me to ask a few more questions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Wisconsin has referred to one Phillip Jaffe; has he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Was Phillip Jaffe convicted of a crime?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes or he pleaded guilty.

Mr. DONNELL. Approximately what was the date of that?

Mr. McCARTHY. That was in 1945.

Mr. DONNELL. So, 4 years before Mr. Lattimore was sent on this mission to Afghanistan, Mr. Jaffe had been convicted, and that was a matter of public knowledge. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct; there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has observed—I am sure he knows the fact, but I ask whether he has observed—that in the published report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at page 1446 of that document, the committee had this to say—it is not long, and I should like to read it; and I ask the Senator whether he has observed this, and then I shall ask him a further question:

Throughout its existence in this country the Communist Party has made a specialty of propaganda through publications and periodical. It would be difficult indeed to compile an absolutely complete list of these publications and periodicals, but the following tabulation presents many of them. In addition to these, there have been thousands of local and shop papers, some of which have been printed and some of which have been mimeographed.

Did the Senator from Wisconsin observe that immediately following that statement by the committee of the House of Representatives, to the effect that the Communist Party has made a specialty of propaganda through publications and periodicals and stating that, "The following tabulation presents many of them," the very first one that is mentioned is Amerasia? That is correct, is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Amerasia has long been known as completely controlled by the Communist Party. I do not think there is any one, no matter how partisan, who would deny the fact that Amerasia is an organ of Soviet Russia.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin in referring to Phillip Jaffe referred to the same Phillip J. Jaffe, managing editor of the editorial board of Amerasia, listed at page 1446 of the document to which I have referred, as being managing editor and a member of the editorial board of 12 persons, of whom Owen Lattimore is listed, likewise, as being one of those members? Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I may say also, for the Senator's benefit, that Far Eastern Survey, the publication of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, for a long time occupied offices adjoining the official offices of Amerasia; in fact, I understand that in order to get into one office, one went through the other—almost a sort of joint venture.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Then, am I correct in understanding from the statement contained in this report of the House committee,

from which it appears that the information I have just read about membership on the editorial board of Amerasia came from the issue of August 1938, that the fact that Mr. Jaffe, who was convicted in 1949, was a member of a board of 12, of whom Owen Lattimore was one member, was known from 1938 up until and including the present time and at the time when Mr. Lattimore was sent to Afghanistan on the mission upon which he is engaged; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Missouri is 100 percent correct. I may say that I think he inadvertently stated "1949" when he meant 1945. Jaffe was convicted in 1945.

Mr. DONNELL. In referring to 1949, I was referring to the year which I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say was the year when Mr. Lattimore was sent to Afghanistan.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; in 1949 he went to New Delhi, India, on a project which was sponsored, apparently jointly, by the State Department and the Institute of Pacific Relations. It was in 1950—a matter of weeks ago—that he went to Afghanistan.

But lest the Senate be misled as to the 1949 project, let me say that I have tried to get the information as to the extent to which the State Department sponsored the meeting in New Delhi. The local newspapers certainly appeared to think it was a State Department project. Our Ambassador over there attended. One of my representatives talked to the members of one labor organization who said they had been invited to send two representatives to this conference, and that while they would not be on the Government pay roll, their air travel would be taken care of through the State Department. So, the only information I can give the Senator as to the sponsoring of that project is that the Indian newspapers all carried it as a State Department IPR project, and apparently either the State Department paid for, or furnished the air travel for the individuals who went there. In 1950, up to this time, until but a few days ago, Lattimore has been in Afghanistan working out the point 4 program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. In whose behalf is it that the Senator understands that Mr. Lattimore is now in Afghanistan working out the point 4 program?

Mr. McCARTHY. All I can say is, the Afghanistan Government asked our State Department to send a man. They said, "We will send Owen Lattimore." I think perhaps the Senator will find that he is on the payroll of UN; of course, being paid American money.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding the Senator a few minutes ago to say that the State Department was requested to send a man to Afghanistan on the matter to which he has referred?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And that Mr. Lattimore was sent by someone on that mission? Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. He was picked by the State Department and sent on that mission.

Mr. DONNELL. And that was in the year 1950, was it?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That was 5 years after the conviction of Phillip J. Jaffe, to whom reference has been made. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. What was the crime of which Mr. Jaffe was convicted and what was his punishment, if the Senator recalls?

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not know what particular crime he was finally accused of, but it was in connection with the theft of documents from the State Department, and from the Office of Naval Intelligence. There were 360 taken from the State Department and, while I do not have the exact figures, a sizable number were taken, from the Office of Naval Intelli-

gence, from Army Intelligence, and one other agency. I should like to give the Senator very briefly a resume of some of the documents, so he will realize their importance, but I am sorry, I do not have the data before me at the moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, while the Senator's assistant is looking for that, may I, with his permission, ask another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri for a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin has there ever been, so far as he knows, since the publication of the House committee from which I have read—and which, by the way, was printed at the United States Government Printing Office in 1944—has there ever been any serious question raised, so far as the Senator knows, as to the correctness of the conclusion of that committee, that Amerasia was a publication through which the Communist party put forth propaganda? Is there any doubt of that in the Senator's mind?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no doubt whatever in my mind, and I do not believe there can be any doubt in the mind of any open-minded individual. The Senator is speaking of Amerasia, I take it.

Mr. DONNELL. I am speaking of Amerasia. Has there ever been, so far as the Senator knows, any action taken by any committee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, setting aside or contradicting the conclusion of the House committee in 1944 that Amerasia, having Jaffe and also Mr. Lattimore on their editorial board of 12, was a Communist publication? Has there ever been any action of any committee of the Congress which set aside that conclusion or denied its validity?

Mr. McCARTHY. None whatever. Merely to give the Senator a better picture of some of the individuals on the board of Amerasia, I may say I have a letter here signed by T. A. Bisson, who was in the State Department, and also on the Amerasia board. The letter is addressed to the head of a Protestant missionary council.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt to ask whether that is the same T. A. Bisson who was listed by the House committee in 1946?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is the same Bisson. I shall cover this in more detail later. The letter is a fantastic document if ever there was one. He writes to the head of a Protestant missionary council—and I will give the Senator the letter—advising against giving aid in, to quote, “rehabilitating the Red-ravaged districts.” In other words, when the Communists departed and the Protestant missionary group undertook to give the people aid, Bisson wrote saying it was wrong. He ends his letter with a postscript, which sounds interesting:

P. S.—I would strongly advise every prospective missionary to China to read Chinese Destinies, by Agnes Smedley.

In case the Senator does not know who Agnes Smedley is, she was the individual about whom MacArthur's intelligence unit issued a document which was placed in the Record in which she is branded as the outstanding Soviet agent for over 20 years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know of any reason why the State Department has found it necessary, in sending a man abroad, if it did send him, on this Afghanistan project, to select a man who was on the editorial board, consisting of 12 members, of a publication which the Congress of the United States, through the House of Representatives, had officially stated was a periodical through which the Communist Party had made a specialty of issuing propaganda?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me state in this connection that, as the Senator will recall, John Service was arrested. That is the case which Hoover says was a 100-percent airtight case. Joseph Grew, who was then Under Secretary of State, was very vigorous in insisting on the prosecution of Service. Grew resigned. Dean Acheson took over. A few days later, John Service was reinstated. He is the man who was accused of stealing these documents. Subsequently, he was put in charge, so far as I can determine, of personnel, promotions, and placements in the Far East. The man who stole the documents for Amerasia, an outfit which is clearly Communist-controlled, and who was the subject

of this espionage case was picked up by Dean Acheson, and was not only reinstated but was placed in the position of controlling placements and promotions of personnel in the Far East. This may explain why men like Lattimore were assigned such important jobs in the East.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, are these the documents Jaffe was accused of stealing, or that he did steal?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not of trying to steal, but which he did steal. These are documents which were recovered from the office of Amerasia by the FBI or Naval Intelligence. I think this is the one which was recovered by the FBI—either the FBI or Naval Intelligence. First, there is a document marked "Secret," obviously a document originating in the Navy Department, with the schedule and targets for the bombing of Japan. This particular document was known to be in the possession of Philip Jaffe on one of the days during the early spring of 1945, before the bombing program had been undertaken. That information, in the hands of our enemies, could cost us many precious lives.

Second, there is another document, also marked "Top Secret," likewise originating in the Navy Department. It dealt with the disposition of the Japanese fleet subsequent to the major naval battle of October 1944, and gave the class and location of each Japanese warship. What Jaffe wanted that for is a \$64 question.

Third, there is another document stolen from the Office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship, a secret report on the Far East, which was so stamped, leaving no doubt in the mind of anyone.

Another document stolen from Military Intelligence consisted of 22 pages; and one of the documents, of considerable interest, which was found in his possession and that apparently reached Jaffe before it reached the State Department, was John Service's report No. 58, a report highly critical of Chiang Kai-shek. Does the Senator follow me? Before the document reached the State Department from Service, he had first mailed it to Philip Jaffe.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I give assurance that I am going to trespass only a very short time further on the Senator's time, but I should like to ask another question or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. This is in connection with the query that is in my mind as to why it would be necessary for our Government in selecting a person to go to Afghanistan to restrict itself to a man who had been connected with an organization such as Amerasia, as a member of a board consisting of 12 members, of whom Jaffe, who was convicted in 1945, was one. The further question I have along that line arises from a similar query. I find in the same report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, published in 1944, that there is a series of exhibits listed. I should like to ask the Senator a question based thereon. The report says:

In this section of the report will be found numerous exhibits of Communists and Communist-front organizations. The personnel of these organizations reveals an extensive interlocking directorate with the other organizations that are discussed in these volumes. In his memorandum on the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, the Attorney General has called attention to the importance of the interlocking directorate in identifying Communist-front organizations.

Then, I point out to the Senator, and will ask him the question in a moment, the fact that among the exhibits that reveal a part of the personnel of these organizations, or I should say, among those organizations, is the Maryland Association for Democratic Rights.

I want to ask the Senator whether he has noted that at page 1136 of the report of the House of Representatives in 1944, 6 years before Mr. Lattimore was selected to go to Afghanistan, it appears that the Maryland Association for Democratic Rights, listed as an organization under the heading of "Miscellaneous Communist and Communist-front Organizations," included among the sponsors of a certain conference the name of Owen Lattimore. I ask the Senator if he knows why it is necessary that our Government should have any organization acting for or with the consent of our Government to restrict its choice of a man to go on an important diplomatic mission to Afghanistan to someone who is not only connected with a publication such as Amerasia, but is also a member of an organization which is listed among Communist and Communist-front organizations? Can the Senator explain the necessity for our Government, or anyone connected with it, or with its approval, confining itself, in

X  
X

the instance cited, to a man who is connected with such organizations?

Mr. McCARTHY. I can see no conceivable reason for it. There is an excuse for some of these unusual individuals being appointed, I suppose, but the picture has been so clear and it has been painted over so many years that there can be no conceivable reason for this man's being appointed. There are, after all, a vast number of good, intelligent individuals who are not painted with the brush with which Lattimore has been painted, who could do a good job.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Wisconsin if he is familiar with the photostat put into the Record by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman] which contains a most irresponsible and vicious attack upon Mr. Dulles, then a Senator of the United States and one of the principal architects of our bipartisan policy, and which was signed not by some irresponsible fly-by-night organization, but was signed, according to the committee, by Pauline Fitzpatrick, chairman?

Mr. McCARTHY. I was aware of that fact.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. In furtherance of the questions raised by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Donnell], is the Senator from Wisconsin familiar with the fact that the House of Representatives took recognition of some of the publications and appointed a committee to investigate many of the charges made? Is he familiar with the results of the investigations?

Mr. McCARTHY. The results of the investigation of the publications?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the charges made against hundreds of citizens which resulted in Republicans and Democrats voting unanimously to discredit most of the charges.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure that I understand the import of the Senator's question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I asked the Senator if he is familiar with the fact that the House of Representatives, stirred up by

these charges, appointed a committee to look into them, that there was evidence before the House that charges had been preferred by employees of the Department without the faintest consultation with a single member of the committee, and that it resulted in new rules which prohibited them from issuing publications of this character. I wonder if the Senator wants to review the whole procedure of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I know, there is no Member of the House who has objected to the finding that Amerasia is a mouthpiece for the Communist Party.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that among those listed were many persons who held high political office, men who were even Members of the Congress of the United States, and would it not have been the duty of the House to expel Members who belonged to such organization?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is picking out one of the weakest bits of evidence and asking whether—

Mr. ANDERSON. I was somewhat disturbed by the questions of the Senator from Missouri who had not seen this list and might not be familiar with the fact that the House of Representatives itself has taken some recognition of the situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that when we find a person belonging to Communist organizations, then, under no circumstances, should they be permitted to represent the United States until we find out why they joined the Communist organization. In connection with Lattimore's connection with the Communist-front organizations, I invite attention to the fact that the American Legion has named him as one of the individuals who should, under no circumstances, be sponsored by any Legion group. The California Senate committee also named him as an individual who is writing subversive books for colleges or schools. It is the entire picture which is important. It is not the question of belonging to the Maryland association; it is the entire chain of events.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the Senator identified Lattimore with employment by the State Department? Was the man from Canada appointed to the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. He was appointed by the United Kingdom. Our State Department is not the head of that group. Even if we did not have evidence putting him at work in the State De-

partment, the fact remains that both Roosevelt and Truman considered Lattimore an expert on the Far East. Roosevelt, according to Wallace's book, pointed out that "this man is our greatest expert on Chinese-Russian relations." I believe you can ask almost any school child who the architect of our far-eastern policy is, and he will say, "Owen Lattimore."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico has made inquiry as to whether the Senator from Wisconsin knew of the fact that subsequently to the preparation of the lists from which I read the House of Representatives had taken notice of them and appointed committees, and that many persons were exonerated, or words to that effect. That may be entirely correct, but is it not a fact that two things are true, first, that the lists which I read are not mere lists which were presented to the committee, but are set forth in a report of the committee, and in this section of the report there will be found various things? Is it not also true that there has been no exoneration of Amerasia? Certainly if everyone else had been exonerated along the lines of the distinguished Senator's question, Jaffe's statement with reference to the charges to which the Senator has referred clearly demonstrates that there has been no exoneration of Amerasia set forth in the official report of the House Committee on Un-American activities.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is 100-percent correct. In that connection, I should like to point out that Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a man who has admitted and proclaimed to the world that he is a Communist, was editor of Amerasia for a considerable period of time.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator if he will permit me to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that at page 1446 of the official report, from which I have read, Frederick Vanderbilt Field is stated to be chairman of the editorial board, according to the issue of March 1943, and that according to the issue of August 1938, Frederick V. Field was shown to be chairman of the editorial board. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. In connection with that I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point a brief article entitled "Millionaire Communist—A Case

Study of Frederick Vanderbilt Field," published in the May 1949 issue of the magazine Plain Talk.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### MILLIONAIRE COMMUNIST—A CASE STUDY OF FREDERICK VANDERBILT FIELD

(By Archie Black)

Of the half dozen millionaire Communists in the United States, none provides a more fascinating case history than Frederick Vanderbilt Field. The great-great grandson of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, with an annual income well into the upper brackets, Mr. Field suffers none of the disabilities of a lowly proletarian.

A Vanderbilt without power, Frederick V. Field, as he prefers to be known, has hitched his star to the Communist chariot in pursuit of power. That, too, explains the servility which this Vanderbilt scion has displayed in the presence of Communist commissars. Furthermore, being a mediocre writer, Mr. Field has been able to satisfy his ambition of becoming a columnist in the pages of the Daily Worker. And the Communist movement sets up no barriers for the playboy; his volatile and fickle temperament can find ample expression in the Red pastures. Undoubtedly the analyst of the future will discover other psychological facets in the make-up of a millionaire Communist. As a social phenomenon, the type has hardly been studied.

Sympathy for oppressed peoples all over the world is the theme song for Mr. Field's writings. And it is said that, in general, he tries to practice what he preaches. On the occasions when he seems to revert to type and snub the proletariat, he does so through his eagerness to serve Moscow's higher-ups. An example occurred a few years ago when Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party, sent word that he was coming to see Field at the latter's office. Field rushed down to meet him. A lame Negro woman was waiting to take the elevator. At the sight of the party's grand sachem, Field became so flustered that he unceremoniously shoved the woman out of the way to make room for Browder, whom he escorted into the elevator.

A tall, slender man in his early forties, Field has a high brow and thin face which give him the air of an intellectual. Though he has never had to do a day's work at any gainful occupation, he works hard and earnestly for a multitude of party causes. Frequently he puts in long hours in his office at 23 West Twenty-sixth Street—a building which serves as headquarters for Communist fronts.

When Frederick Vanderbilt Field invited Whittaker Chambers to luncheon at the Vanderbilt Hotel in New York City in the middle 1930's, to discuss a certain crucial underground matter, Field was already closely linked to the Communist Party machine. Less than a decade earlier he had graduated from Harvard (class of 1927) where he had had a good academic record and had served, among other leading activities, as president of the Harvard Crimson. When he entered college, classmates of his say, he had little interest in politics. But

in the atmosphere of Harvard at the time that Laurence Duggan and Alger Hiss were also students, Field began to be converted to the political left.

After his graduation Field traveled to England to study at the school of economics of London University. Here the lectures of Harold Laski were influential in turning him further toward socialism. His break with his family past became apparent in the presidential campaign of 1928, when, after dallying with the idea of supporting Alfred E. Smith, he publicly endorsed Norman Thomas and became active in the affairs of the American Socialist Party. For a time he acted as secretary to Mr. Thomas. In 1928 he organized the League of First Voters, a group which had its origin in Harvard and which aimed to fight for liberalism and socialism.

During the early thirties Field grew more and more dissatisfied with the slowness of socialism in achieving reforms. Those who were intimate with him at the time report that he was obsessed with the idea of using quick action to get quick results. He viewed the Soviet Union as having succeeded. Like so many who began as Socialists, he turned to the more militant gospel of Stalinism. How large a part in his awakening to the true faith was played by Communist wooing of his ego can only be surmised.

One of Field's first party assignments was to help lead others down the road he had taken. Appropriately, it was the open-road tours to which he was detailed as president. This Communist-controlled travel outfit was designed to show Potemkin villages to visitors in the Soviet Union. That was before the iron curtain descended, but the innocents who took the tours saw only what the Kremlin wanted them to see.

By the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact in 1939, the Vanderbilt heir was an established toiler in the Communist Party vineyard and a willing slave of its Fuehrers. He undertook a major role in the Communist task of softening up America with "peace" propaganda, to block our preparedness against the Nazi aggressors. Field served as national secretary and one of the chief financial backers of the American Peace Mobilization (APM) launched in September 1940 — the Communist front which flooded the country with the slogan, "The Yanks Are Not Coming." Under his leadership, APM picketed the White House and opposed lend-lease and conscription as a spearhead of the attacks on our democracy.

"On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House," reported Attorney General Francis Biddle in the Congressional Record. Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union. No more antidefense propaganda was fed into the APM mimeograph machines. Superpatriotism and dedication to the "people's war against fascism" were the order of the day. And on February 13, 1942, Frederick Vanderbilt Field applied for a commission in the United States Army Military Intelligence.

After an investigation, the Army turned him down. Mr. Field was hurt; he was eager to aid the war effort. Why were his services refused? His stated reason for applying was that the Far East had

been his specialty. Actually, so far as is known, he has visited the Orient three times, living there for a year on one occasion.

It is as an authority on the Far East that Field has shone particularly in the varied theaters of Stalinist culture. He has given a lecture course on "The Far East in World Affairs" at the Jefferson School of Social Science—the party-line academy listed as subversive by the Attorney General, and of which Field was one of the organizers. He has written voluminously on Asiatic affairs for the Daily Workers, the New Masses (now Masses and Mainstream) and the highbrow Communist monthly, Political Affairs. Unfailingly these articles are full of diatribes against United States imperialism in the Pacific, against the iniquities of the Chinese Nationalists, and against United States interference with the course of democracy in China as it might be bestowed by the Communists under Mao Tse-tung.

The line Field follows is the same that has been peddled with such success to our State Department and our muddled intellectuals by the fellow-traveler writers and commentators. It is doubtful whether Field's party writings have influenced anyone outside the faithful who read the prescribed party organs. But through his Communist-front activities, he has aided in a more subtle plan to reach the public at large with propaganda designed to keep the United States out of the Orient so that the Soviet Union might have clear sailing there.

Appearing in pamphlets under the imprint of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR)<sup>1</sup> Field's party-line views won a wider audience. In 1929, after he left London, Field attended the third biennial conference of the IPR in Kyoto, Japan. He was to play a long and increasingly important role in this organization, leading to its almost complete Stalinization. Field was one of the eight members of the inner circle of the IPR's American Council—the executive committee of its board of trustees.

Field is no longer connected with IPR, which has purged itself of the Stalinist group that misdirected it. But he has a new vehicle for his activities in behalf of a Sovietized Asia. This front, with the high-sounding name of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, has Field and other Communists on its board of directors. The current program of the committee stresses that the United States should give no aid to Nationalist China, but should do business with and aid Communist China, and investigate the "China lobby" in Washington.

A secret directive of the Communist Party of New York State, dated March 1, 1949, and signed by May Miller, assistant organization secretary of the party, ordered all sections and counties of the party to plan action in their communities on the China question, following a special outline prepared by the committee. Miss Miller's letter to the comrades concluded:

"Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City."

Typical of Field's current line on China is a 15-page article signed by him which was published in the January 1949 issue of Political Af-

fairs (a magazine "devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism"). He rejoices that "under the leadership of the great Communist Party of China and its renowned chairman, Mao Tse-tung, the heroic Chinese people are discharging their duties with honor. The imperialists are being decisively beaten back in China." These are hardly novel sentiments for Field to express. What is new is this undisguised call to United States Communist action:

"It is incumbent on the American people, in the first place the American labor and progressive movements, not to overlook this opportunity to demand an end to all political, military, and financial intervention in China. It is our task, as American Communists, to help mobilize the forces of labor and all anti-imperialists in our country, to deal such further blows at Wall Street, that the Chinese New Democracy may consolidate its victories and move firmly and powerfully on the road toward socialism."

Though most of the millionaire Communist's thunder against the world intrigues of Wall Street is directed to the East, his concern for downtrodden colonial peoples extends also to Latin America and to Africa. He serves as executive vice president of the Council for Pan-American Democracy, which devotes most of its propaganda to opposing "United States imperialism" in Latin America. He has entertained Lombardo Toledano, the leading promoter of the Stalinist line in Latin American labor circles.

The executive secretary for the council is Marion Bachrach, a sister of John Abt, avowed pro-Soviet attorney whose wife, Jessica Smith, edits Soviet Russia Today. All three of them were members of the inner Russia First circle in Washington. It was a circle in which cocktails and the cause often mixed. And Frederick Vanderbilt Field served as a base for this mixture.

On October 21, 1945, for example, a quiet, unreported cocktail party was held at 16 West Twelfth Street, the private home of Mr. Field. About seventy persons were present and each paid \$100 for the privilege. The purpose of this exclusive gathering, far from the eyes of the press, was to raise funds for the Communist-controlled Council on African Affairs.

The chief notable was Paul Robeson. At such conclaves he speaks instead of singing. He told the sympathetic guests what was on his mind. He had recently made a tour of Europe for the USO and was distressed by what he had "seen," a distress that earlier had been announced by the Soviet Union. Fascist elements were still permitted to rule, according to Robeson. This was the result of State Department instructions to the American Military Government. Next, he indicted the Catholic Church; his accusation was that it was preaching the same Fascist sermons which, he charged, it had delivered under Hitler.

Later in the evening—the \$100 tariff not being satisfactory—an appeal was made for additional funds. This brought in \$3,500. A

<sup>1</sup>For two articles analyzing Communist influence in the IPR, see Plain Talk for December 1946 and January 1947.

buffet supper was then served; drinks were plentiful. The enlightened guests, clipped for the cause, happily discussed current events. Result: seventy persons, meeting privately, contributed \$10,500 for a Stalinist cause. Nobody, not even the neighbors and certainly not the press, knew or knows anything about this meeting which included among the guests Diana Forbes-Robertson and Muriel Draper.

Though Field held no office in the Council on African Affairs, he was evidently assigned by the party to keep an eye on its activities. His wife, Edith C. Field, served as treasurer of the council in 1946, at a time when its chairman, Paul Robeson, issued a call for a "Big Three Unity for Colonial Freedom" rally, held in Madison Square Garden.

The headquarters of the Council are in the four-story building at 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, which was purchased in 1944 by a partnership of Field, Yergan, & Field. It was actually Communist Party property, as subsequent events were to show. Dr. Max Yergan, executive director of the Council, who broke with the party in 1948, bought a one-third share in the building. The rest of the purchase price of \$30,000 was supplied by Field and his wife. When the break came between Yergan and the party, the latter employed the law firm of Pressman, Witt, & Cammer. It became obvious that they would protract the proceedings indefinitely, so Yergan settled for \$5,000. The majority of the Council, Yergan reported, were in favor of his position, but they resigned in protest against the Communist tactics. The organization was then taken over completely by the Communist Party.

The party building, which owes two-thirds of its purchase price to the Vanderbilt fortune, is listed by Mr. Field in the telephone book as his business address. Among the Communist fronts it houses are the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, which is especially active now in defense of Communist agents who never bothered to take out American citizenship; the Civil Rights Congress; the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; the National Defense Committee, under the aegis of Ferdinand Smith; the Council for Pan-American Democracy, and a district office of the American Labor Party. On the main floor is the elegantly furnished Frederick Vanderbilt Field Library, open to the public.

Sharing Field's interest in some of these causes is his wife, the former Edith Chamberlain Hunter, whom he married in 1937. She studied at the Katherine Branson School in Ross, Calif., as well as in New York and abroad, and was married previously to Phelps Stokes Hunter of Santa Barbara. Field's first marriage, to Elizabeth G. Brown of Duluth in 1929, ended in divorce 6 years later.

Field is a stockholder in other Stalinist enterprises. The Trade Union Service, Inc., of New York owns a number of labor papers, so-called, published for and by party-line trade unions. The law requiring publication of a statement of ownership has revealed that Field, together with Corliss Lamont and others, has a finger in this pie.

When the Wallace campaign cried for funds last summer, the Vanderbilt scion was quick with his checkbook. His contribution was \$5,000, the maximum permitted by law.

In 1945, Field was issued credentials to attend the top-secret sessions of the Communist Party at the time of Browder's deposition and Foster's ascension to the throne. A member of the organizing committee of the Jefferson School, and later a trustee, Field has served also as treasurer of the New York Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Journalistically, he has been associate editor of the New Masses, chairman of the editorial board of the pro-Communist *Amerasia*; legal owner of *People's Press*, edited and published by Frank L. Palmer, and many years a supporter of the party line.

The *Daily Worker* sent Field to San Francisco in May 1945, to report on the founding of the United Nations. While there he spoke at a meeting on the United Nations Conference presented by the Communist Political Association of San Francisco.

One of Field's UN columns, Molotov versus Vandenberg at Frisco, contrasted the two delegates and, quite naturally, favored the Soviet representative. He reported:

"Molotov has given the clearest expression to the views of those who believe the United Nations are here forming an international organization for the related purposes of eliminating the danger of future Fascist aggression and promoting democracy. The Michigan Senator is the leader of those elements who conceive the main task of the new organization to be the policing of the Soviet Union and the promotion of reaction."

Frederick Vanderbilt Field conceives his own main task to be that of a Soviet sentry in the United States. Molotovs may come and go, Soviet policies may be exposed as those of a most reactionary police state, one independent nation after another may fall under Stalin's iron heel, even Titos and Dimitrovs may be denounced by the Politburo as capitalist lackeys, but the intellectually adrift millionaire Communist will remain unswervingly loyal to the great Red father in the Kremlin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Incidentally, this man Field is no shrinking violet. Field uses the term "we American Communists." He is the man who created what is known as the American People's Fund, Inc. The sole purpose of the fund is to act as a repository for funds which are to be doled out to such Communist organizations as Field decides to name. There is no secret about it. He proclaims the fact publicly. He is a man with a great deal of money, which incidentally he did not earn, but inherited. No one who is on the board could have any conceivable doubt that the chairman of the board is a self-proclaimed and leading Communist. Actually, of course, Field is not a leader of Communists. The Communists are simply using him for his money. He would like to regard himself as a leader, and he has proclaimed himself as such, and he is the chairman of the editorial board. Therefore Lattimore could have had no doubt as to the nature of the organization.

One of Lattimore's subtle methods is to put his own ideas in the mouths of some hapless Mongol tribesman, or Chinese peasant, who cannot possibly refute Lattimore's assertions, and does not even know what sentiments are being ascribed to him by the learned professor. For instance at page 140 in *Solution in Asia*, he writes:

Let us take an Uighur in Sinkiang Province \* \* \* who learns that among his near kinsmen, the Soviet Uzbeks, a poor man's children may attend, free, a school at which they are taught in their own language \* \* \*; that they may go on to the university and become doctors, engineers, anything in the world \* \* \* then he is going to think that the Uzbeks are free and have democracy.

Incidentally, the professor is in error here. Stalin's subjects have had to pay for their high school and college education since 1941.

However, the main point is that this passage is clearly designed to batter down any doubts the reader may have, by confronting him with evidence of Lattimore's unique knowledge of people such as Uighurs and Uzbeks, whose names his audience cannot even pronounce and of whose existence they have never heard.

I certainly never heard of them until I took the trouble to read Lattimore's books, and I have probably pronounced Uighur incorrectly.

The poor Uighurs are forced to act as a ventriloquist's dummy in Lattimore's writing. When he thinks that it would be advisable to have someone voice his own admiration for the Soviet Union, Lattimore needs only to drag in some Uighur tribesman who are obviously not in a position to contradict him. Since no one else in America knows any Uighurs, Lattimore can safely ascribe to these nomads the greatest love and respect for Communist Russia. So, for instance, in his 1949 book, *The Situation in Asia*, he tells us how in 1949, he "ran into" some Uighur pilgrims on their way to Mecca via the Soviet Union, who said to him: "Haven't you heard? The Russians have democracy. They are good to Moslems."

After a perusal of Lattimore's writings, one begins to feel quite sorry for the Uighurs who have no one else to interpret their sentiments, and in all probability have no idea that a professor at Johns Hopkins has been telling the world how much they love communism.

Whereas Marco Polo found, when he returned to Venice from China and central Asia, that his true reports of this strange and unknown world were not believed, Owen Lattimore has been able to convince his readers and lecture audiences that his fantasies or untruths are the truth.

In passage after passage Lattimore slyly slips in big lies and small, always with the air of a detached observer and student of international affairs. In one place he casually refers to "the trend toward increased personal liberty and economic prosperity which has contributed so much to—Russia's—advantages in competing with us" for the favor of the peoples of Asia, as compared with our tardiness in "the evolution of democratic processes." In another place he refers to the grant by Moscow to Mongolia of "independent diplomatic representation and action." All the evidence available contradicts the first statement, and the second is simply not true. But how many Americans can be expected to know how things are in Mongolia?

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the hour is getting late, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a further analysis of the writings of Owen Lattimore, so that I may go on to the next case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In his book, *The Situation in Asia*, published in 1949, Lattimore has gone even farther in deceiving the American people than in his former writings. Also, something new has been added. Formerly, he urged us to recognize only the superior "power of attraction" of the great and good Soviet Union, and the virtues of the Chinese Communists. Now he is also seeking to awaken our fears. This book of his seeks to convince us that, whether or not we like communism, the Soviet Union and its adherents all over the world are certain to win, so we had better appease them if we want to avoid destruction. For instance, he writes: "clearly the Communist ascendancy had become so decisive that it would not be reversed."

It would seem that Lattimore, and others like him, had only two choices after it became increasingly clear to the American people that they had been deluded concerning the nature and aims of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists. They had either to retreat, or advance to the offensive. To retreat would have meant that they would be forced to admit: (a) that the Soviet government is neither peace-loving nor democratic nor "progressive," but a totalitarian tyranny; (b) that the Chinese Communists are not nice liberal agrarian reformers unconnected with Moscow, but very "real" Com-

munists under Moscow's orders. To retreat would have meant that Lattimore and his friends in the State Department must sacrifice their reputations and possibly their jobs since they would have exposed themselves as ignoramuses or liars.

Having once hitched their wagons to the Soviet star, they had either publicly to recant, or convince us that the Communists are destined to win and so force us to give way to them. Lattimore has chosen the latter course.

In The Situation in Asia he tries to maintain his reputation as an objective and scholarly student of world affairs by admitting to a few unpleasant facts about the Soviet Union and the Communists which are by now too well known to be denied; but his main effort is directed toward frightening us into pursuing a policy of appeasement, by demonstrating that we have no hope at all of stopping the triumphant advance of communism because we are much weaker than we know.

Whereas formerly, when the climate of American opinion was favorable to the Soviet Government, Lattimore forbore to mention anything bad in Russia, he now writes: "No propaganda can hide (from Russia's neighbors) the fact that there is good and bad in Russia."

Since his readers must be expected to know that the Soviet satellite countries are not happy under the Communist yoke, and that Yugoslavia has broken with Russia, Lattimore can no longer rely in putting across his propaganda on the complete ignorance of his readers. Instead, he seeks to turn the tables on America by arguing that Stalin's abandonment of persuasion for compulsion in dealing with subject peoples is due to fear of an American attack and the necessity to consolidate the defenses of the Socialist world against imperialist America. He writes: "When under the pressure of a war scare the Russians feel that there is no time to take it easy, to explain and persuade, or to ease the transitional processes from capitalism to socialism in countries like Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, or Outer Mongolia. They sacrifice the federalizing aspects of nominal political voting equality between big and little states in the cominform to what they think is the compelling need for harsh military centralization."

Thus, Lattimore argues, the "Tito crisis broke into the open when in the spring of 1948 \* \* \* we (meaning America) prepared to go onto a war footing."

Lattimore manages even to blame America for Russia's looting of Manchuria. "The Russians," he writes, "were afraid that Manchuria, if its industries were left a going concern, might be turned into an American stronghold on the doorstep of Siberia so they gutted the factories of Manchuria as they withdrew."

Maybe, Lattimore says, this was a bit hard on the Chinese Communists, who were sure they could hold Manchuria, and were loyal to Russia in all questions of common world policy. But, he remarks, "This ruthless example of the sacrifice of the interests of non-Russian Communists has not diminished the Russian power of attraction in Asia."

In this book, as shown by the above quotation, Lattimore has silently abandoned his former pretense that the Chinese Communists are not real Communists. The admission that they are under Moscow's orders is used instead to frighten us, now that they control all of China. This in turn is used as an argument for appeasement. Briefly his argument runs as follows:

"The Soviet Union is not at the moment in a position to give economic aid to Communist China, so if America will give such aid without asking for anything in return, if we will refrain from using our economic power to force political concessions, we may be able to prevent all Asia joining up with the Soviet Union against us."

One has only to read the published report of Mr. Acheson's speech to the National Press Club last January to see how closely the State Department line follows the Lattimore line.

The first chapters of *The Situation in Asia* are replete with warnings to America to recognize the limits to our power. He tells us we just have not got what it takes. Russia, he tells us, is stronger than we are largely because of her greater power of attraction, and although the Communist band wagon is not yet completely repaired, anyone who does not jump on it now is a fool, because communism represents progress and is therefore bound to win eventually.

In this book, Lattimore reveals why he is on the side of the Communists. He writes: "To be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down."

True, he does not directly assert that he believes this; he says this is Communist theory. But he makes it quite clear that he agrees by telling his readers that when Russians read Stalin's formula for revolution "they are convinced of the farsight and wisdom of their leaders, and have the feeling that their country and their cause are going forward on the tide of history." Stalin's formula, Lattimore continues, "is so electrifyingly exact that it should be studied with cautious respect."

The belief that the Communists are going forward on the tide of history is the keynote of Lattimore's philosophy and teachings. Clearly he is determined to be on the side of the powerful, because, as he tells us, power is the only thing which counts. And since he believes that the Soviets are more powerful than America, he is naturally on the side of the Communists. If, however, America would only stop worrying about moral issues and decide to adopt Communist methods and the Communist philosophy, Lattimore might decide to stick by us.

The issue, Lattimore repeats again and again, "is one of power." Americans are just silly to think that moral issues are important. Besides, we aren't moral anyhow, since everything we do is in our own self-interest. The only reason we do not always act like imperialists is that we sometimes find it more profitable not to do so. The only reason, for instance, that we have behaved better in the Philippines than other western powers in their Asiatic colonies is that we just did not need or want Philippine raw materials or sugar.

In case any Americans, inspired by Lattimore's philosophy, should

start demanding that we use such power as we have to stop the Communist conquest of Asia, Lattimore hastens to add that there is just one exception to his "power decides" formula. "In China," he warns us, "moral attitudes will take precedence in deciding the future." Since, according to Lattimore, Russia is way ahead of us with respect to moral attitudes in the eyes of Asiatics, we should not imagine that we can win. Our failure so far in China is in fact due to our unmoral attempt to foist a dictatorship on the Chinese people. Soviet Russia has succeeded because she advances by "political infiltration or persuasion which is a moral question."

These totally false arguments are based on an equally false premise, namely, that America did her level best to aid the Chinese National Government and thus prevent the seizure of power by the Communists. The facts are entirely different. But since the State Department has misled the American people in respect to the amount of aid we gave to Chiang Kai-shek's government, Lattimore is here on ground where his ability to tell persuasive untruths has free rein.

Now, Mr. Lattimore is "a great authority" on China. He cannot, therefore, plead ignorance of the true facts. He must know that General Marshall embargoed all arms and ammunition to China in July 1946; that this embargo was not even partially lifted until a year later; and that the first shipment of arms voted for China by the Congress in 1948 did not start arriving until the end of that year. So he must know he is not telling the truth when on page 152 of his book, he writes how much better it would have been "if military aid to the Kuomintang had been suspended," or again, when on page 147 he writes: "All during the period of General Marshall's mission, the Kuomintang kept accumulating American supplies."

Far from giving his readers the facts, he again and again misinforms them about the course and motivation of American policy in China. The incontrovertible facts are that General Marshall was sent to China in December 1945, to try and force the National Government to share power with the Communists. This was the announced purpose of his mission, as shown by President Truman's public statement on December 15, 1945, in which he said that unless and until the Communists were given "fair and equitable representation" in a coalition government, all economic or other aid would be denied to the Chinese Government. Yet Lattimore, far from admitting that United States policy was designed to help the Communists acquire at least equal power with the Nationalists, refers to "American attempts to maintain indirect control (in China) by backing one side against the other in a civil war"; and continues: "The grandiose and disastrous American attempt to determine the character and outcome of the Chinese civil war \* \* \* proved that America does not have the kind of power that can settle Chinese issues" (p. 43).

Further on in his book, Lattimore is indiscreet enough to repeat almost verbatim the charge made by the Chinese Communist radio against America. He writes at page 165:

"It took 3 years and from two to four billion dollars of American money to prove the uselessness of an American attempt to imitate this early Japanese policy in China."

I could cite many other quotations from Lattimore's writings to demonstrate his anti-Americanism. As against his totally unfair and untrue diatribe against America, he insists that Soviet policy "cannot fairly be called Red imperialism." "It certainly," he continues, "establishes a standard with which other nations must compete if they wish to practice a policy of attraction in Asia. Russo-Mongol relations in Asia, like Russo-Czechoslovak relations in Europe, deserve careful and respectful study."

I shall confine myself to mentioning only a few of the most blatant untruths Lattimore has written on other matters. In order to make us believe that Moscow has little or no control over the Chinese Communists, he makes the following false assertion: "The top political and military leadership (of the Chinese Communist Party) is not Moscow trained." Mr. Lattimore, who has been called the best informed American on Asiatic affairs living today, certainly must know this is not true. He is deliberately deceiving his readers. For the Chinese Communists themselves have been proud to acknowledge the fact that almost all of the important leaders of the Chinese Communist Party are Moscow-trained. Among the many names which could be cited are the following:

Chou En-lai, who headed the Communist delegation which negotiated with General Marshall in Chungking in 1946. Chou En-lai was for years the representative of the Communist Party in China's war-torn capitals and acted as a sort of Communist Ambassador. His charming manners and skill in representing the Communists as democrats is thought to have been largely responsible for General Marshall's falling into the trap set by Moscow.

Today he is Premier and Foreign Minister of the Chinese Communist Government at Peking.

Li Li-san spent 15 years in Moscow before returning in 1945 to his native land with the Russian Red Army, to become the Communist boss of Manchuria, and Stalin's personal watchdog over the Chinese Communist Party.

The Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco United Nations Conference in 1945 was Tung Pi-wu, also a Moscow-trained Communist. Subsequently he became head of the Communist government in Peking after it capitulated to the Communists.

Liu Shao-chi, vice chairman of the present Chinese Communist government, is Moscow-trained.

Jen Pi-shih, the economic dictator of Communist China, is Moscow-trained.

Yeh Chien-ying, the present Communist boss of Canton, who was formerly the Communist delegate to the executive headquarters set up by General Marshall in Peiping in 1946 to direct the true terms which were supposed to stop the civil war, is another famous Communist leader who was trained in Moscow.

Gen. Liu Po-cheng, the Communist boss of southwest China, known as the one-eyed dragon, is yet another Moscow-trained Communist.

Wang Miu, otherwise known as Chen Shao-yu, a most important man in China, was for years the Chinese representative on the executive committee of the Comintern and is Stalin's personal disciple.

Liu Shoa-chi, leading theorist of the Chinese Communist Party, was also Moscow-trained.

Even the Chief of Staff of the Chinese Communist armies, Nich Yung-chun, was trained for his job in Russia.

And if one takes the Chinese Communist leaders, such as Chu Teh, who were not actually trained in Moscow, one usually finds that they were educated in Germany or France by Comintern agents.

Let me mention a few other typical Lattimorisms:

"Greece is a doubtful stronghold because it is a stronghold in which the garrison is besieged by the populace."

In other words, the Greeks wanted to be ruled by a Communist tyranny.

Another:

"Every one of the east European governments, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, had been Fascist or semi-Fascist."

Another untruth. Poland had a predominantly liberal and Socialist government in exile. Nor is it correct to describe Yugoslavia under its monarchy as Fascist. Mihailovitch, murdered by Tito, after leading the Siberian anti-Nazi forces, can by no stretch of the imagination be designated as a Fascist. But Lattimore makes it clear throughout his book that he accepts the Communist definition of a Fascist as identical with a supporter of a capitalist, or free-enterprise system, such as we have in America.

Having done his best, and a very good best it was, to influence American policy along a line which would lead to the defeat of our loyal ally, the Nationalist government of China, and to the Kremlin's conquest of China, Mr. Lattimore is now busy telling us that it is too late to do anything; that there is no longer anything but a corpse in China for us to support. In a debate against Senator Ferguson, on the American Forum of the Air in Washington, on May 9, last year, Lattimore said:

"Senator, I think we ought to try to get down to the basic realities of the situation. \* \* \* From the American point of view, what can American policy do in the situation? \* \* \* (we are left) with nothing there to support, so we cannot talk of the interests we would have defended if there were something there for us to support."

In Solution in Asia, Lattimore was intent on proving that the Chinese Communists were independent of Russia. He writes (p. 94): "The Chinese Communists were so isolated \* \* \* that they could not receive arms or any other help from Russia, while the intensity of the fight for survival made it impossible for them to slacken or strengthen their civil-war efforts in accordance with 'directives' from either the Third International or the Soviet government. They were on their own."

The period referred to is the late thirties. Now, Mr. Lattimore

reads both Chinese and Russian so, if he is in fact the eminent authority he is represented to be, he must have studied the writings and proclamations of the Chinese Communists. So he cannot plead ignorance of the fact that Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, was then on record as follows—I quote from the Chinese Handbook on Party Organization:

“According to the constitution of the Chinese Communist Party, all who recognize the constitution and rules and program of the Communist International and the \* \* \* Chinese Communist Party may become party members. \* \* \* The Chinese Communist Party was born with the help of the Communist International; it grew up under the guidance of the Communist International, and the Chinese revolution developed under the guidance of the Communist International. The Chinese Communist Party and its central committee, with the exception of the two short periods, have been loyal to the guidance of the Communist International. \* \* \* To carry out the International line and to be loyal to the executive committee of the Communist International is to guarantee the success of the Chinese revolution.”

During this same period when, according to Professor Lattimore, the Chinese Communists were on their own, their representative on the executive committee of the Comintern, Comrade Wang Min, wrote as follows in the December 1937 issue of the Communist International:

“The Chinese Communist Party is guided by the new line of tactics of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, and the historic report made by Comrade Dimitrov.” This historical report I should here explain was the one in which Dimitrov laid down the trojan horse tactic for Communists everywhere in the world. They were instructed at this Comintern Congress to get influence inside the liberal movements everywhere by pretending to be democrats in order to destroy the non-Communist world from within.

Comrade Wang Min, in his article, explained that abandonment of the policy of overthrow of the Kuomintang Government, and the pretense of being disciples of Dr. Sun Yat Sen, was only a tactic, and once Japan was defeated the slogan of a Soviet China would be revived.

Now I am ready to believe that Mr. Jessup and Mr. Acheson were so innocent and ignorant as to be taken in by this transparent stratagem. But I do not believe that Professor Lattimore was just an innocent dupe. Not only does Professor Lattimore pride himself on his scholarship and intimate knowledge of Russian and Chinese affairs, but we also have direct evidence to show that he himself participated in Moscow in working out the tactics to be pursued in deluding the American and other peoples concerning Moscow's designs and plans.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in passing I should like to deal briefly with a rather fantastic bill of goods which Lattimore and his friends are trying to sell to the American people and which they apparently are with some success selling to some few members of the press and radio.

I understand that a national magazine of some prominence has been taken in rather completely and is about to run a picture story on it. A well-known radio commentator really swallowed the story hook, line, and sinker. If he is in the gallery, and would like to take a half gainer to the floor, I shall ask the pages to get out of the way.

Sunday night I heard him very dramatically tell his listeners that this man Lattimore, whom McCarthy accused of being a Communist, rescued the Living Buddha from Mongolia—the Living Buddha, who escaped from Mongolia a step ahead of the Russians.

The reason for bringing the Living Buddha to Baltimore, where he is now teaching at Johns Hopkins, was to have him available when the time came for Mongolia to start its drive upon Russia. According to this radio commentator—I do not have a transcript of the radio address—the Baltimore Living Buddha is to all Mongolians what the Pope is to all Catholics, and the day will come when all Mongolians will rally around the Living Buddha and wrest Asia from Communist control.

I do not blame him so much for having been taken in, because, after all, very few of us have had any reason to make a detailed study of the politics of Mongolia.

I think this is significant in view of the fact that Lattimore and his friends have been making such a tremendous attempt to foist such a fantastic story on the American people as proof that Lattimore cannot be a Communist.

A number of things should be mentioned, however, one is that if this living Buddha fled from Moscow ahead of the Russians, it must have been about 25 years ago, because Russia has had almost absolute control of Mongolia for approximately that period of time. Also it should be mentioned that living Buddhas actually are not very scarce in Mongolia, in that they are merely priests or ministers of Lamaism.

Normally, I would not want to take the Senate's time with this subject, but I do think that because of the fact that there is apparently an attempt to use this living Buddha as proof that Lattimore is a loyal American, it might be well to give you a very brief picture of just how important to the politics of Asia is the Baltimore living Buddha.

Lamaism is a form of Buddhism believed chiefly by peoples of Tibet and Mongolia, and is a mixture of Buddhism and shamanistic practices.

Lamaism believes in reincarnation. After the death of a Hutuktu, that is, the living Buddha, his spirit is said to reappear in the person of some boy born at the time of his death, and thus comes forth reembodyed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Holland in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like, if I may, to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to this question. I interrogated the Senator a little while ago in regard to some observations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944. I call another matter to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, and ask him for whatever observations, if any, he sees fit to make upon it. I refer to the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, which occurred in September 1949, and particularly to a part of each of two pages referring to Frederick Vanderbilt Field, to whom the Senator referred. I ask the Senator what comment he will make upon what I shall read.

A question was asked by Mr. Dekom, who is one of the staff of the Senate committee, as follows:

Are you familiar with the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

The witness, a Mr. Huber, said:

Yes; I am. That is a Communist front set up to promote the Communists in China and the Far East generally; that is, to propagandize the American people on behalf of communism in Asia. This organization was formed at the home of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who is an ardent supporter of the Communist Party as well as a writer for its publications. In connection with this organization, I was able to attend a closed meeting of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy held in the library of the building at 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, which houses the offices of a number of Communist-front organizations. Paul Robeson has his offices there. The building is owned by Frederick Field. Only known

persons were admitted to this meeting, and about 60 were present. Ira Golubilin was the chairman.

Then, at page 580, referring to a meeting held December 3, 1944, he said:

On December 3, 1944, I attended a party of leading Communist functionaries in this country given at the home of Seymour Copstein, a Communist professor, honoring Alexander Trachtenberg. Trachtenberg is the president of International Publishers, the Communist publishing house in New York City; a member of the national committee of the Communist Party; and on the board of directors of the Jefferson School of Social Science.

There were about 30 people present, and admission was by invitation only. Only old and trusted friends of Trachtenberg were invited. Entertainment was furnished by Richard Dyer-Bennett, who sang and played folk songs of Russia.

Then he gives a list of the guests, saying, "The guests included," and among others is the name of Frederick V. Field. Mr. Lattimore was at one time a member of the Amerasia Board, but I would not say, without reference again to the papers, which I do not have before me, that he was a member at the same time Mr. Field was, but I ask, does the information in this hearing, developed in the testimony before the Senate committee in 1949, indicate to the mind of the Senator that Frederick V. Field possessed the qualifications which the Senator has previously indicated, namely, of "close communistic affiliations"?

Mr. McCARTHY. Field goes beyond that. There can be no doubt about Field. He himself said, "I am one of the leading Communists." He himself said, "My mission is to communize the world." He is deluded by the idea that the Communists consider him as a leader. Actually the Communists in this country consider him as a stooge, whose money they use.

Mr. DONNELL. Without reference to documents, a moment ago I said I was unable to state whether Mr. Field and Mr. Lattimore had been on the board at the same time. I call attention to the fact that on page 1446 of the House hearings it is recited that the editorial board consisted of Field as chairman, Jaffe as managing editor, and several other members, including Mr. Owen Lattimore.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall develop that point later. Frederick V. Field was also on the board of trustees of the American Council of IRP, as was also Alger Hiss, as was also Owen Lattimore, as was also Philip Jessup.

In 1947 one of the members of the board, one of the good American members, insisted that there be an investigation to determine the extent to which the Communists had taken over control of the American Council of IRP. That was very vigorously opposed. Keep in mind that at that time Frederick V. Field was a member of the board. Hiss was then a member, or was shortly thereafter. Lattimore was a member of the board. One of the men who vigorously protested, and sent a letter over his name, which I have, objecting strenuously to any such investigation, was our Ambassador at Large, Phillip Jessup. I intend to go into that later. So this man Field has had many activities. For the information of Senators, I have a photostat of the letter which I shall place in the Record later, to show how Field used some of his money. I wish the Senator from Missouri would not ask any questions about that now.

The most important Hutuktu—living Buddha—is the Dalai Lama, who is the temporal head of Tibet. The next in importance is the Panchan Lama, who is technically the spiritual head of Tibet. During recent decades, however, the Panchan Lama was driven out of Tibet by the Dalai Lama, and now the Chinese Communists are using the Panchan Lama as a puppet to regain control in Tibet. The temporal and spiritual head of Tibet is therefore the Dalai Lama, with headquarters in Lahsa, Tibet.

The other important Hutuktu, the Djebtsung Damba Hutuktu, was not reembodied since 1924.

Of the important living Hutuktus, the following are the most prominent: Changchia Hutuktu, Galdan Siretu Hutuktu, Minchur Hutuktu, Chilung Hutuku, Namuka Hutuktu, Achia Hutuktu, Lakuo Hutuktu, Tsahantarkhan Hutuktu.

A Hutuktu—living Buddha—thus is a religious title. It is not hereditary, but chosen by the process of reincarnation. It represents the top of a series of religious offices. There are, however, hundreds of Hutuktus existing simultaneously, and there are some who are more important than others. The relative importance is mostly determined by the territory over which each exercises control, and there are Hutuktus who control no territory at all.

The Mongols do not live exclusively in Mongolia. Wherever there are Mongols, they are divided traditionally into leagues — such as Ulanchab League, the Ikhchao League, the Alashan League, and so forth—and the leagues are in turn di-

vided into banners. The Hutuktus—living Buddhas—sometimes are heads of these leagues; these are important. Others are heads of banners; they are less important. Still others only get the title without any territory; they are the least important.

Diluwa Hutuktu—now teaching in Johns Hopkins University—comes from the Mongols in the Chinese Province of Ching-hai, with headquarters at Kokonor—Blue Sea.

So far as I know he never was in Mongolia. So it must have been that one of his ancestors escaped ahead of the Communists by fleeing from Mongolia.

The Kokonor Mongols are divided into two leagues and 29 banners. They are a very minor branch of the Mongolian race, because Kokonor is overwhelmingly populated by Mohammedans.

Although Lattimore's Diluwa is a Hutuktu by reason of religious attainment, he is the head of neither a league nor a banner and is a very minor figure, he is not included in any list of living Buddhas, such as the list given above.

Diluwa Hutuktu is primarily a religious teacher, with a handful of disciples, some now in Baltimore, and some in Tibet. He has none in Mongolia.

The whole edifice of Mongolian Government is guided very strictly by the rule of seniority. It is not possible for an individual priest, whatever his rank in the religious hierarchy, to achieve any degree of power and allegiance unless he has followed the trodden path of promotion.

In this connection I have before me an affidavit—this is the affidavit which I asked the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman] to glance at—of an American citizen who, for a considerable period of time, edited several newspapers in China and who knew Lattimore while he was in China.

It deals in complete detail with background facts which explain rather clearly why the Living Buddha and his two friends are in Baltimore. This affidavit is also being turned over to the FBI. I might say that this affidavit certainly does not indicate any great plan to use this Living Buddha to reconquer Asia from the Communists. In fact, I might say it deals with nothing grand of any nature.

We next come to Dr. Philip Jessup who is an important part of this entire picture. Perhaps the kindest thing that can be said about Dr. Jessup is that he was simply an unwitting but very

willing stooge of the brilliant Owen Lattimore. Unfortunately, however, the damage which he has done is as great as though he were selling out for 30 pieces of silver.

Mr. Jessup, either knowingly or otherwise, became the very, very valuable tool of the Communists in 1943. In order to fully understand the picture at that time it might be well to again recite some history of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "IPR—Tokyo Axis," written by Sheppard Marley, and published in the December 1946 issue of Plain Talk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Holland in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

#### IPR—TOKYO AXIS

(By Sheppard Marley)

Some time ago the Institute of Pacific Relations placed the following notice in the personals column of the Saturday Review of Literature:

"Long on curiosity—short on time? IPR popular pamphlets make you a scintillating conversationalist on the Far East. You can deftly discuss everything from Australian slang to the problems of China and the Philippines. Send for a list of Institute of Pacific Relations pamphlets today. Box 939-K."

If a reader of this semi-intellectual lonely-hearts column had made a slight error in the box number and written to 938-K instead of the IPR's 939-K, she would have received an answer from the gentleman who inserted the following notice in the same issue: "Will lady in a quiet castle seek spiritual relaxation through exchange of correspondence with a highly learned gentleman?"

What the IPR copy writer deftly neglected to mention in this prospectus designed for the busy dilettante was that the publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations are likely to make the deft conversationalist sound similar to a Daily Worker editorial, though on a much more genteel level. For the IPR is still another of the respectable moneyed organizations into which fellow travelers have infiltrated and have developed workers in their own image. The peculiar conjuncture of social conditions and psychological ailments which has resulted in the dissemination of Stalinist propaganda by groups supported mainly with capitalist money is a problem for the academicians. Here we merely offer another case study.

The Institute of Pacific Relations came into being in July 1925, in Honolulu, at an international conference of which the chief engineer was Mr. Edward C. Carter, the present executive vice chairman of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations and apparently its most influential officer. The intricate nature of the administrative set-up of the Institute makes it ideal for control by a few

well placed persons. Small wonder then that many of its leading and most prolific writers are dependable fellow travelers who faithfully follow the tortuous path Stalin sets—even if they have to slow down around the sharp turns of Soviet policy.

The institute's activity seldom reaches any large section of the public directly, and few persons know that it exists. It is doubtful if 1 out of 1,000 of the parents of boys who fought their way across the Pacific, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa, has ever heard of this organization. Yet in Government circles, including those where America's high policy in the Pacific is determined, the influence of the Institute of Pacific Relations has been enormous and is apparently growing.

During the recent war, the Institute supplied many agencies with experts on the Far East. Four IPR staff members worked for the China section of the UNRRA. Three others did research for MacArthur's headquarters on Japanese reconstruction. William L. Holland was the head of the OWI in China. Owen Lattimore was President Roosevelt's gift to Chiang Kai-shek for a time and President Truman's special adviser to MacArthur as well as Far Eastern head of OWI. The IPR supplied lesser lights to the OWI, OSS, and the State Department. Not all of these workers who joined Governmental agencies were Communists or fellow travelers. The IPR, however, frequently provided research specialists who were interested mainly in the furthering of Stalin's aims in the Far East.

Many IPR trustees reached positions of considerable importance. In 1941, Lauchlin Currie was President Roosevelt's special emissary to China. William C. Johnstone worked on a special assignment for the State Department. George E. Taylor was director of the OWI's Far Eastern Section and later in the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Benjamin Kizer, a Spokane lawyer, headed the UNRRA in China.

The Institute's aid to the Government was not limited to supplying experts of varying degrees, for the Government bought 750,000 IPR pamphlets for soldiers in the Pacific and Asiatic theaters. Schools, too, have been influenced by IPR publications, especially the series published jointly with the Webster Co. of St. Louis, designed for a 14-year-old reading level. In three and a half years this series sold over a million copies.

Another way in which the IPR influences public opinion is through the newspapers and periodical press. As the IPR itself does not tire of saying, no one seems to know anything about the Far East. The harried editorial writer is immeasurably pleased, then, when he sees on his desk a neat publicity release and a copy of an article on some aspect of Chinese politics which he can now proceed to discuss as deftly as though he had read the IPR's notice in the *Saturday Review of Literature*.

Like most associations into which the Communists and fellow travelers have moved, the IPR reveals certain inconsistencies and peculiarities of policy that can be explained only by the ideological affiliations of its most important figures.

Operating more cleverly in IPR than in most groups they have entered, the Communists and their friends have been able to keep the

reputation of this outfit pretty clean. But evidence of their work is easily noted when one takes the IPR material in bulk and breaks it down into two types—the controversial and noncontroversial. What has buffaloeed most readers of IPR books, pamphlets, and periodicals is that so much of the stuff is of a very scholarly nature, not at all on subjects that arouse the emotions any more readily than do articles on Chinese pottery. Yet in the last decade or so at least two out of every three articles in IPR's two journals—Pacific Affairs, quarterly, and Far Eastern Survey, biweekly—on such hot subjects as Chinese politics, the Soviet Union, and the general political situation in the Far East, with respect to those two countries and the United States, have been written by such staunch defenders of Stalin as T. A. Bisson, Owen Lattimore, Harriet Moore, Laurence Salisbury, and others not too numerous to mention in due time.

It may be claimed that by selecting excerpts and quoting "out of context" any writer can be shown to believe almost anything. This is frequently true. Yet the weight of the evidence that links the IPR to the Communist line is too great to pass off with such platitudes. The writings of the fellow travelers and outright Communists in IPR publications constitute only a small part of the total IPR material—but they constitute its most vital part, and they deal with the subjects that are most significant for American foreign policy, international relations, and public education.

The IPR's chief method of disclaiming responsibility for what appears under its sponsorship is to include a statement in its publications that the views expressed are those of the writers, not of the IPR or any of its component units. But no one is ever fooled by such disavowals, not even IPR people. Owen Lattimore, who edited the IPR quarterly Pacific Affairs from 1934 to 1941, wrote in a report of the IPR secretariat in 1936: "The fact that there is a printed notice in each number [of Pacific Affairs] specifically declaring that each contributor is personally responsible for his own statements of opinion and that neither the national councils nor the institute as a whole can be held responsible has meant little."

The IPR has often protested that it does not select its writers according to their political beliefs, but because of their scholarship and research ability. One wonders, nevertheless, whether the bulk of the IPR publications would yield an impression any different from the one it does now if it were not being used as a front for Communist propaganda. It could hardly do better work for Stalin even if it had been set up by his agents.

The Institute of Pacific Relations is composed of 10 member bodies from each of the following countries: Australia, Canada, China, France, Netherlands-Netherlands Indies, New Zealand, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States. The Pacific Council, nominally the ruling body, has one representative from each of these national councils. With the members of the Pacific Council scattered over thousands of miles there is little centralized control. Actually the American council is the main unit, and the one most familiar to Americans as well as the one most afflicted with the disease of Stalinist apologetics. Like the parent organization, the

American Council is itself a nightmare of administrative complexity. In recent years there has been no meeting of the membership, which now is just below 2,000.

Genuine power in the American Council of the IPR is vested in the executive committee of the board of trustees. Of the eight members of this ruling group, the four most vocal are Communists and fellow travelers. This is what the broad and respectable front of IPR conceals. The big four are Edward C. Carter, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Harriet L. Moore, and Owen Lattimore. All four, with the recent exception of Field, who has joined the Communist Party, move exclusively on the higher levels of gentility in American academic and political life.

Edward C. Carter, the leading light in the IPR, is not the intellectual type. He has written rather infrequently, but his affiliations are nevertheless enlightening. For many years he was on the board of directors of the American-Russian Institute, which publishes a quarterly dedicated to the scholarly adulation of all that takes place in Stalin's Russia. He has contributed to *Soviet Russia Today*, a less esoteric market for pro-Soviet articles. In 1938 he signed a statement, published in that magazine, defending the Moscow mock trials. During most of the war years he was a member of the board of directors of Russian War Relief.

The case of Frederick Vanderbilt Field is more obvious. Now a member of the Communist Party, Field is the *Daily Worker's* special expert on the Far East, and an associate editor of the Communist weekly, *New Masses*.

Harriet L. Moore has the usual Communist-front connections. She was secretary of the Russian War Relief and a member of the board of directors of the American-Russian Institute, whose publications she edits. She has also been on the editorial board of *Amerasia*, long a tooter of Stalin's horn among those interested in Far Eastern affairs. This is the magazine which figured as the focal point in the State Department espionage case, as reported by E. S. Larsen in *Plain Talk* for October.

Of the four chief policy makers of IPR, Owen Lattimore is the best known and most respected in academic circles. He is now director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University. He too had served his stint on the editorial board of *Amerasia*, and has defended the Moscow purge trials.

Through his editorship of the quarterly, *Pacific Affairs*, from 1934 to 1941, Owen Lattimore was able to exert considerable influence in IPR. When he took it over, *Pacific Affairs* was dull, unknown, and devoted mainly to research and statements apparently carefully pruned to remove the slightest trace of a positive point of view about anything more controversial than the depth of the Sulu Sea. As fascism spread and the threat of war increased, Lattimore published articles that took a forthright stand, but in general he followed the popular front line then in vogue. *Pacific Affairs* contained contributions generally favorable to Soviet Russia, against America's neutrality policy, and in praise of the Chinese Communists.

Is the IPR a pressure group or a research outfit? The letter from

Owen Lattimore to Edward C. Carter, which we are publishing on page 18, a remarkable document in several respects, should settle this question once and for all, although the stream of highly opinionated writing emanating from the IPR for years furnishes a clear-enough answer. Three characteristics stand out in a study of the IPR publications:

First, there is not to be found in its literature any fundamental criticism of the Soviet Union, either of its internal regime or its foreign policy.

Second, there has been abundant and vigorous criticism of the Chinese Government and, especially in recent years, equally strong and prominent espousal of the cause of the Chinese Communists.

Third, there was until Pearl Harbor relatively little criticism on the part of the IPR of Japan's internal regime or its foreign policy.

Indeed, in the light of the accompanying letter from Mr. Lattimore to Mr. Carter and of the additional pieces of evidence as to the IPR's ties with the Japanese imperialists, there is room for a congressional inquiry into this still dark field. In a subsequent article, we shall deal with the first two aspects of the IPR's activity, namely, its pro-Soviet and anti-Chiang Kai-shek stands. Here we shall confine ourselves to five salient features of the strange marriage between the IPR and the Japanese war lords:

1. Owen Lattimore wrote his letter on May 19, 1938, less than 10 months after Japan launched its undeclared war on China and but a few weeks after Hitler's annexation of Austria, events which were regarded in Moscow as the beginnings of World War II. In this mis-sive Mr. Lattimore proposed the dismemberment of China and a settlement with Japan on the basis of "what China is and what Japan is, as of 1939, rather than what either country was as of 1936." The occasion for this communication was a memorandum by a Chinese pro-Communist, Chen Han-seng, who had outlined a study of Chinese foreign policy to cover the period of 1931-39. Mr. Carter, upon the receipt of the extraordinary letter, is on record in a memorandum, dated May 20, 1938, addressed to Miriam Farley of the IPR, as follows: "This morning I have received Owen Lattimore's comment with which, of course, I agree." All that remains to be added on this point is that neither Mr. Lattimore nor Mr. Carter made clear the purpose of the proposed settlement. Was it intended to help Japan retain the vast areas in North China gained by her aggression or to enable the Chinese Communists to extend their domains as they did in 1945?

2. Lattimore's suggestion, with which Mr. Carter agreed, contemplated direct action by the IPR in the political field, something which it has been at pains to deny frequently. As recently as October 24, 1946, Mr. Carter wrote to a critic of his organization: "The IPR is not an action group, and I can assure you it has never set up an action group of any nature whatever." It is obvious from Lattimore's letter that in pressing for terms of settlement the IPR certainly qualified as a pressure group, which is hardly distinguishable from an action group.

Is it possible that Mr. Carter, finding himself on the horns of a

dilemma, really had meant to endorse the idea of turning over half of China to the Communists and not to the Japanese? For this is what he wrote on October 24, 1946:

"One of your most fantastically inaccurate statements is the accusation that Mr. Owen Lattimore, back in 1938 and 1939, advocated peace in China by turning over half of China to the Japanese. Mr. Lattimore was far ahead of the vast majority of Americans in recognizing the nature and danger of Japanese aggression—years before our Government and people were fully alive to its menace."

3. In 1936, a Japanese scientific expedition was permitted by the United States to cruise freely in the waters along the Alaska coast, where it took soundings. Around the same time the Japanese tried to establish fisheries rights in the same area. In both of these ventures, it has been charged by Miller Freeman, Pacific-coast publisher and former Navy Intelligence officer, that the Japanese were aided by the chairman of the American Council of the IPR at the time, who was also a member of a special advisory committee on trade and commerce in the Department of State.

4. Upton Close, writer and radio commentator, made the following signed statement: "A few days prior to the Pearl Harbor disaster, Mr. Trammel [of the National Broadcasting Co.] received a letter from E. C. Carter, head of the Institute of Pacific Relations, demanding that I be dropped from the air because I was anti-Japanese."

5. The Japan Council of the IPR served the interests of aggression. A dispatch of December 7, 1945, by Frank Kelley, then in Tokyo as correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, describes how in Japan the IPR was used as a front for imperialist purposes. Prince Fumimaro Konoye, who was Premier of Japan during much of the crucial period between the renewed war on China in 1937 and the attack upon Pearl Harbor 4½ years later, took a deep interest in his country's IPR chapter. He put his personal trusted aides into the key posts in the Japanese IPR, which was supported largely with funds contributed by the very industrialists who helped the militarists plan and carry out wars of aggression throughout the Pacific area. It was Konoye who had ordered the preparation of a report explaining Japan's need for expansion because of population pressure. This report was read to the IPR international conference of 1936, which was held in Yosemite National Park, in California.

The chief secretary of the Japan Council of the IPR, according to Mr. Kelley in the Herald Tribune, was Tomohiko Ushiba, Konoye's private secretary. Through Ushiba, Prince Konoye kept in touch with Edward C. Carter, then chief of the IPR's international secretariat, so that he could keep watch on American State Department policies. Far-eastern experts, such as abound in the IPR, must surely have known that Prince Konoye was among the leading exponents of Japanese aggression for many years before Pearl Harbor. Yet there is no evidence that the institute ever took any steps to prevent its use as a front for the dissemination of propaganda in the United States and for the gathering of inside political and military information about this country.

Unlike the pink pills served by Dr. Carter when treating Russia or China, these five points bearing upon the relations between the IPR and the imperialists of Japan cannot be sugar-coated. The responsible directors of the IPR, which is in the nature of a higher educational institution, owe it to the public to probe fully into its baffling ties with the Mikado's servants. Considering the semiofficial status which the IPR has acquired in the policy-making branches of the Federal Government, the Congress owes it to the country to investigate the history of the organization, its obscure foreign links, its unduly complex administrative set-up, and its alliances with pro-Soviet and pro-Communist elements both at home and abroad.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 18, 1938.

Mr. Edward C. Carter,  
New York City.

Dear Carter: I have just been reading with great interest Chen Han-seng's memorandum of 27 April attached to your letter of 9 May. As I shall be going with Fred<sup>1</sup> to a regional conference at Seattle at the end of this week and so shall have to miss Holland when he passes through, I am replying directly.

As usual, Chen Han-seng has picked out the really crucial points. The IPR stands to maintain and increase its reputation by presenting the constructive possibilities of a far-eastern settlement. All reactionary estimates of "What is China?" will be based on prewar China and will exclude changes occurring in the course of the war. In pressing for terms of settlement, the IPR is in a better position than any other agency to gage the character and extent of changes occurring during the war; it could and should establish what China is and what Japan is, as of 1939, rather than what either country was as of 1936.

Of course in order to establish the "is" of 1939, the taking-off point must be the "was" up to 1937; but the "was" should be only the taking off point and the major emphasis should be consistently applied to the processes of change in 1937 and 1938 and the levels attained and further trends indicated as of 1939.

Your very sincerely,  
Owen Lattimore.

Mr. McCARTHY. This institute consists of the councils of 10 nations having interests in the Pacific. As originally set up it was in no way controlled by the Communist Party. Since its creation it has had on both the board of trustees and the executive committee a very sizeable number of outstanding and loyal Americans. Membership on the board of trustees or on the executive committee in no way in and of itself indicates any Communist sympathies or leanings. Apparently the board of trustees

<sup>1</sup>Probably Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire Communist.—Editor.

was not a prime target for the Communists. Of the 50 members, as far as I know, not more than 10 or 15 at any time were Communists or fellow travelers. However, as far as I know, the board actually never meets, but does its business by having the various members send in their proxies.

The executive committee, however, consists largely of trustees who live in or near New York and is 10 in number. The executive committee in effect controls the institute. The executive committee is a prime target for the Communists. The Communists apparently try to have on the executive committee at least four or five members of the party or fellow travelers upon whom they can depend at all times. This, of course, is not a majority but the committee is made up of busy men and the attendance at meetings apparently is such that even three or four can control the activities of the institute.

Then there is the research advisory committee, the principal function of which is to edit and pass upon the material which goes into the American Council's publication, Far Eastern Survey.

Dr. Jessup was vice chairman of the American Council and chairman of the research advisory committee for some time. Under him the council's biweekly publication, Far Eastern Survey, pioneered the smear campaign against Chiang Kai-shek and the idea that the Communists in China were merely agrarian reformers and really not Communists at all. Of this campaign the former editor of the Daily Worker, Louis Budenz, on March 19, 1949, in an article in Collier's entitled "The Menace in Red China," had this to say:

Most Americans during World War II fell for the Moscow line that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists but agrarian reformers. That is just what Moscow wanted Americans to believe. This deception of United States officials and the public was the result of a planned campaign. I helped to plan it.

The first blast in this campaign was fired in Jessup's publication on July 14, 1943, in an article signed by T. A. Bisson. I think it might be here important to call attention to the record of this man Bisson, who as I recall was allowed to resign from the State Department because of his Communist connections in 1946.

I have here a photostatic copy of a letter to Bisson, which I briefly discussed in answer to a question the Senator from

Missouri [Mr. Donnell] asked. As I have stated, this is a rather fantastic document coming from the man whom Mr. Jessup used to initiate the smear campaign—a rather fantastic document coming from a man high up in the State Department, but not too fantastic, however, when coming from a man who worked under Frederick Vanderbilt Field on Amerasia. This is written to the International Missionary Council, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York City. It reads as follows:

I have just noticed the statement in the Herald Tribune that the National Christian Council is cooperating with the Nanking government in "rehabilitating the Red-ravaged districts." Could you tell me whether this step is approved by the boards at home, or is it taken only on the NCC's initiative: In my opinion, any such collaboration involves great risks for the future of the whole Christian enterprise in the Far East.

In other words, any help to the poor people in the Red-ravaged area, in Bisson's opinion, endangers the Christian endeavor in the Far East.

He further says:

The Nanking government is under fire from many Chinese progressives for its direct tie-up with western imperialism, particularly its reliance upon foreign aid in the anti-Communist campaign.

Mr. President, Senators should keep in mind that at that time Bisson was in the State Department and was an important figure—I beg pardon; he may not have been in the State Department at that time. I am not sure. I do not recall at what dates he was in the Department.

Then Bisson, the writer of this letter, goes on to point out that this missionary group should be careful not to make the mistake of aligning itself "against the great progressive movements of the future in the East."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed at this point in the Record.

The postscript to the letter is very interesting. In it Bisson says:

I would strongly advise every prospective missionary to China to read, "Chinese Destinies," by Agnes Smedley.

Mr. President, in case any Senator does not understand the significance of that reference by Mr. Bisson, I refer now to page A725 of the Congressional Record of February 10, 1949,

which contains a report by the National Military Establishment, or, more specifically, by General MacArthur's intelligence unit, which report was inserted in the Congressional Record by Representative Harold Lovre. Let me quote briefly from the Congressional Record at that point, for it gives a direct quotation from General MacArthur's intelligence unit report. This covers the individual whose book Bisson says all prospective missionaries should study before they will be qualified to become missionaries to China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire at this time whether the Senator has offered for the Record the letter to which he has just referred.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be incorporated in the Record.

The letter is as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.,

New York, November 4, 1933.

Dr. A. L. Warnahuis,  
International Missionary Council,  
New York City.

Dear Dr. Warnahuis: I have just noticed the statement in the Herald Tribune that the National Christian Council is cooperating with the Nanking Government in "rehabilitating the Red-ravaged districts." Could you tell me whether this step is approved by the boards at home, or is it taken only on the NCC's initiative? In my opinion, any such collaboration involves great risks for the future of the whole Christian enterprise in the Far East. The Nanking Government is under fire from many Chinese progressives for its direct tie-up with western imperialism, particularly its reliance upon foreign gunboats in the anti-Communist campaign. If, now, the Chinese Christian Church links itself up with the Nanking regime, which maintains its power through a continuous "white terror" against the Chinese workers and peasants, its future will be deeply compromised. Henceforth it will flourish or decline in accordance with the fluctuations in the political fortunes of a regime of capitalist exploitation that is steadily outraging the elementary sense of justice of the Chinese masses. Is it wise for the Chinese Christian Church to take sides in a political struggle of this importance? Might it not be the part of statesmanship to maintain a neutrality that would enable the church to succor the victims on both sides of this domestic conflict? In the long run, I feel convinced that the workers and peasants of Asia will throw off the yoke of foreign imperialism and native exploitation, and assume control of their own political destinies. Is the mission enterprise looking ahead toward this future, and laying its plans accordingly?

Frankly, I believe that the whole future of the Christian Church—in the west as well as in the east—is bound up with the answer to this question. In many ways, the modern church has demonstrated its wisest and most forward-looking policies in connection with the youthful churches in Asia. It is for this reason that I question the wisdom of this reported step of the National Christian Council, which, in my opinion, will aline the mission enterprise against the great progressive movements of the future in the east.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. Bisson.

P. S.—I would strongly advise every prospective missionary to China to read *Chinese Destinies*, by Agnes Smedley.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in paragraph (e) of the report of General MacArthur's intelligence unit, we find the following:

Agnes Smedley, American-Soviet spy: This American, Miss Agnes Smedley, has been one of the most energetic workers for the Soviet cause in China for the past twenty-odd years.

The Army intelligence report then goes on to state that much harm has been done by Agnes Smedley—

but perhaps it could be mitigated if she is now exposed for what she is, a spy and agent of the Soviet Government.

So we find that Bisson, who either then or later was a State Department employee, and, incidentally, also was one of the members of the Amerasia editorial board, was urging that all prospective Christian missionaries to China, in order to qualify themselves, should read Agnes Smedley's book. I give this information on Bisson because he is the man whom Jessup used to pioneer the smear campaign against Chiang Kai-shek.

Lest anyone question Jessup's control over Far Eastern Survey, let me call to your attention that the Chinese consul objected strenuously to the Bisson line being carried in the Institute of Pacific Relations publication. He was referred to Jessup, who made the magnanimous offer that he would print his answer to Bisson's letter. However, before printing the Chinese consul's answer, Jessup submitted the letter to Bisson and obtained for publication in the adjoining column Bisson's criticism of the Chinese consul's answer in an obvious attempt to ridicule, twist, and distort the meaning of those loyal Chinese who were backing our ally, Chiang. There can be no question there as to where Jessup stood.

Within a matter of weeks after Jessup's labeling the Chinese Communists as land reformers, the Daily Worker and Isvetzia also took up the line of comparing the Chinese Communists with "Iowa farmers."

Professor Jessup must, therefore, be credited by the American people with having pioneered the smear-campaign against Nationalist China and Chiang Kai-shek, and with being the originator of the myth of the "democratic" Chinese Communists.

From that time onward we witnessed the spectacle of this three-horse team of smears and untruths thundering down the stretch—Jessup's publication, Far Eastern Survey, the Daily Worker, and Isvetzia. What an effective job they did can best be demonstrated by the fact that this was the line which the State Department followed in formulating its far eastern policy, right down to the last comma.

I personally have stated that I thought that Jessup was a well-meaning dupe of the Lattimore crowd. However, I do not think the decision on that point is up to me; but rather, it is up to the Congress and the American people.

In that connection I hold in my hand two photostats which I think may interest the Senate and the American people mightily.

In order to recognize the significance of these two documents, it might be well for me to digress for a minute and give the background of one Frederick Vanderbilt Field.

Of course, Mr. President, I believe it will be unnecessary for me to go into detail in that respect, in view of the fact that we went over that matter in great detail in connection with the questions asked by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Donnell]. Suffice it to say that Frederick Vanderbilt Field acknowledges, proclaims, and brags about the fact that he considers himself one of the top Communists in this Nation. In passing, I may state that he also contributed \$5,000 to the Wallace campaign in 1948.

Getting back to the photostats of the documents in question, we should keep in mind that Jessup pioneered the fictional idea that the Communists of China were not really Communists at all. He did that in July 1943. That is when the campaign started.

I now hold in my hand two photostats, one being a photostat of a check in the amount of \$2,500, signed by Frederick Vanderbilt Field, and made payable to Jessup's organization, the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This check is dated September 12, 1943, and was cashed by the institute.

I also hold in my hand another check, signed by the same man, the man who says, "I am the outstanding American Communist"—Frederick Vanderbilt Field. This check is in the amount of \$1,000, and was made payable, also, to Jessup's organization, the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The check is dated November 27, 1942; and this check also was cashed by that institute.

Incidentally, Mr. President, these checks came, not from Field's own personal account, but from the American People's Fund, Inc., which is a repository created by Frederick Vanderbilt Field for funds for whatever Communist or Communist-front enterprise he saw fit to support. In other words, the American People's Fund, Inc., has no function whatsoever except to act as a bank for funds to be turned over to such Communist enterprises as Field decided to contribute to.

Therefore, we find Jessup in 1943 using his magazine to sell to the American people the identical line followed by *Isvetzia*, one of Soviet Russia's official papers, and also the line followed by the *Daily Worker*, which, as everyone knows, is the official Communist newspaper in this country, and at the same time receiving funds to support the publication from a man who publicly proclaimed that he was one of the top Communists in this Nation—Frederick Vanderbilt Field.

Whether Jessup was simply a dupe or whether he was publishing the party line for a fee, I leave to the Senate to determine. However, when we consider that Jessup, using Bisson as the writer, started that campaign to smear; and when we consider that in his publication he followed the Communist Party line right down to the dotting of every "i" and the crossing of every "t"; and then when we consider that he got money for it—\$3,500—from the man who says, "I am the outstanding Communist in this Nation," then I leave it to the Senate to decide whether he was a dupe—if so, he must have been an extremely stupid one—or whether he knew what he was doing for a fee.

Lest Jessup say he did not know Field's connections and Field's communism, let me again point out that Field made no

secret of the fact that he went all-out in support of communistic Russia. For example, in 1941, he was executive director of the American Peace Mobilization, and led the picket line which picketed the White House and heaped abuse upon the head of then President Roosevelt, as a warmonger, and used all the foul objectives in the communistic vocabulary. That picket line was before the White House on the morning of June 22, 1941; and let us keep in mind that Field was the director of the organization and leading that picket line. The Senate will recall that was the day when Hitler invaded Russia. Confusion hit the picket line when the newspaper headlines proclaimed Hitler's invasion of Russia, and by early afternoon all the pickets had quietly slunk away. Then the American Peace Mobilization became the American People's Mobilization, which commenced again to vilify the President, not this time as a warmonger, but this time for his failure to establish a second front quickly enough to relieve Joe Stalin.

In view of that, I do not believe there is anyone who can say that Jessup did not know exactly who Field was when he took from him \$3,500 while at the same time publishing the Communist Party line.

I may say that I think the kindest thing we can say about him is that he was a dupe. What I have said so far is that he was a complete dupe. After all, before that time he was simply a professor of international law; and let me say in passing that very little international law originates in China. However, overnight he suddenly became an expert on far eastern affairs. As I have said, I think the man was such a dupe that he did not know that he was being used by Owen Lattimore. That is the kindest thing we can say about him. But dupe or knave, certainly he is not the type of person we want shaping our foreign policy.

In fact, a few weeks later, Frederick Vanderbilt Field signed an open letter demanding a second front. Mr. Field, incidentally, was the paid secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations from 1933 to early 1940, and was one of the trustees until 1947. Field was also named by Chambers as head of a Communist espionage ring.

Thus we find Jessup taking money from a traitor and a Communist to support his magazine which was following the party line to a "t."

I also have before me a photostat of a letter dated March 17, 1947, which is of some interest. This is a letter written by the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, signed by Jessup and others. It expresses vigorous opposition to a proposed investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations to determine whether or not it was Communist controlled. In other words, Jessup says, "No, let us not have this investigation," and sends a letter over his name to that effect. At that time, incidentally, Frederick Vanderbilt Field was on the board of trustees, and Alger Hiss was either on the board at that time or became a member shortly thereafter.

I do not know whether I pointed out to the Senator the fact, but the magazine Amerasia, about whose Communist line there can be no question, for a period of time had its offices right next to the offices of the Jessup publication for IPR.

I think it might be well at this point to discuss also Jessup's connection with various Communist-front organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires whether that particular letter was offered for the Record.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it has not been. If any of the Senators care to have it put in the Record, I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have noted since the beginning of this inquiry, that there are those who contend that membership in Communist front organizations and association with Communists is not a serious matter. There are sincere people who are disturbed because they think this is an attempt to establish guilt by association. They forget that we are dealing here with extremely sensitive positions where the individual has access to top secret material, the disclosure of which might well shove us into or cause us even to lose a war. They forget that it is not a question of guilt by association, but a question of bad security risk by association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that a naive or gullible person who associates with the wrong people constantly and thereby discloses—perhaps even unknowingly—secret information, has done the country the same damage as the party agent who divulges or obtains the same information, for a fee, or otherwise. Let me repeat, it is not a question of guilt by association, it is a question of bad security risk by association.

For example, if any one of you of the Senate happened to

be a bank president and you found that your cashier was traveling with a crowd of crooks, safe crackers and racketeers, you would undoubtedly no longer trust this cashier with the depositors' money. In your mind, it would be a question of whether he was guilty of some crime, but rather a question of whether you could safely trust him with large sums of money. In such a case you have to give your depositors, instead of the wayward cashier, the benefit of the doubt. Unfortunately, the State Department does not adopt that rule.

When the State Department adopted the rule which provides that those who travel with Communists and join Communist-front organizations are bad security risks, it was apparently done because of the fact that it has been proven over thousands of years that "birds of a feather flock together."

While it is possible occasionally to get a few good citizens on a letterhead of a questionable organization, you can be certain that if anyone associates with such an organization for any length of time, he is in sympathy with its aims. That, gentlemen, is just good every day American horse sense. And keep in mind, it was the Attorney General, and not McCarthy, who has listed those organizations as Communist-front and subversive because of their aims.

That, Mr. President, is just good, every day, American horse sense. And keep in mind, if you will, it was the Attorney General, it was congressional committees, not the Senator from Wisconsin, who listed those organizations as Communist fronts and subversive because of their aims.

Of course, any American has the complete right to join any front organizations he pleases; but having joined such organizations and having exercised that right, he must necessarily jeopardize the privilege which he has to hold a position in the Federal Government.

In this connection it should be noted that Mr. Jessup was also quite a joiner. Perhaps he was also a dupe in this respect, but it is rather significant that the only organizations that he so prolifically joined were Communist-front organizations. He does not seem to be so prolific in joining any other type of organization, which I believe he should explain.

For example, the American Law Student's Association was affiliated with the American Youth Congress according to the testimony of William W. Hinckley, former executive secretary

of the American Youth Congress. That is in the hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, volume 11, page 7039. It was also affiliated with the United Students Peace Committee, of 347 Madison Avenue, New York City, according to an exhibit presented to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, volume 12, pages 7568, 7569. The United Students Peace Committee was closely interlocked with the American Peace Mobilization, which I recently mentioned in connection with Field and the picketing of President Roosevelt. According to the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937, page 2, the American Law Students Association was affiliated with the American League Against War and Fascism, an organization with an outright treasonable program, which has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and Attorney General Biddle.

Jessup was not only a member of this organization but was a sponsor. There is a difference between being a sponsor and merely a member.

In this connection it should be noted that this organization, of which Jessup was the sponsor, the letterhead of which organization bears his name, used the Communist Party print shop, which was known as the Prompt Press, and used union label 209.

In view of the fact that Jessup was the head of a magazine engaged in considerable printing, it is hard to believe that he did not know where this material was being printed. It is hard to believe that he did not know that union No. 209 was the union which was doing the work of the Prompt Press, which is the Communist print shop.

Also in connection with Communist-front activities, I call your attention to the fact that the National Emergency Conference was held in Washington in 1939 or 1940. Dr. Jessup not merely attended this affair, but was a sponsor of it, and signed the call of the conference which went against registration and fingerprinting of aliens—things which certainly could not adversely affect any alien with intentions of becoming a loyal American citizen.

Mr. President, let it be noted that he sponsored and issued the call for this organization, which meant, and which said, "We are against the registration and fingerprinting of aliens," and that was at a time when all of us expected war momentarily. Registration and fingerprinting obviously, could only be opposed

by those aliens who, in those early war days, were engaged in activities in which the FBI and our law enforcement agencies would be interested.

Why Jessup at that time should have so vigorously opposed such a simple matter, it is rather difficult to understand. We know the Communist line at that time was that this type of registration and fingerprinting was an encroachment upon the civil liberties of the individual.

Dr. Jessup's position against the registration and fingerprinting of aliens was enthusiastically supported by the Communist press and by individuals such as Carol King, attorney for Gerhardt Eisler, and Doxey A. Wilkerson, an avowed member of the Communist Party.

This organization later changed its name to the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights and was cited as a Communist-front organization by both the House Committee on Appropriations on April 21, 1943, and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1942, and again by the House Un-American Activities Committee on March 29, 1944.

Jessup was not only a sponsor of the above-mentioned affair, but the letterhead of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights shows that he was a member of the board of sponsors of this organization, also.

Here is something of considerable interest. I have in my hand a photostat of the New York Times, dated February 16, 1946—a time at which it was becoming rather clear that Russia had already embarked upon world war III and was committed to annihilation of western nonatheistic civilization. In this letter the brilliant Dr. Jessup urges not only that we quit producing atomic bombs but that we eliminate the necessary ingredients which were produced for atomic bombs by—and I quote—“means such as dumping them into the ocean.”

It should be recalled that at that time the Russians were already engaged in a race to surpass us in the production of atomic weapons.

Let the Senate and the country decide whether he was so stupidly blind that he did not realize what he was urging or whether he planned it that way. I frankly think that the man was merely stupidly following the Lattimore line—a line which in this case certainly was the line which must have warmed the cockles of Stalin's heart.

In this connection I would like to read to the Senate an editorial from the New York World-Telegram entitled "Who Is Dr. Jessup?"

Dr. Phillip C. Jessup, the American spokesman in the current United Nation's debate on Nationalist China's charges against the Soviet Union, is the same Dr. Jessup chosen by the State Department to draft a new American policy for the Far East.

For this reason, his past associations and attitudes have become of general public concern.

Over a period of years, Dr. Jessup held various positions in the Institute of Pacific Relations, including the chairmanships of its American and Pacific councils. In these capacities he was in close association with such well-known left-wingers as Anna Louise Strong, Guenther Stein, Harriet Lucy Moore, E. C. Carter, Theodore A. Bisson, Andrew Grajdanzev, and Frederick Vanderbilt Field.

While the institute's publication, the Far Eastern Survey, was under Dr. Jessup's direction, it began a campaign against Nationalist China. Referring to what it called the two Chinas, it said, in an article signed by Mr. Bisson: "One is now generally called Kuomintang China, the other is called Communist China. However, these are only party labels. To be more descriptive, the one might be called feudal China, the other democratic China."

Let us keep in mind that in July 1943, when this was printed, and also in November 1942, before it was printed, Jessup took sizable checks from a known Communist. This one article in July of 1943 was of course only part of a whole series of like articles.

Thus began the long campaigns to tear down Chiang Kai-shek and present the Chinese Reds to the American people as democrats and simple agrarian reformers. We know them better than that now. But that is due to no contributions by Dr. Jessup.

The Communist-front organizations with which Dr. Jessup has been affiliated or has sponsored include the American-Russian Institute, the National Emergency Conference (organized in 1939 to protest the deportation of aliens who advocated changing our form of government), the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights and the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo—on Red Spain.

He was one of 12 signers of a letter in the New York Times, February 16, 1946, urging the United States to suspend the manufacture of atomic bombs, following the appointment of the United Nations Commissions on Atomic Energy.

This letter, urged, in order that the discussions on atomic energy control might proceed in an "atmosphere of good faith and confidence," that:

Here is where Jessup urged, and it was while the Communists were exerting every effort to outstrip us in the production of atomic weapons—

1. "The United States at once stop the production of bombs from material currently produced"—this to include the preparation of sub-assemblies and "all other procedures involved in the fabrication of the bomb."

2. "For 1 year, which would seem to be a reasonable time for the commission to mature its plans and to secure action on them by the governments concerned, we will stop accumulating purified plutonium and uranium-225, which are the essential ingredients of atomic bombs."

The letter to the Times added that any fissionable products developed while keeping the atomic energy plants on a stand-by basis should be dumped in the ocean or returned to their original mixture.

Since the Russians claim they began making bombs in 1947, they might have caught up with us or passed us in atomic bomb production had Dr. Jessup's views prevailed.

Dr. Jessup was a character witness for Alger Hiss at his first perjury trial.

He was the editor of the State Department's white paper on China, which one student of the subject characterized as a "bulky compendium of many truths, some half truths and frequent contradictions of published and acknowledged fact."

Here, at best, we have the picture of a confused liberal feeling his way round in circles and often finding himself in questionable company. Certainly it is not the record of a man who should be chosen to formulate anything of such tremendous potentialities as an American policy for the Far East.

Imagine sending a Dr. Jessup to preside over a conference on far-eastern affairs at Bangkok, when we have a man like Gen. Douglas MacArthur in nearby Tokyo.

Incidentally, I think it is of interest to note that the State Department, apparently upon Jessup's suggestion, chose Bangkok as the place for this all-important conference. Anyone who is at all a student of that area knows that it is the hotbed of Russian espionage activities and that the only sizable hotel in the city is owned by the Russian Government. Just why he said, "Let us go to that area instead of to some area controlled by General MacArthur, such as Tokyo," is not clear.

I read further:

If this is the way American foreign policy is being made, God save us from the Russians.

One interesting insight into Dr. Jessup's lack of sensitivity

to disloyalty is shown by his answer to the question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] on March 20, last. The Senator asked Jessup if he was of the same opinion now about Hiss as he was at the times last year when, as one of Hiss' character witnesses, he stated that Hiss' reputation for integrity, loyalty, and veracity was good. Dr. Jessup answered the Senator that he saw no reason to alter his statements. One can understand a person standing by his friend on a private basis; but Dr. Jessup as ambassador-at-large, represents the American people. He is supposed to be aware of the dangerous tactic of infiltration as practiced by Stalin's police state. To put it mildly, Jessup's reaction to gross disloyalty seems obtuse. He can say, without qualification and as a most important public official, that he can see no reason whatever to change his opinion about Hiss' veracity, loyalty, and integrity, even though an American jury has convicted him of perjury and what amounts to far-reaching espionage on damning evidence which satisfied the jury and a Federal judge that Hiss, beyond reasonable doubt, was proved to be an underground Communist agent.

In other words, if Jessup today were in charge of the loyalty program he would say, "In my opinion, Hiss still has an outstanding reputation for veracity, integrity, and loyalty, and I see no reason to change my opinion."

This is in the very best Acheson tradition of "not turning one's back" on treason.

The Senate will recall that I presented to the committee the case of one Haldore Hanson, who has been named by the State Department as chief of the Technical Cooperation Projects Staff, which is developing plans for the point 4 program.

It will also recall my mentioning the fact that Owen Lattimore is now in Afghanistan in connection with making a study and submitting recommendations in regard to the application of our point 4 program in that area.

So we find Owen Lattimore again the great planner. This time instead of directing Jessup to pioneer the campaign of villification against Chiang Kai-shek and the deification of the Chinese Communists; this time instead of helping Service and Roth in their theft of secret State, Navy, and Intelligence documents, he is helping Haldore Hanson to plan the point 4 program in that area of the East which has not yet fallen under Communist control.

This is the same Haldore Hanson who in his book "Human Endeavor," on page 349, condemns the right-wing groups in the Chinese Government "for fighting against the democratic revolution by Moa Tse Tung of the Communists." This is the same Haldore Hanson who on the same page complains that anti-Red officials within the Government were making indirect attacks upon the Communists, and that "leaders of the Communist Youth Corps were arrested by military officials at Hangkow."

This is the same Haldore Hanson who was the penniless coeditor of a Communist magazine in Peiping when the Japanese-Chinese war broke out. This is the same Haldore Hanson who in chapter 28 condemns the red-baiting officials in Chungking.

Rather than take the time of the Senate in developing the entire Hanson case, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point the case of Haldore Hanson as I presented it to the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the case was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The next case is that of Haldore Hanson.

This man occupies one of the most strategically important offices in the entire State Department.

It is my understanding that he joined the Department of State in February 1942, and is recognized in the Department as a specialist and expert on Chinese affairs.

Hanson, now Executive Director of the Secretariat of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, will head up a technical cooperation projects staff of the new point 4 program for aid to underdeveloped areas which will have charge of the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars of our taxpayers' money over all the world. (Source: Department of State Departmental Announcements 41, dated February 21, 1950.)

The pro-Communist proclivities of Mr. Hanson go back to September 1938.

Hanson was a contributor to Pacific Affairs, the official publications, whose staff was headed by millionaire Frederick Vanderbilt Field, an admitted Communist. Field has devoted his entire fortune to the Communist cause.

It is important that the committee keep in mind that Mr. Hanson also wrote for the magazine Amerasia, of which Philip Jacob Jaffe was managing editor.

Jaffe was arrested, indicted, and found guilty of having been in

illegal possession of several hundred secret documents from the State, Navy, War, and other Government Department files.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a document entitled "Department of State, Departmental Announcement 41." The heading is "Establishment of the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development." Then in parentheses, by way of explanation of this rather high-sounding name, we find "point 4 program."

The first paragraph of the order reads as follows:

"1. Effective immediately there is established under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Interim Office for Technical Cooperation and Development (TCD)."

On page 4 we find that the chief of this technical cooperations project staff is one Haldore Hanson.

Paragraph 2 on page 1 sets forth the following responsibilities of Hanson's division:

"The interim office is assigned general responsibility within the Department for (a) securing effective administration of programs involving technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas and (b) directing the planning in preparation for the technical cooperation and economic development (point 4) program. In carrying out its responsibilities the interim office will rely upon the regional bureaus, Bureau of United Nations Affairs, and other components of economic affairs area for participation in the technical assistance programs as specified below, and upon the central administrative offices of the administrative area for the performance of service functions."

From this it would appear that his division will have a tremendous amount of power and control over the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars which the President proposes to spend under his point 4 program, or what he has referred to as the bold new plan.

Hanson's appointment is not made by the President, but by the State Department and is not subject to any Senate confirmation. Therefore, it would seem rather important to examine the background and the philosophy of this young man.

The State Department Biographical Register gives what would on its face seem to be a chronological story of an increasingly successful young man. It shows that he graduated from college, for example, in 1934 at the age of 22; that he was a teacher in Chinese colleges from 1934 to 1937; and then a press correspondent in China from 1936 to 1939; a staff writer from 1938 to 1942; then in 1942 he got a job in the State Department at \$4,600 a year; that in 1944 he was listed as a specialist in Chinese affairs at \$5,600; that in 1945 he was made executive assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State at \$6,500; that in May of 1948 he was made assistant chief of the area division number 3; that on June 28, 1948 he was made Acting Chief for the Far Eastern Area, Public Affairs Overseas Program Staff; that on November 14, 1948 he was made Executive Director of the Secretariat of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. There is certainly nothing unusual about this biography. Nothing there to indicate that this man might be

dangerous in the State Department as Chief for the Far Eastern Area, Public Affairs Overseas Program Staff, during a time when the Communists were taking over China. However, much is left out of this biography. It does not show, for example, that this young man was running a Communist magazine in Peiping when the Japanese-Chinese war broke out. It does not show, for example, that he spent several years with the Communist armies in China, writing stories and taking pictures which the Chinese Communists helped him smuggle out of the country. Nor does this biography show that this man, after his return from China, wrote a book—a book which sets forth his pro-Communist answer to the problems of Asia as clearly as Hitler's *Mein Kampf* set forth his solutions for the problems of Europe.

Nothing that he has said or done since would indicate that he repudiates a single line of that book.

This man clearly believes that the Communists in China stand for everything that is great and good. His is not the picture of a mercenary trying to seel his country out for 30 pieces of silver. In reading his book, you are impressed with the fact that he firmly believes the Communist leaders in China are great and good men and that all of Asia would benefit by being communized.

Take, for example, what he had to say about Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Communist Party at that time and now the Communist ruler of China, and Chu Teh, commander-in-chief of the Eighth Route Communist Army, and according to *Life Magazine* of January 23, 1950, No. 2 man in prestige to Mao Tse-tung.

In chapter 23, entitled "Political Utopia on Mt. Wut'AI," in describing a meeting with an American Major Carlson, here is what he had to say:

"We stayed up till midnight exchanging notes on guerilla armies, the farm unions, and the progress of the war. I was particularly interested in the Communist leaders whom Carlson had just visited and whom I was about to meet. Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Communist Party, Carlson characterized as 'the most selfless man I ever met, a social dreamer, a genius living 50 years ahead of his time.' And Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Eighth Route Army, was 'the prince of generals, a man with the humility of Lincoln, the tenacity of Grant, and the kindness of Robert E. Lee.'"

For a man slated as chief of the bureau which may have the job of spending hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the world this indicates, to say the least, a disturbing amount of hero-worship for the No. 1 and No. 2 Communist leaders in the Far East today.

On page 349, he condemns the right wing groups in the Chinese government for "fighting against the democratic revolution as proposed by Mao Tse-tung and the Communists."

On the same page he points out that anti-Red officials within the government were making indirect attacks upon the Communists and that "leaders of the Communist youth corps were arrested by military officers at Hankow. I myself was the victim of one of these incidents and found that local officials were the instigators."

From Hanson's book it appears that the Nationalist Government knew of his close collaboration with the Communist army. For example, on page 350, we find that his passport was seized by the police in Siam when they found that he was traveling from Communist guerrilla territory to the Communist headquarters. He states that the man responsible for this illegal action was Governor Ching Ting-wen—one of the most rabid anti-Red officials in China. The Governor's purpose was merely to suppress news about the Communists.

Before quoting further from this book written by Mr. Hanson, it might be well to give a clearer picture of the job which Secretary Acheson has picked out for him. The State Department document lists some of the duties of his bureau as follows:

1. Developing over-all policies for the program.
2. Formulating general program plans and issuing planning directives.
3. Coordinating specific program plans developed by the regional bureaus and making necessary adjustments.
4. Approving projects, determining action agencies, and allocating funds for United States bilateral programs.
5. Directing negotiations and relationships with intergovernmental agencies and with other United States agencies participating in the coordinated program or otherwise carrying on technical assistance activities.
6. Initiating and developing plans for technical assistance programs for individual countries or groups of countries within their respective regions.
7. Reviewing program proposals affecting their regions which originate from any other source.
8. Negotiating and communicating with foreign governments.
9. Directing State Department personnel assigned abroad to coordinate and give administrative and program support to, bilateral programs.
10. Continuously evaluating programs and projects within regions.
11. Proposing program changes.
12. Initiating instructions to the field carrying out their responsibilities and reviewing all other instructions concerned with technical assistance programs.

This gives you some idea of the tremendous powers of the agency in which Mr. Hanson is a top-flight official.

Let us go back to Hanson's writings:

All through the book he shows that not only did he have complete confidence in the Communist leaders but that they also had complete confidence in him. On page 256 he refers to how Communist Generals Nie and Lu Chen-Tsao acted as his couriers, smuggling packets of films and news stories for him with the aid of Communist guerrilla spies into Peiping.

In this connection I might say that he very frankly points out that the Communists do not tolerate anyone who is not completely on their side. Hanson makes it very clear all through the book that he is not only on the Communist side, but that he has the attitude of a hero worshipper for the Chinese Communist leaders.

His respect and liking for the Communist leaders permeates almost every chapter of the book. For example, on page 284 and page 285, he tells about how some ragged waifs whom he had gathered into his sleeping quarters regarded Mao Tse Tung and Chu Teh as "Gods." He then goes on to tell about their favorite Communist General, Holung, and states that they convinced him that Holung was a very extraordinary man whom they described as "big as a Shantungese, heavy as a restaurant cook but quick as a cat in battle." He then goes on to describe Holung, he found him to be much as the hero-worshipping boys had described him. "He is," said Hanson, "a living picture of Rhett Butler from the pages of *Gone With the Wind*."

This praise of Chinese Communist leaders goes on page after page. On page 278, he describes Communist General P'eng as the most rigid disciplinarian and "the most persistent student of world affairs."

In chapter 26 he speaks with apparently bated breath of the "brain trust" of Communist leaders who were immortalized by Edgar Snow in his *Red Star Over China*.

On page 295 in referring to two other Communist generals, he said: "Should this book ever fall into Communist hands, I must record that those two lonely men made excellent company during my 3 weeks in Yen-an."

After describing in complimentary manner this university and the students, on page 296, he says, "Every cadet divides his time between political and military subjects. On the one hand he listens to lectures on Marxian philosophy, the history of the Chinese Revolution, the technique of leading a mass movement; on the other hand he studies guerrilla tactics, the use of military maps, and the organization of a military labor corps."

On page 297 he points out that no tuition is charged at the academy and that each student is supplied with uniform, books, and food, plus a pocket allowance, and then has this to say: "Some recent visitors to Yen-an have spread a report that the academies are supported by Russian rubles—a thin piece of gossip. I was told by several Chinese leaders, including Mao Tse-tung, that the largest contributions came from American sympathizers in New York."

On pages 297 and 298 Hanson relates that in talking to one of the Nationalist war lords: "I suggested that he could learn a great deal from the Communists about discipline and integrity of leadership."

On page 303 Hanson has this to say: "My attitude toward Communist China's leaders was a mixture of respect for their personal integrity and a resentment of their suspiciousness. They impressed me as a group of hard-headed, straight-shooting realists."

After an interview with Mao Tse-tung he states, "I left with the feeling that he was the least pretentious man in Yen-an and the most admired. He is a completely selfless man."

Following is Hanson's description of how the Reds took over. I quote from page 102:

"Whenever a village was occupied for the first time, the Reds arrested the landlords and tax collectors, held a public tribunal, executed a few and intimidated the others, then redistributed the land as fairly as possible."

In chapter 28, in comparing the Communists to Chiang Kai-shek's troops, Hanson had this to say:

"I left Yen-an with only one conviction about the Communists; that they were fighting against the Japanese more wholeheartedly than any other group in China."

He then goes on to condemn "Red-baiting" officials in Chungking.

On page 312 of his book, Hanson quotes a Communist editor as stating as follows:

"Our relationship to the U. S. S. R. is no different than that of the American Communist Party. We respect the work of Russia's leaders and profit by their experience wherever we can, but the problems of China are not the same as those of Russia. We plan our program from a Chinese point of view."

Hanson then adds, "The explanation seemed logical enough to me."

In connection with Hanson's position as Chief of the Technical Cooperation Projects Staff, in charge of Truman's point 4 program, the following on pages 312 and 313 of his book would seem especially significant. He quotes Mao Tse-tung as follows:

China cannot reconstruct its industry and commerce without the aid of British and American capital.

Can there be much doubt as to whether the Communists or the anti-Communist forces in Asia will receive aid under the point 4 program with Hanson in charge?

Gentlemen, here is a man with a mission—a mission to communize the world—a man whose energy and intelligence coupled with a burning all-consuming mission has raised him by his own bootstraps from a penniless operator of a leftist magazine in Peiping in the middle thirties to one of the architects of our foreign policy in the State Department today—a man who, according to State Department announcement No. 41 will be largely in charge of the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars in such areas of the world and for such purposes as he decides.

Gentlemen, if Secretary Acheson gets away with his plan to put this man to a great extent in charge of the proposed point 4 program, it will, in my opinion, lend tremendous impetus to the tempo at which communism is engulfing the world.

On page 32 of his book, Hanson justifies "The Chinese Commu-

nists chopping off the heads of landlords—all of which is true," because of hungry farmers. That the farmers are still hungry after the landlords' heads have been removed apparently never occurred to him.

On page 31 he explained that it took him some time to appreciate the appalling problems which the Chinese Communists were attempting to solve."

In chapter 4 of Hanson's book, he presents the stock Communists' arguments for the so-called Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939.

Secretary Acheson is now putting Hanson in the position to help the Communists solve the appalling problems in other areas of the world with hundreds of millions or billions of American dollars.

The obvious area in which this man will start using American money to help the Communists solve the people's problem will be Indo-China and India.

It should be pointed out that this case was brought to the attention of State Department officials as long ago as May 14, 1947. At that time the Honorable Fred Busbey, on the floor of the House, discussed this man's affinity for the Communist cause in China.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in my opinion the all important thing to be determined is not so much the question of whether Lattimore was a Russian agent or whether Service was guilty of espionage in the Amerasia case, nor the disloyalty or bad judgment of many of the particular individuals in the group of untouchables determining the far eastern policy, but rather, to determine to what extent our far eastern policy has paralleled the Communist Party objectives.

At this point I would like to read a brief of the Communist Party objectives insofar as the Far East is concerned, as laid down by the Asiatic Cominform of May 1949:

1. Conquer China; (2) conquer Hainan, and (3) Formosa (air base to neutralize Ryukyus and Okinawa).
2. Infiltrate and conquer Indochina and Burma.
3. Infiltration and riots in India and Pakistan; Philippines.
4. Infiltration and riots in Japan; wean Japan from the United States.

#### PROPAGANDA

- (a) Japan cannot survive without trade with China.
- (b) United States taxpayers cannot pay the tax bills to support 88,000,000 Japanese.
- (c) Maintain split between Japan and Philippines.
- (d) Maintain split between Japan and Australia.
- (e) Omit all mention of Japan's deeds in China (1931-45).

5. Prevent Far Eastern Pact (Pacific Alliance) at all costs.
6. Keep Nehru out of Far Eastern Pact.
7. Woo Afghanistan.
8. Self-determination in Sinkiang Province. Future ethnic ties to Soviet Uzbeks, etc.
9. Infiltration, riots in Iran. Get pro-Soviet Ministers appointed.

It should require no comment to cause anyone with even a semiopen mind immediately to recognize the fact that the Lattimore line follows that line practically 100 percent. The important question, of course, is not whether Lattimore follows that line, but whether the State Department actually follows that line.

In connection with the question of whether or not Acheson knows what the party line actually is, I would like to quote to you from a letter written by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] in April of 1947.

In that letter the Senator from New Hampshire questions whether the State Department Far Eastern Planning Branch is following two official documents which set forth in detail the Communist objectives in China. He points out those two documents are available at the Library of Congress or at the State Department.

The two documents are as follows:

1. "The Program of the Communist International and its Constitution." Workers Library Publishers. 1928. Third American edition, 1936.
2. "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semi-Colonies," adopted as a resolution by the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern, September 1, 1928.

Acheson's answer sheds considerable light perhaps on why he may, without even knowing it, be following the Lattimore Communist line. He points out that his top adviser on Chinese affairs "advises me that he has never even read the two Communist documents under reference. I have never read them myself."

Can anyone imagine a person trying to plan a policy or a campaign against Hitler without having read his *Mein Kampf*?

So we find the Secretary of State admitting that he and his top advisers in Far Eastern Affairs do not even take the time to acquaint themselves with the Communist aims in that theater.

I can assure him that Lattimore knows what the Communist aims are.

Let us see how much of the party line of the Soviet Agent, Lattimore, has found its way into Secretary Acheson's Far Eastern policy.

The Secretary of State made his most important speech on Far Eastern policy before the National Press Club on January 12th last. While in that speech he refers to the detachment of the provinces of northern China by the Soviet Union and he somewhat frowns upon this action, he asserts that we must do nothing by way of intervention, such as aid to Chiang on Formosa, which would merit the Chinese wrath that they now have for the Russians.

But the important thing in Mr. Acheson's speech, and the main burden of his argument, is that in the rest of China a democracy has been born. He states that communism is a subtle instrument of Soviet foreign policy, which would "if it could, take from these people what they have won, what we want them to keep and develop which is their own national independence, their own individual independence, their own development of their own resources for their own good, and not as mere tributary states to this great Soviet Union.

Has Acheson the temerity to state that the people of China have won China for themselves? Does Acheson want the Chinese people to keep their present government? Does Acheson really want us to believe that they have won their national independence and their own individual independence?

This is exactly the line that Lattimore wrote in his article, *Asia Conquers Asia*, in March of this year in which Lattimore refers to Russian communism only as a "hypothetical threat—a card unplayed."

Acheson ended his China policy speech of January 12 with these words. Listen to the mind of Lattimore in the voice of Acheson:

What we conclude, I believe, is that there is a new day which has dawned in Asia. It is a day in which the Asian peoples are on their own and know it and intend to continue on their own. It is a day in which the old relationships between East and West are gone, relationships which at their worst were exploitations and which at their best were paternalism. That relationship is over and the relationship of East and West must now be in the Far East one of mu-

tual respect and mutual helpfulness. We are their friends. Others are their friends.

Let us compare that with the final paragraph in one of Lattimore's latest books, *Situation in Asia*:

Throughout Asia today there prevails an atmosphere of hope, not of despair.

Acheson says:

What we conclude, I believe, is that there is a new day which has dawned in Asia.

Acheson said:

There is not a single country in Asia in which people feel that we are entering on an age of chaos. What they see opening out before them is a limitless horizon of hope—the hope of peaceful constructive activity in free countries and peaceful cooperation among free peoples. There will be disillusionments along the way as these hopes unfold. They should not come from America, or as the result of American policy. A great part of Asia's hopes, however, will be fulfilled, and should be fulfilled with American cooperation. We have everything to gain by being on the side of hope.

Acheson at the National Press Club said a new day had dawned for Asia, Lattimore, his teacher on oriental affairs, tells of the "limitless horizon of hope in Asia."

Acheson told the Press Club:

It is a day on which the Asian peoples are on their own and know it and intend to continue on their own.

Lattimore had said—

There will be disillusion along the way as these hopes unfold. They should not come from America, or as the result of American policy.

Lattimore wrote that it was China that conquered China. Acheson believes that China has conquered China.

The best authority on China affairs in the Senate is perhaps the junior Senator from California [Mr. Knowland].

I wish to quote his estimation of the grave problem that we are considering. In a speech printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record on March 23 of this year, at page A2255, he said—and I shall not read the entire speech:

There is one great void in the speech of the Secretary of State dealing with our Asia policy. He treats the islands of Formosa, Hai-

nan, Kinmen, Chosun, and the Pescadores, with their 8,000,000 people under the jurisdiction of the legal government of the Republic of China as though they were ships which had been sunk beneath the waves of the China Sea and the Pacific.

Since Formosa alone has more population than either Australia or Greece, this is hardly realistic. Formosa is closer to the Philippines than the island of Luzon is to the island of Mindanao. It is hardly conceivable that this Government can view with unconcern the moving of international communism off the Asiatic land mass on its first major island-hopping venture.

An American missionary with years of experience in China recently said to me: "Senator, I cannot understand how Chiang Kai-shek can be the No. 1 target in the Far East of international communism and at the same time be the No. 1 target for the Far Eastern Division of our own State Department." From my own observations in China last November and from recent communications from people still there and these who have just returned, I believe that the Republic of China has passed her darkest hour of Dunkerque and Valley Forge. There has been a new rebirth of morale that is of tremendous significance to those who are no so blind that they will not see.

The Benedict Arnolds, the Quislings, and the fair-weather friends have long since departed. The new Cabinet of President Chiang Kai-shek contains many young and able administrators who are men of integrity. \* \* \*

It is not realistic to ignore the fact that the Republic of China has approximately 600,000 men under arms, 300,000 of whom are excellent soldiers. This total number is greater than the combined troop strength of Korea, the Philippine Republic, the United States of Indonesia, Siam Viet Nam, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and the United States forces in Japan.

The island of Formosa is not needed by the United States as either an air or naval base. In the friendly hands of the Republic of China, it presents no problem to our own defenses. In the hands of international communism, the many Japanese-built air strips and the excellent harbors would drive a wedge into our Pacific defense line that runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines. In unfriendly hands it would be a strategic loss that no competent military, naval, or air commander would or has overlooked.

Does Acheson believe that Mao's conquest of China is the birth of a new day? Does he think that the Chinese people are now "on their own," as he says?

He looks upon the Chiang government with horror and he sees the bright new day for 400,000,000 Chinese.

He was asked by a questioner after his January 12 speech the following question:

You stated that the present trend in Asia is to throw off foreign

domination. Is not the present debacle in China the very reverse of this; that is, the allowance of a foreign power to overthrow an existing government?

But Acheson did not answer that very pointed question.

Acheson takes the same position as his grand counselors on far-eastern affairs—Lattimore, Jessup, and Service—he has adopted almost wholly the thesis of Lattimore's article in *United Nations World* for March 20, "Asia Has Conquered Asia."

But let us take a look at the real record. Let us take a look at a secret document of our Department of State, entitled, "Current Foreign Relations," printed for the month of March 1950, which was not meant for the eyes of the American public, the contents of which the people are entitled to know at this time in view of the astounding position of the Secretary of State.

I read directly from page 10 of this secret document, and I might incidentally commend this document to the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. Knowland]. There is much in it which I believe will shock him also. This, Senators will understand, is not written by the Lattimores and the Jessups and the Services. This is written by some of the loyal people in the State Department who know what is going on, and that undoubtedly is why it is marked secret. I read directly from page 10 of the secret document:

Position in Far East, the Communist conquest of the mainland of China and the conclusion of the Soviet-Chinese treaty of alliance constitute the greatest advance which Soviet imperialist expansion has achieved since the war, and this advance is no doubt a major factor behind the attitude of confidence which appears to characterize the current Soviet outlook.

That is the true state of affairs. That is a bit different from Jessup's statement before the committee when he tried to treat what is happening in Asia as a victory for the United States; it is a bit different from his attitude when he condemned me for having in some way interfered with that successful program in the Far East. Mr. President, the true state of affairs as set forth in that document is not meant for the eyes of the public. That is the opinion of the loyal Americans in our Department of State whose voice has been muffled by the small group of intellectuals that has ensnared Acheson's mind.

It was not Chinese democracy under Mao that conquered China, as Acheson, Lattimore, Jessup, and Hanson contend.

Soviet Russia conquered China and an important ally of the conquerors was this small left-wing element in our Department of State.

I should like to point out that this document is a direct contradiction of what Dean Acheson himself has publicly told the people. It is a direct contradiction of everything that Owen Lattimore has said.

This secret document, which is less than a month old, dated March 19, expresses the frank analysis of the situation from the American point of view. I would like to read the frank analysis of the situation from the Russian point of view as contained in a broadcast from Moscow on December 17 last, as follows:

The Chinese people have dumped Chiang Kai-shek into the garbage can of history. The same fate awaits the United States puppets in other countries. Inspired by the grand historical victory of the Chinese people, the people of Indonesia and Viet Nam, the Philippines, Southern Korea and Burma are intensifying their national liberation struggle. The democratic movement is gaining ground and strength in Japan where people refuse to be tools in the implementation of the plan cooked up by Wall Street.

It sounds almost like Lattimore in his latest article.

With the triumph of Chinese democracy, the popular liberation movement of the peoples of Asia under the oppression of the imperialists has entered a new and more advanced stage.

The mind of the Soviet Foreign Office is as sharp as steel. The mind of the left-wing crowd in the American State Department is as soft as curdled milk.

The truth, as the Senator from California [Mr. Knowland] has pointed out, is that the only fighting force in the whole of Asia is the army of Chiang Kai-shek.

Acheson on January 12th referred to support of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa in these terms:

Some silly adventure which some people in this country are urging,

And—

The folly of ill-conceived adventures.

The great mind of the Secretary of State refers to the support of the Nationalist cause as "silly" and "folly," while it still has the best-equipped army of China and is even now on the offensive.

For his benefit let me point out that the most recent battle he led was the battle of Kinmen, an island off the coast of China opposite Formosa. As reported by the New York Herald Tribune:

On October 25, 17,000 Communists with supporting artillery made a night attack on Kinmen. By the twenty-seventh, the three Nationalist armies there, sparked by regiments trained under Sun Li-jen, had annihilated the attackers, of whom 8,000 were captured and 9,000 killed or drowned. The Nationalist air force aided the defenders.

The battle of Kinmen is the largest battle in which the Communists were defeated. For the first time, the new Chinese forces trained on Formosa had a test with the Communists, and came out triumphant.

Another recent battle was the battle of Tengpu Island, in the Chusan group, off the coast south of Shanghai. According to the same source:

On November 3, a somewhat smaller Communist force attacked Tengpu Island (near Tinghai), and on the sixth they were finally destroyed by units of the four armies in the Chusan group.

The reporter of the Herald Tribune commented:

The morale of the Nationalist troops participating was good, and as a result of the battles they captured artillery and small arms which strengthen their position.

The above quotes are from a dispatch by A. Doak Barnett, New York Herald Tribune, December 29, 1946.

We have seen the flow of crocodile tears for the families of those who have been named as the formulators of that policy. The searchlight of truth has finally been thrown upon these men and it is unfortunate, indeed, that their families have suffered from the adverse publicity. But those who shed tears for the families of these people with whom I also sympathize, I say, What kind of tears will you shed for the 400,000,000 people of China, the free leaders of which are now being prepared for liquidation as Mao drinks vodka with Stalin in Moscow?

The left-wing intellectuals are now in the process of actually preparing world tragedy. Can we stop them before it is too late? Can we have done with this business of subversion and degeneration behind high-sounding, phony diplomacy?

The Senate of the United States should take firm hand in its constitutional role of helping now to formulate a real foreign policy for the United States of America.



# SENSATIONAL OFFER!

Super-sensational packet of literature exposing Communism  
in all its phases

## \$1.00

11 dynamic pieces of literature, plus an introductory subscription to **The Cross and the Flag** (monthly magazine) for three months.

This magazine contains no advertisements and averages 32-pages per month. It deals with current issues without gloves. It contains between 40 and 60 editorials per month dealing with dangerous truth which few public men have the courage to discuss.

The above offer, including the introductory subscription and the packet of sample literature may be had for just \$1.00.

Additional copies of this book may be had at the following rates:

1 copy .....	\$ .50
3 copies .....	1.00
15 copies .....	5.00
100 copies .....	30.00

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO:

## Christian Nationalist Crusade

Post Office Box D-4, St. Louis 1, Missouri