



№ 9335.4A368

COPY 2



1001
7 3 4
HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 1689

TO CREATE THE FREEDOM COMMISSION FOR THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCIENCE OF COUNTERACTION
TO THE WORLD COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

JUNE 17, 18, AND 19, 1959

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1959

7-10 2-2
10-10-10

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, *Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*
BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Testimony of—	
Cherne, Leo, Washington, D.C.	139
Grant, Alan G., Orlando, Fla.	10
Herlong, Hon. A. S., Jr., U.S. Representative from Florida.....	1
Hunter, Edward, Port Washington, N.Y.	99
Jackson, C. D., New York, N.Y.	59
Judd, Hon. Walter H., U.S. Representative from Minnesota.....	119
McDowell, Arthur G., Philadelphia, Pa.	73
Niemeyer, Dr. Gerhart, South Bend, Ind.	67
Philbrick, Herbert A., Rye, N.H.	134
Possony, Stefan, Washington, D.C.	79
Statements:	
Bennett, Chas. E., U.S. Representative from Florida.....	156
Biemiller, Andrew J., Washington, D.C.	56
Brune, Hon. Frederick W., Baltimore, Md.	38
Dobriansky, Lev E., Washington, D.C.	159
Douglas, Sen. Paul H.	163
Hook, Sidney, New York, N.Y.	56
Kornfeder, Joseph Z., Detroit, Mich.	113
Manchester, Lt. Col. M. H., Washington, D.C.	153
Mundt, Sen. Karl E.	161
Payne, Mrs. E. Wyatt.	156
Sarnoff, David, New York, N.Y.	39
Stough, Mrs. Claude, St. Louis, Mo.	57
Walsh, Hon. Lawrence E., Washington, D.C.	39

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND FREEDOM ACADEMY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:55 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd (vice chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd and Hruska.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator DODD. The subcommittee will be in order.

I am sorry to be a bit late, but I was attending another meeting. We on the committee are very pleased to have Congressman Herlong here.

It is a personal pleasure to welcome you and hear you.

Senator HRUSKA. I would like to join in that, Mr. Chairman. I know both of us recall with pleasure the time we served in the other body with the distinguished gentleman.

TESTIMONY OF HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM FLORIDA

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to say that I am here in the interest of S. 1689, a bill which has been introduced by Senators Douglas and Mundt for the purpose of establishing what is called the Freedom Academy.

(S. 1689 reads as follows:)

[S. 1689, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Commission Act".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings:
(1) The Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a total political war against the United States and against the peoples and governments of all other nations of the free world.

(2) Unlike the free world, the Soviet Union has systematically prepared for this total political war over several decades. Drawing on the experience of previous conquerors and upon their own elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, the Soviet leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare into a highly effective operational science. Recognizing that political warfare is a difficult science making unusual demands on its practitioners, the Soviet Union and Communist China have established an elaborate network of training schools, within and without the free world, in which have been trained large numbers of highly skilled activists. These activists continue to receive intensive continuous training throughout their party careers.

(3) In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle.

(4) Since the end of World War II, the Soviets, taking full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how, have inflicted a series of political warfare defeats on the free world. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than a disaster for the United States and the free world and the continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival.

(5) In order to defeat the Soviet political warfare offensive and to preserve the integrity and independence of the nations of the free world, it is imperative—

(A) that the knowledge and understanding of all the peoples of the free world concerning the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy be increased as rapidly as is practicable;

(B) that private citizens not only understand the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy, but that they also know how they can participate, and do participate, in this continuous struggle in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner;

(C) that Government personnel engaged in the cold war increase their knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy, develop a high esprit de corps and sense of mission and a high degree of operational know-how in counteracting the international Communist conspiracy.

(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the hereinafter created Commission to achieve the objectives set forth in the preceding subsection (a)(5) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as hereinafter set forth are to be broadly construed.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this chapter—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Freedom Commission;

(2) The term "Academy" means the Freedom Academy; and

(3) The term "joint committee" means the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION; COMPOSITION; CHAIRMAN AND ACTING CHAIRMAN; QUORUM; OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN; SEAL

SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a Chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies,

persons, or the public, and, on behalf of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decisions of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

MEMBERS; APPOINTMENTS; TERMS; COMPENSATION; EXTRANEOUS BUSINESS

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and the Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve during the pleasure of the President. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$25,500 per annum.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; FUNCTIONS

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized and empowered to establish under its supervision and control an advanced training and development center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Academy shall be—

(1) the development of systematic knowledge about the international Communist conspiracy;

(2) the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy into an operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen, and to achieve this purpose the entire area of counteraction is to be thoroughly explored and studied with emphasis on the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to Government agencies other than the methods and means already being used;

(3) the education and training of private citizens concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to that conspiracy;

(4) the education and training of persons in Government service concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to that conspiracy to the end that they can be more useful to their Government in defeating the international Communist conspiracy.

ACADEMY STUDENTS; SELECTION; GRANTS AND EXPENSES; ADMISSION AS NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS; DEPORTATION

SEC. 7. (a) Academy students shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from a cross section of the diverse groups, within and without the United States, in which the total political war is being fought. Before accepting any student for training who is an officer or employee of a Government agency, the Commission shall first obtain the concurrence of that agency. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All other agencies and departments of Government are authorized to aid and assist the Commission in the selection of students.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this chapter. This authorization shall include authority to pay travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under this chapter, and authority to give financial

assistance to the dependents of students during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act. Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 1101(a)(15) of title 8, United States Code, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 1251-1253 of title 8, United States Code. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 1254 of such title 8.

NONACADEMY TRAINING OF ACADEMY STUDENTS

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to provide students selected for training at the Academy (either before, after, or during Academy training) with such additional education and training at colleges, universities, or technical schools other than the Academy, or with such on-the-job training in industry and business as the Commission shall determine to be in the public interest.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH AN INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 9. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate with or without charge information and materials which will assist persons and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and the ways and means of defeating that conspiracy. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 10. Nothing in this chapter shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 11 (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk and a report thereof has been made to the Freedom Commission.

(b) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Commission may request that any individual employed by the Commission, or under consideration for employment by the Commission, be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such personnel shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their com-

compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws: *Provided, however,* That no personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of \$19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee;

(3) to conduct such research, studies and surveys as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(5) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. Whenever the Commission shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under the authority of this Act, the Commission shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

(7) to utilize or employ on a full- or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without said personnel severing their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and further to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 73b-2 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and in addition compensation at a rate not to exceed \$50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

GENERAL MANAGER; APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION

SEC. 13. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$18,000 per annum.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL FREEDOM COMMITTEE; MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 14. There is established the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee" to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be the members of the same political party.

AUTHORITY AND DUTY OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 15. The joint committee shall make continued studies of the activities of the Commission and of problems relating to the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy. During the first sixty days of each session of the Congress the joint committee shall conduct hearings in either open or executive session for the purposes of receiving information concerning the development and state of counteraction. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of the Commission's activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or House of Representatives relating primarily to the Commission shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the joint committee, or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE; VACANCIES IN MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 16. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the members from that House.

POWERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 17. In carrying out its duties under this chapter, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The joint committee may use a committee seal. The provisions of sections 192-194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE; UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES;
ARMED PROTECTION

SEC. 18. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information,

facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

CLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 19. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information.

RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 20. The joint committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine in the interest of the common defense and security.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 21. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HERLONG. I appreciate very much the interest of the subcommittee in this subject which prompted these hearings on what I think is a most important and maybe already too late to solve problem. We think legislation in this field is a must.

We are grateful to you for the privilege of presenting our views to you.

What I have here is a part of the correspondence I have received on this bill. It comes from all parts of the United States, and, in fact, from some other countries.

I won't go into the details of the bill at this time because there are others who are going to testify after me, who are prepared to discuss the technical aspects of the bill.

I shall simply talk about the general principle that is involved and hope that we have at least developed a framework in this bill from which legislation can be drafted which will fill this much needed vacuum in the area of fighting the cold war against the Communists.

In this file here, I have correspondence endorsing this legislation ranging all the way from the eighth grade geography class in the Chadwick School in Rolling Hills, Calif., to the endorsements of Life magazine. Quite a number of those who have written me have expressed the desire to be among the first to apply for admission into this Freedom Academy, if it should become established, and we certainly hope that it will.

Hardly a day passes that I don't have one or more people representing national organizations come to me and ask what they can do in order to help get this plan moving, because they realize the importance of time in getting this school established.

I am sure, too, that you are aware of the very broad bipartisan character of support for this legislation.

Mr. Judd and I introduced companion bills in the House, and since that time identical bills have been introduced by Senators Mundt and Douglas and Representative Bennett, of Florida, and Representative Jackson, of California.

Likewise, the editorial support shows a broad range of political philosophy as attested to by the endorsement of legislation in my own

State by three newspapers of widely divergent political philosophy; the St. Petersburg Times, the Tampa Tribune, and the Orlando Sentinel Star.

I would like to read to you, Mr. Chairman, some brief excerpts from editorials which have been in the press endorsing this legislation.

From the New York Daily News of March 9, 1959, I quote:

A much sounder cold war strategy, we believe, is embodied in this legislation. We trust that Congress will give some of its best attention to this bill. From here, a Freedom Academy sounds like a college which we could well use.

From the Citizens News in Hollywood, Calif., March 10, 1959:

In the struggle for control of Iraq, the issue is whether this oil rich, strategically located middle eastern country will come under the domination of the Soviet Union.

For many years, the Communist agents have been busy there. We do not know how active the free world has been there, but the situation gives support to a law like the one proposed by Congressmen Herlong, of Florida, and Judd, of Minnesota.

From the Parkersburg News of West Virginia, Monday, March 16, 1959:

Never before has any action or any political movement employed the weapon of infiltration as extensively as the Communists now are employing it.

Never before have we faced so serious a threat to our way of life. Ideological armament has become as necessary as physical armament.

The Freedom Academy might provide the rallying point for a new, to us, and immensely important type of warfare.

From the Fairbanks, Alaska, Daily News-Miner, an editorial of March 25, 1959:

In the minds of many, the Herlong-Judd bill will enable us to close the political warfare gap in many areas of the world which is, in the long run, as serious as the missile gap.

The Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune of February 19, 1959, said editorially:

This bill should be supported by all who take the Communist threat as seriously as the Communists intend it.

The Tulsa Tribune of March 7, 1959, editorialized:

A full-time devil can beat a part-time angel any day. We need some full-time angels.

To this end, a bill has been introduced in Congress by Representatives Herlong of Florida and Judd of Minnesota which would set up a Freedom Academy not only for the training of U.S. diplomats, but for citizens of other nations who seek better methods of combating subversion, confusion, and the big lie.

It would, in short, develop a technique for the big truth. It is a good idea.

The Lewiston, Maine, Daily Sun, on March 7, 1959, had this to say:

So that the West can battle the Reds on their chosen battlefield, Representative Judd and Representative Herlong proposed establishment of what they call a Freedom Academy, which Life magazine calls a West Point of political war. A successful institution of this sort would be more significant than a victory over West Berlin.

We urge Congress to debate the bill fully, endorse it, and finance it.

Now Mr. Chairman, I have given you excerpts from a few of the editorials that have been written endorsing this proposal.

I have taken them from every section of the country purposely so that you can see that the support for the bill isn't just sectional.

We don't know that what we have proposed is exactly what should be done, but we do know, as I said a few moments ago, that there is a vacuum in the area of counteraction against communism; that we are not doing the job in fighting the cold war that we are capable of doing if we had trained people to help in this battle.

I would like very much to see this committee go into this matter thoroughly. If the legislation that we have proposed isn't what is proper, we hope that you will come up with something that will do the job and let us get on our way, because the Communists have a headstart of some 50 years on us in this type of ideological warfare and we have to catch up.

Just yesterday, the committee of which I am a member reported a bill to the House again raising the national debt limit. The temporary debt limit is up to \$295 billion. This is something, of course, that we have to do because of the tremendous expenditures which we have had to make and a great portion of it is brought about by the military and defense costs.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a program of the type, suggested in this bill, properly handled, will greatly reduce the necessity for such large defense expenditures when we get to the point where we can fight the cold war on even terms with the Communists. Until we reach that point, we are going to have to continue these enormous defense expenditures.

I submit further that we have here an opportunity, by spending just a little money, to save billions of dollars and also assure, or to come more nearly assuring, the preservation of the freedoms of the countries of the free world.

Senator DODD. Well, Congressman Herlong, we are very grateful to you.

It is a most serious matter and we expect to hear from a great number of witnesses.

Senator HRUSKA, do you have any questions?

Senator HRUSKA. No questions, except to repeat your appreciation for the appearance here of Congressman Herlong.

He has been very helpful and has laid a good foundation for the testimony we will hear later and I know both the chairman and the Senator from Nebraska will be interested in learning how later witnesses implement the objectives you set forth so well.

Mr. HERLONG. Thank you very much.¹

¹ Senator Karl E. Mundt, cosponsor of the bill, appeared before the subcommittee in earlier hearings on antismuggling legislation to ask for favorable action on the Freedom Commission Act. Two other witnesses in those hearings commented on the bill.

Roger Fisher, of the faculty of Harvard University Law School, said: "We, today, are fighting on many fronts and I submit that one of the most critical ones is the battle for men's minds. The battle can be won on the kind of issues that S. 1689 * * * deals with, affirmative furthering of the ideas of freedom, convincing the world what this country is all about. We must make the image of the United States so clear that no one in Europe or Asia or Africa could fail to understand the difference between our system and the Soviet system."

Lloyd Wright, former Chairman of the Commission on Government Security, said: "I cannot too strongly support the obvious desirability of the proposed Freedom Commission. Whether it is possible to indoctrinate peoples who have an entirely different philosophy of government * * * is something that the Congress must determine. At first blush it appears to me, however, that some difficulties might arise in those foreign countries where the control of government vacillates so frequently."

Written statements also were submitted by other witnesses, and were included in the earlier hearing record.

Attorney General Louis Wyman, of New Hampshire, said that the basic purpose of S. 1689 "appears to me to be sound, but I am not sure whether this is something that is best done by Government or from private sources." Mr. Wyman said that, generally speaking, he opposes the creation of additional agencies. But, he said, if the Department

Senator DODD. Mr. Alan G. Grant is our next witness.

Good morning, Mr. Grant. We are glad to hear from you and look forward to your testimony. Will you state your name and address for the record?

TESTIMONY OF ALAN G. GRANT, ORLANDO, FLA.

Mr. GRANT. My name is Alan G. Grant, 860 Metcalf Building, Orlando, Fla. I am a practicing attorney in Orlando, and one of Congressman Herlong's constituents.

Senator DODD. Do you have a statement?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator DODD. Go right ahead with it.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to this committee for affording me the privilege of testifying before you today. For the record, I am appearing as a representative of the Orlando Committee for the Freedom Academy to speak on behalf of the Freedom Commission Act, S. 1689, which the Orlando committee drafted.

Some of the members of the Orlando committee have been working with the basic proposal before you since 1951. This legislation presents a new idea, a new procedural concept in the cold war.

Since it is new, we feel it is of some importance for this committee to understand the considerable history of the proposal which led to the present bill and to know some of the thinking which has gone into this proposal over the last 8 years.

I therefore ask this committee's indulgence while I read the somewhat lengthy statement which the Orlando committee has prepared in compliance with the rules of your committee.

The origins of the Freedom Commission Act go back to the late summer of 1950. American forces in Korea had been pressed into the Pusan perimeter and we faced a serious military situation. But more important, it had by then become plain that the Soviets had thrown an across-the-board challenge at the West which would test our national character and every part of our free society as it had never been tested before. The stakes were national survival and the challenge would continue indefinitely conceivably for the remainder of this century, or longer.

of Justice and the FBI and other interested groups are unopposed, he does believe "some positive action should be taken to wage the battle for minds and consciences of mankind a little more positively than we have done to date." The personnel of this agency would have to be of the "highest quality and ability," Mr. Wyman said.

Frank B. Ober, of Baltimore, author of Maryland's antisubversion legislation, suggested that the proposed joint congressional committee might conflict with the activities of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. "I hope the jurisdiction will be clarified," he said.

Dudley B. Bonsal, president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, expressed hope for a broad study program, including history and techniques of communism, political history of the United States and the world, constitutional law and rules of evidence, "because the real nature of the Communist conspiracy becomes more apparent to the student who is also thoroughly grounded in our constitutional system." Mr. Bonsal also said he assumed that the joint committee would take the place of the existing Senate and House committees in this area and thought such a move "wise, as providing an opportunity for pooling the efforts of the two Houses of Congress, consolidating of staffs, etc."

Dean Abner McCall, of Baylor University School of Law, said the program outlined in S. 1689 "would furnish a needed supplement to the programs of the various governmental agencies now engaged in resisting the Communist conspiracy."

Alfred Kohlberg, of New York City, said in a statement that "the idea motivating S. 1689 is sound and long overdue." He added that some such plan "must be effectuated if the confusion in the public mind, and especially in intellectual circles, is to be overcome."

This challenge placed a unique burden on our citizens, for they would be required to make unusual sacrifices over long periods without the unifying stimulus of a general hot war. This was something the American public had not been called on to do before. If our people faltered, if they became apathetic under the diminishing impact of repeated crises, if they began to concentrate more and more on the material joys of an abundant society and less and less on the survival problems, then the free world would be in grave peril.

The long-term challenge was above all a challenge to the American educational system which must produce citizens willing to make the sustained sacrifice necessary to meet the total challenge.

In the late summer of 1950, a small group of Orlando citizens organized themselves into a committee called the Know Your Enemy Speakers. This committee believed that as an absolute minimum our high school seniors should be given a broad survey course on world communism (in addition to courses in American history and civic courses to show the advantages of an open society) so they could understand something of the frightful challenge—political, scientific, economic, and military—facing their Nation, and as a result would better understand the unique obligations of American citizenship. Our committee soon learned our high school teachers were not prepared to give such a course, and it was up to us if anything was to be done.

To avoid controversy, our committee was quietly organized on a broad bipartisan basis to include management and labor, the major religions, and both political parties. Our object was to create a committee on which there would be at least one person in whom each member of the community would have confidence, and a committee of which the community as a whole could say, if these representative people can agree that this is the correct method to teach the facts about communism and the Soviet challenge, then it must be the right method, or at least an acceptable one.

During the 5 months from the formation of the committee to the beginning of the lecture series, we were careful to explain the program to the many organized groups in the Orlando area, and the Sunday before the kickoff the local newspaper ran a full page story explaining how the subject matter would be handled. Thanks to this careful public relations no opposition developed even though we were "bringing communism into the classrooms."

The program ran 3 years. The first year we had seven lectures. By the third year the subject matter was broken down into 5 group areas and ran a total of 17 hours. This included 2 hours in group I on the historical development of communism from Marx to Stalin; 4 hours in group II on Soviet Russia covering such matters as the NEP, the 5-year plans, forced collectivization, slave labor, the secret police, the position of the party, and the arts and sciences under communism; 2 hours in group III on the satellites and particularly Poland from 1939 to the present; seven lectures in group IV on the organization, strategy and tactics of the Communist conspiracy in which we described the open and secret structure of the party, the methods by which an idealist is recruited into the party and then converted into a hardened conspirator, how the party sets up a front organization or penetrates an existing institution and then manipu-

lates the membership, the meaning of Communist terminology, and something of the Soviet espionage apparatus; finally, in group V a survey of Communist strength on both sides of the Iron Curtain and a summation of the total challenge to our society and the special obligations of U.S. citizenship in the years ahead.

In preparation the committee gave each speaker a lengthy reading assignment, including at least 1 book in each of the 5 group areas, and from 5 to 20 in his assigned area.

The program was, of course, inadequate. But we like to think it gave the small number of students who were able to hear the entire series an insight into the survival problems and a sense of urgency and challenge. More important was the education of the speakers themselves.

This school program demonstrated several points which I believe will help this committee better understand the Freedom Commission Act and some of the things it can accomplish.

First, it is possible for a broadly representative group of private citizens to work together harmoniously on an important anti-Communist project. It has been a heartening sight to watch liberals and conservatives drop their other differences and pull together to meet the Soviet challenge, once they have completed their reading assignments and acquired a common fund of knowledge. At the community level at least, we have been able to demonstrate that in relation to the Soviet conspiracy our pluralistic society can work together as a team. The key to this training is the common fund of knowledge acquired through an extensive reading and discussion program which gave the committee a common framework of reference and a mutual insight into the survival problems and a sense of urgency which subordinated differences that might have otherwise fractured the group. There is a remarkably broad consensus of opinion among Americans who have done their homework in this area.

Second, a project like the Orlando program is only possible when there are one or more persons in the community who have been intensively trained in the broader aspects of communism and the Soviet challenge and are willing to submerge their other interests in order to meet this primary threat. This condition existed in Orlando, but under present circumstances it is a rare phenomenon. Other communities tried to copy the Orlando program, but not one succeeded, because they lacked the trained leaders and the sense of urgency necessary to put in the thousands of man-hours.

Third, once you have a trained, representative leadership group at the community level, then the community can make its weight felt in the cold war. Our community has been fascinated by the number and variety of important cold-war projects that become possible once you have trained community leaders. Without such trained leaders, community participation in the cold war is severely limited. Our committee is convinced there is a huge, untapped, and almost unexplored reservoir of anti-Communist organizational strength in our private citizens and institutions which can support and supplement the activities of our cold-war agencies. This can be tapped by properly trained leaders. Whether we train these leaders in time can have a decisive effect on the cold war.

While the school program was in progress, we made inquiries to learn what other communities were doing to inform our youth of the Soviet challenge. It appeared that very little was being done. No one had had the foresight to teach the teachers to give such courses and the school administrators, the PTA's, and the general public felt no urgency in the matter. Furthermore, little was being done to reach the undergraduates in our colleges and universities. True, as part of a course on political thought in the 19th and 20th centuries the student might read the Communist Manifesto and State and Revolution, or in a history course he might study a few chapters on Russia after 1917, but this told him almost nothing of Soviet conflict techniques or of the total challenge facing his country. To us this was an appalling situation. Here we were deep in a total political war for national survival in which this Nation's ability to survive would depend very much on the temper and attitude of its citizens—a cold war which would directly or indirectly affect every part of the future of every high school and college graduate. Yet our educational system was being run as though the Soviet challenge did not exist. The failure to familiarize our youth with the character and methods of the Soviet enemy, the failure to impress upon our youth the total character of the challenge, this could only have a serious effect on the Nation's ability to respond to the challenge.

The educational failure has manifested itself in many ways. We have seen it in the difficulties our cold war agencies are having in recruiting our most talented people. After all, why should they give up the abundant life to fight a cold war which to them is vague, unreal, and far, far away. We have seen it in Korea where one-third of all captured GI's collaborated in some degree with the enemy, and where few of our troops were prepared to cope with the political arguments of their interrogators. We have seen it in the failure of our young leaders at the community, State, and national level to involve themselves and their organizations in the survival questions. Above all, we have seen it in the bottomless pit of public apathy which is eroding our entire position.

In Orlando we asked how can this educational failure be corrected. How do you go about training thousands of high school teachers or hundreds of college level instructors to give these courses? What is the best method of building a nucleus of trained leaders in each community? What organizational forms will be required? Can this best be done by private means or public legislation?

More appalling to us than the educational failure was the overall cold war position of the United States which seemed to be gradually weakening in relation to the Soviets.

All our reading and study pointed to the central fact that the Soviets were winning the cold war, because they had systematically prepared themselves over many decades to wage total political war, while the West had not. To the Soviets, political warfare or psychopolitical warfare is an all encompassing concept which gives direction and orientation to everything they do. They consider it the most important of the sciences. In the West it has been a neglected stepchild.

Soviet concentration on political warfare has given them three important operational advantages and a tremendous lead time. While

these three advantages may appear obvious, nevertheless they are matters, the implications of which the West has not faced up to in terms of counteractivity. I would like to list these three advantages briefly, because they will help pinpoint the specific problems which the Freedom Commission Act will help solve.

First, the Soviets have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare or psychopolitical warfare into a true operational science. To wage this new dimension of warfare, they have designed and field tested a broad spectrum of political weapons and political weapons systems. They have thought out the many open and covert organizational forms and operational techniques by which a highly trained, though small, power elite can acquire maximum power and influence in any given society or situation. Finally, the Soviets have meshed their psychopolitical warfare into their overall long-range strategy of protracted conflict, in which we are never given a sufficient provocation to use massive retaliation, but where, nevertheless, our overall position gradually weakens in relation to the Soviets. There is not time to make any detailed comments on Soviet operational methods and I don't believe that is necessary before this committee. However, because so little has been written about Soviet conflict techniques, that is, communism as a method, I would like to respectfully refer this committee to three books which the Orlando Committee believes do this much needed job. They are "Protracted Conflict," just published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania; "The Organizational Weapon," a 1952 Rand Corp. study, and "A Century of Conflict," by Dr. Stefan Possony, of Georgetown.

Second, the Soviets have trained the most skilled, dedicated, and cohesive political warfare cadres and leadership groups the world has known. They simply fight harder and with more know-how than their opponents. From the beginning Communist leaders have realized that political warfare is a sophisticated science which makes heavy demands on its practitioners. Perhaps no other area of human activity requires a greater personal commitment. This is not something which can be intrusted to amateurs or dilettantes. It requires intensively trained, fully committed professionals.

To train their cadres and leadership groups, to give them intense motivation and a high degree of operational know-how, the Soviets have established an elaborate system of training schools within the free world and behind the Iron Curtain. While the Soviets take every precaution to conceal the existence of these schools, much is known. I would like to list a few examples which have come to the attention of the Orlando Committee.

Father de Jaegher, a Belgian Catholic missionary, who spent many years in or near Communist-controlled areas of China prior to 1948, has described the seven levels of political training schools from village to Moscow through which the top cadres of the Chinese Communist Party have passed. After many years of intense schooling, the end distillate, the Moscow-trained man, is, in the words of Father de Jaegher, a new type of Chinese, a man who lives only for the cause, and literally burns himself out in his passion to turn first China and then the entire world into a completely communized state.²

² See "The Enemy Within," pp. 165-169.

Daniel James, a leading authority on communism in Latin America, in a 1954 Post article, described a training center in Prague devoted exclusively to the training of Latin American Communists and European Communists who would be working in Latin America. According to James, the enrollment was 750, and political warfare was the primary subject. Presumably many thousands of Latin Americans have now received advanced training at this center and have been redeployed throughout the fabric of our southern neighbors. Recently there have been published reports of another training center in Prague for African Communists with facilities for 3,000 students. I call your attention to the Alsop column for June 13, 1959, which is attached to this statement.

Last November, Time magazine reported the Argentine police had accidentally uncovered an advanced Communist training school located in a walled estate near a small provincial town. The students came from all over Central and South America, and included school-teachers, university professors, lawyers, doctors, and labor leaders. The course was 6 months long, 7 days a week, and covered a variety of political warfare subjects. Presumably certain graduates went on to Prague and Moscow.

Professor Alexander, of Rutgers University, in his book, "Communism in Latin America," mentions briefly a whole system of training schools by the Chilean party to increase the sophistication and know-how of its members.

Herbert Philbrick, in "I Led Three Lives," has described the secret district training school, run by the party in the Boston area to train party cadres. This school was considered sufficiently important to rate the personal attention of Jack Stachel.

Joseph Z. Kornfeder and William C. Nowell, alumni of the famed, but little understood Lenin Institute, have told us about the training in political warfare the present leaders of the various Communist parties received in Moscow in the twenties and thirties. In the September 1955, issue of Facts Forum, Montgomery Green has written a revealing article on the system of political warfare colleges operated in Russia. The article begins with these words:

Perhaps the most closely guarded secret of world communism, cut off from view by the Iron Curtain and shrouded in unbelievable security precautions, is the system of colleges for professional revolutionaries that annually turn out thousands of skilled agitators to bedevil the free world. Although this educational program has been in action for 30 years, and has graduated political saboteurs estimated to number a minimum of 100,000, its very existence is unknown to most people in the West.

The reason for the supersecrecy with which these schools have been surrounded is that they constitute the most successful cold war weapon yet developed by world communism.

Third, they have a superior organization which is skillfully deployed throughout the fabric of each nation to obtain maximum power and influence for the numbers involved. This organization, manned by trained political activists, permits the Communists to take full advantage of the infinite variety of organizational possibilities inherent in a total political war, whether setting up a front to organize and manipulate a previously unorganized sector of a given society, infiltrating an existing institution, or recruiting student leaders for a guided tour of the "New China." It is significant that an advanced

textbook on Bolshevik strategy and tactics is called "The Organizational Weapon"—Selznick, McGraw-Hill, 1952.

Finally tremendous resources within Russia and China have been mobilized to support Communist political warfare efforts. This is seen in their extensive language training program which emphasizes the numerous languages and dialects of Asia and Africa, and in the training of engineers and technicians beyond internal needs. This enables the Soviet to flatter and impress Indians by furnishing technicians to erect a steel plant who can speak the local dialect and can mix effectively with the local populace. It is seen in the systematic training of cultural groups and athletes for political effect. In the words of one expert, Chinese and Russian cultural groups touring the Near and Far East are so numerous and diversified, they amount to a "cultural cold war." It is seen in the huge effort in the publishing field where hundreds of party line books and magazines are translated into numerous languages, to be used in the underdeveloped areas. It is seen in the rapid increase in the size and diversity of Soviet aid programs which now exceed our own in carefully selected target nations (Iraq, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, and so forth). We can expect Soviet political warfare to become even more deadly as their fast rising production curve gives them not only a new propaganda theme but the means to supplement their psychopolitical techniques with ever-increasing economic subversion.

The Communists have been aptly described as the masters of "conflict management." With their superior operational science, with their skilled cadres and leadership groups, with their sophisticated organizational forms, the Soviets are able to achieve their short- and long-term objectives through an amazing variety of means. Their overall attack is so diverse only a trained individual can begin to identify its many forms.

The Soviets can, for example, slow down the development of a new weapon, like the H-bomb, by skillfully playing on the guilt complexes of Western scientists and opinion makers through a number of open and covert means, or they can teach sophisticated guerrilla-political techniques to a nationalist revolutionary movement and then penetrate and manipulate that movement in order to freeze out American bases, or they can contrive a racial bombing in the United States, and through their deep penetration of news media in Asia and Africa obtain major propaganda effect, or by skillfully recruiting African students into the French Communist Party in the thirties and forties they can vitally affect African history in the fifties and sixties.

In summary, Soviet cold war gains have been made possible by the systematic development of the science of political warfare and conflict management, by the intensive long-term training of leadership groups in this science, and by the creation of the diverse organizational structure which can fully utilize the new science and the superbly trained cadres and leadership groups.

These Communist strengths highlight the basic United States and free world weaknesses which underlie many of our cold war defeats and are severely handicapping our long range efforts.

I would like to list these weaknesses briefly as the Orlando committee sees them, because I believe this will help your committee

understand our thinking and will lead to a fuller understanding of the Freedom Commission Act.

First, there has been no overall, intensive, systematic effort to develop counteraction to the Soviets into an operational science which will meet fully the Soviet's total political warfare and protracted conflict strategy and techniques. When I say "counteraction" I mean both the so-called positive and negative aspects and also counteraction in the private as well as the governmental sector. Also, and this is important, I mean an operational science which fits within democratic morality and concepts—not a conspiratorial science to fight a conspiratorial science.

During the past few years a great deal has been written about Russia, China, and communism, but strangely almost nothing has been written which attempts to develop an operational science for the West which will fully meet the total Soviet challenge. This is of course, a tremendous challenge which, in its details, is beyond the capacity of any one man.

As far back as 1952, Dr. Stefan Possony, professor of political science at Georgetown and adviser to the Defense Department on Soviet Affairs, wrote in his pioneering book, "A Century of Conflict," and I quote :

Only fools refuse to learn from their enemies. There is no reason why we should not pick up some of the Communist tricks and use them, if and when they fit into the framework of our own requirements and morality. If only for defensive purposes, we must understand Soviet procedures. The Western World must urgently develop a new synthesis of the operational art.

Possony goes on to say this must be the subject of another book. Unfortunately, he has never gotten around to writing that book, nor has any other political scientist, to our knowledge.

You can go to most good libraries and pick up any one of dozens of books containing a scholarly description of some aspect of communism. In the final chapters the author often feels a need to suggest free world countermeasures. But, at this point, the scholarly, analytical mind seems to run into a mental roadblock. We are seldom given anything more helpful than broad generalities. While the author may set forth commendable goals, he does not describe any realistic means by which we can achieve these goals. It does no good to say repeatedly that the free world must develop its own operational art, unless we describe the organizational means which will make this possible. For 15 years our political science community has turned its back on the greatest challenge to political thought in our age. This is a fantastic situation.

Second, there has been no broad gaged, systematic effort to train private citizens and cold war agency personnel in the tremendously complex and difficult science of counteraction. There are no free world counterparts to the elaborate system of political warfare training schools the Soviets have been running for 40 years—other than the limited facilities of the CIA which is in the covert area. We have specialists on various aspects of communism. We have almost no experts or trained leaders in the area of counteraction. Nor is any program underway to develop such experts and leaders. After all you can't train people in a science which has yet to be developed. Moreover, not only have we failed to train in counteraction, but very

few of our cold war agency personnel are well grounded in communism, particularly Soviet conflict techniques. Even fewer are well versed in the interrelated military—economic-political aspects of the problem.

Attached to this statement is a memorandum prepared by Dr. Edward P. Lilly of the Operations Coordinating Board which summarizes all cold war educational activities of the Federal Government with the exception of the CIA and the FBI. This shows that present training is conducted along conventional lines and almost nothing is being done to give systematic training to cold war agency personnel in counteractivity. The same gap exists in the private sector. This will be developed by Dr. Gerhard Neimeyer, professor of political science at Notre Dame and current lecturer at the National War College.

The result of this training failure is that too often we find well meaning amateurs competing with fully committed professionals.

Third, we have not created the organizational forms, particularly in the private sector, through which we can counter the total Soviet threat.

Because we have not done these three things, our Government has had to rely on the conventional means of diplomacy, military and economic aid, and intelligence. But these conventional means, regardless of the skill with which they are employed, fail to engage the Communists on much of the battleground. We simply lack the operational know-how, the trained manpower, and the organizational forms necessary to cope with many forms of the Soviet's psychopolitical warfare.

In hearings this spring before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the State Department asked for funds to set up small staffs which could work full time to counter Soviet political and economic warfare. During the hearings Douglas Dillon made this startling and revealing statement:

We feel that it is necessary to have some staff or some group responsible for giving full time to these matters, planning action, following it up, and working out what we should do to counter the Soviet threat.

I have felt the need for this for some time and last year, when the business advisory group looked into the problem they felt the need for it. It was found that there was no place in the Government, in the State Department or anywhere else, concerned solely with this problem and what to do about it. It has been handled, to the extent it has been handled, in the different regional bureaus where they frankly emphasize only what is happening in their own respective areas. They do not exchange views on various parts of the world. They do not know the total Communist drive that may be behind particular actions and I do not think that their results have been anywhere near as effective as they should be.

We have talked over this problem a little bit with some of the countries that are interested and one of the conclusions we came to was that we were not well enough organized ourselves to know intelligently exactly what we wanted to do about a number of these problems. About 6 or 7 months ago I came to the conclusion we do need a full-time staff to work on this subject.

But suppose these staffs are set up. Suppose they do fully understand what the Soviets are doing on a world scale. They will still lack the trained manpower and the organizational forms to meet this new dimension of warfare. They will be a general staff without any army. The Orlando committee predicts many breakdowns from sheer frustration.

The pattern of Soviet penetration in Asia, Africa and Latin America is by now becoming known. The groundwork for this penetration was laid by decades of intensive cadre training and the careful testing and perfecting of a broad range of psychopolitical weapons. The tragic situations in Cuba and Iraq are not the result of any sudden Kremlin brainstorm. Their history goes back to the Lenin Institute in the twenties and thirties and the schools in Prague and Argentina in the fifties. Hundreds of intensively trained cadres, toughened by years of political warfare and underground work were poised to step in and develop any revolutionary situation. Conventional diplomacy and economic aid cannot cope with this. Our virtual helplessness in the face of those developing crises is a direct result of our failure over the past decade to develop counteraction and to get down to the hard, practical work of training leadership groups.

The Soviet challenge requires planning in terms of decades by systematically trained persons who understand the full spectrum of counteraction, both what can be done by government and what can be done by private citizens and organizations. The Cubas, the Iraqs, the Keralas of a decade from now may be lost because we are not training and deploying the people today who could be changing the whole climate of opinion and creating the anti-Communist strength in these target nations which would prevent the situation from ever developing to crisis proportions.

All of these matters deeply concerned our small group in Orlando. To us, the indispensable keys to our long-range victory against this new dimension of warfare were the rapid development of our own operational know-how, the training of leadership groups, and the creation of new organizational forms. But we searched in vain for any sign that a determined effort was being made along these lines either by the Government or by private institutions. It seemed ridiculous that a small group in Orlando should have to take the lead in such an obvious matter.

To us the time factor was becoming urgent. We could no longer afford to develop counteraction through costly trial and error or through isolated, piecemeal research on bits and parts of the problem. We needed an intensive, concentrated effort to develop counteraction and to train leaders.

We believed this could best be accomplished by establishing an advanced training and development center where we could bring together in a single institution the wide diversity of knowledge and talents necessary to develop fully the science of counteraction, and then to train leadership groups on a large scale.

In 1953, we discontinued the school program in order to spend all of our time developing this concept. A new committee was organized, called the Orlando committee, and, by the spring of 1954, this committee had produced a 50-odd page report recommending the establishment of a privately financed academy, which we first called the Lincoln-Petkov Academy and later the Free-World Academy. Petkov, of course, being the Hungarian patriot executed by Communists in 1947.

We sent this report to Robert Cutler, who then headed the planning board of the National Security Council, with the idea that if the administration agreed with us, it could quietly recruit a board of

distinguished private citizens in whom the country would have faith and who could raise the large sums needed.

Cutler circulated our proposal through the various cold war agencies and, in July 1954, the Operations Coordinating Board set up a conference which I attended for the Orlando committee. There were wide differences of opinion among the participants as to details of the proposal and as to the urgency of establishing an academy. This resulted in a noncommittal, least common denominator report going back to Cutler, instead of the strong action report we were seeking.

Frustrated in Washington, the Orlando committee revised the proposal and, in November 1954, mailed it to approximately 160 persons and organizations. This mailing list included a cross section of political thinking and a number of the most experienced anti-Communists in the country. The response was heavy and generally favorable. We were particularly pleased to note that liberal, moderate, and conservative anti-Communists all seemed to be in basic agreement on the urgent need for the academy.

On the basis of this favorable response, the Orlando committee held three all-day conferences in New York City in the winter of 1955. These conferences were attended by a well-balanced group of distinguished liberal, moderate and conservative anti-Communists. Again, there was broad agreement on the pressing need for the academy and much work was done to activate the Orlando proposals. At the end of the first conference, John K. Jessup, chief editorial writer for *Life* magazine, told me he was surprised that so representative a group of anti-Communist thinkers, some of whom had been fighting each other for years, could be brought together in one room. He was astounded when they were able to work together all day with hardly a scratch of the pen passing between them. This strengthened the long-held belief of the Orlando committee that persons of widely divergent backgrounds and political viewpoints can agree on a wide range of action in this area once they have done their homework and so have a common framework of reference and an understanding of the critical problems to be solved.

Despite general agreement among the conference experts, our attempt to establish the academy at that time failed because we were unable to produce adequate financing.

From late 1955 until last September, very little was done to push the Orlando proposals. We felt we would have to wait until there was a change in the climate of opinion. By last September we began to detect a shift in the attitude of an increasing number of our fellow citizens. The stoning of Nixon and our severe setback in Iraq was having its effect. Sam Lubell, the pollster, noted a vague and as yet inarticulate fear that the situation was getting beyond our ability to control and that the United States was gradually being pushed into a corner.

For the first time, the members of the Orlando committee felt there was a reasonable chance to create the academy through public legislation. On October 2, we met with our Congressman, A. S. Herlong, Jr., and briefed him on our ideas. He agreed to introduce legislation in this session.

Along with other members of the Orlando committee, I have been thinking and worrying about the Freedom Academy for a number

of years. I wish there was time to outline our complete concept of what the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy can be and to pass on our many ideas and suggestions. If I were to do so, however, there would be no time left for other witnesses. Attached to this statement is the floor speech made by Congressman Herlong at the time of the introduction of the companion bill in the House on February 2. This speech outlines the substance of the bill and makes suggestions regarding the Commission, the joint watchdog committee, the academy curriculum, the academy faculty, and the student body. It also suggests some of the many benefits which can be expected.

I would like to comment on the bill very briefly.

The heart of the Freedom Commission Act is section 6, which sets forth the principal functions of the academy.

Subsection 1 empowers the academy to develop systematic knowledge about the Communist conspiracy. A great deal has already been done in this area, especially during the past decade, but there is a need to bring together all of this material in a single center where it can be systematized and put to use. Too much valuable work is now gathering dust on library shelves. Also there are still important aspects of the Communist problem which have not been adequately researched or described, particularly material which presents and interrelates the full spectrum of Communist operational strategy and techniques.

Subsection 2 authorizes the Academy to explore and develop the full range of counteraction in both the civilian and governmental sectors, and to achieve a new synthesis of the operational art for the free world. This of course, is the vital area, where very little has been done. We would anticipate the Academy, for example, making a survey of all types of private organizations at the community, State, and National level to determine how they can participate in the cold war in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner. We would expect the Academy to look several decades into the future and to develop programs now which will bear fruit in the sixties and seventies, as well as programs which can meet immediate pressing needs. The Academy would not be engaged in a general search for knowledge for knowledge's sake. It would be seeking the practical, concrete means to meet the total Soviet challenge—the operational techniques and the organizational forms, which can activate and utilize every possible source of strength.

Developing counteraction into a science will be largely an academic accomplishment, unless we take the next step and get down to the practical work of training private citizens and Government personnel in this new science. We must get the material off the library shelves and pump it into our great civic organizations and Government agencies. This is provided for in subsections 3 and 4. There is little point in working out an inspired program for private organizations, unless there is a realistic training program which will provide them with the trained leadership which can give intelligent, bipartisan guidance. Since the Communist organizational weapon is working within a multitude of political, religious, economic, and ethnic groups, counteraction must be carried out by leaders of these same groups. This calls for a broadly representative student body and a training program tailored to a variety of conditions and circumstances.

Before closing this statement I want to comment on two objections which have come up to the present bill.

First, there seems to be a fear that, somehow, the joint watchdog committee might supersede and take over the functions of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. When the Orlando committee first heard this, we thought somebody was pulling our leg. However, this report has persisted and the Orlando committee has asked me to make this point clear: While we consider the joint committee highly desirable, we also consider it to be the least essential part of the present legislation. If the retention of the joint committee creates an obstacle to the passage of this act, then, for heavens sake, drop it.

The joint committee proposed in this bill would not be engaged in investigating the Communist conspiracy within the United States, nor would it be concerned with drafting or amending security laws. That would be the business of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. The last thing we want to do is interfere with those committees in any way or to preempt their jurisdiction. If the language of section 15 needs any amending to make this absolutely clear, then it should be so amended.

What the joint committee would do is to make continuing studies of the work of the Commission and the Academy to see that the intent of Congress is carried out and that an intensive, practical effort is made to develop counteraction and to train relevant personnel. The most important reason for the joint committee is to increase public confidence in the Commission and the Academy. We are aware of the reluctance of the House and Senate leadership to establish further joint committees. We believe an exception is indicated here.

Second, the Justice Department, in a letter to the House committee which has the companion bill, suggests that all the functions of the Commission and Academy can be handled by existing departments and agencies and with less confusion and overlapping. This would be fatal.

It is already very late. We must develop counteraction on a crash program basis. To do this we must assemble at the Academy persons with a wide diversity of knowledge and talents, who have been relieved of other responsibilities and can work full time on this problem. This is not something which can be scattered among the different departments and agencies, to be worked on piecemeal by different technicians and desk-level people whenever the day-to-day problems ease up.

In counteraction, every part affects and influences every other part. The State Department has admitted, in the already mentioned hearings before Congressman Rooney's subcommittee, that it has made a serious error in compartmentalizing its planning and direction of counteractivities to Soviet political and economic warfare. A far greater error will be committed, if we try to divide up the development function into neat little watertight packages to be farmed out to different agencies. This area cries out for an operational science which can closely intermesh the whole range of private and governmental counteraction. This can best be done by a single organization able to consider all aspects of this infinitely complex and sophisticated problem.

Furthermore, no one, to our knowledge, has drafted or is intending to draft legislation to give these other departments and agencies the necessary authority and funds. The fact that these agencies have not sought such authority indicates they are not "hot" to undertake this challenging added burden. Rather, they appear to be fully engrossed with the day-to-day problems, and their whole setup is unsuited for either the development or training functions.

The Orlando committee has worked long and hard on the present proposal at a considerable sacrifice to business and professional careers. Certainly, the present legislation is not perfect but we are getting a little tired of nit pickers who have no counterproposals. This is war. There is no time to wait for the perfect bill. Let's get on to the job. The bill can be amended at later sessions.

Thank you very much.

Senator DODD. We are very grateful to you. That is a very impressive statement. I have read it, and I must say, I think it is a most impressive statement, and we are grateful to you for appearing here today to help us out.

Mr. Sourwine, do you have any questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. I have some. Would the Chair wish to order a copy of the text of the bill S. 1689 to be printed at the beginning of these hearings?

Senator DODD. Yes. It is so ordered.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say the Orlando committee drafted this bill, Mr. Grant?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So it would be proper to ask you about the interpretation of certain provisions in the bill?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. First, just a couple of technical points. Directing your attention to section 2(a)4 which begins at the bottom of page 2. I will read this passage:

Since the end of World War II the Soviets have taken full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how * * *. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than disaster for the United States and the free world.

Do you consider that there is any possibility that the enactment by Congress of what I have just read would furnish propaganda material for the Soviets throughout the world?

Mr. GRANT. Well,—

Mr. SOURWINE. Or would it be desirable to delete that and to let subsection 4 begin with the words, "The continuation."

Mr. GRANT. Well, undoubtedly, the Soviets would try to squeeze that for any propaganda advantage they could. While this would represent a possible limited disadvantage, the advantages of putting that in there, and facing up to our situation in legislative form, far outweigh any propaganda advantages which the Soviets can get out of that statement. In fact, I think those statements in the bill emphasize the part of their procedures the Soviets do not like to have known and brought to the public's attention. Very likely, they would not try to make propaganda out of this, to the extent I think you have in mind. By publicly admitting what we have failed to do in the past, we can pinpoint the specific problems this bill will correct. It

will clear the air. It will show we mean business and it will help to forestall any attempt to convert the Academy into an innocuous academic undertaking.

Mr. SOURWINE. Directing your attention to page 7, if you look at lines 20 and 21, the bill speaks of using means available to the Government agencies, other than the methods and means already being used. Undoubtedly, you have in mind there, the avoidance of all duplication. On the other hand, if Government agencies are presently using certain means and methods which are good, you would not mean to exclude those, would you?

Mr. GRANT. That is correct. What we had in mind there was that we wanted all possibilities fully explored. Obviously, we want to perfect and further improve the means we are already using, and the Academy can make a great contribution here.

Certainly, the Academy, with the type of faculty which we propose to have, should address itself to the problem of further perfecting the conventional means we are presently employing, but it should also explore all other possibilities, operational techniques, organizational forms, which the cold war agencies could use, as well as those which private organizations can employ. That is what we had in mind here. The Academy should explore the entire spectrum of counteraction, with special emphasis on the methods and means we are not presently employing.

Mr. SOURWINE. If this language I have quoted to you should upon close examination appear to foreclose a certain area, that is, the area of those good methods which are now being used, then you would favor other language, would you not?

Mr. GRANT. I certainly would.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, directing your attention—

Mr. GRANT (interrupting). Let me just add right here if I may, in relation to this act, generally, the members of the Orlando committee are not experts on drafting Federal legislation. We felt it was necessary for us to more or less take the bull by the horns and produce the basic bill, which we hoped your committee would perfect. We don't maintain this is a polished document.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). Directing your attention to page 18, lines 17 and 18, you have here a subtitle which reads, "Staff and Assistance; Utilization of Federal Departments and Agencies; Armed Protection."

I find nothing in the subsequent section which has anything to do with armed protection. I wonder why that is in there.

Mr. GRANT. As you probably noticed, Mr. Sourwine, we adopted this part of the act setting up a joint committee from the Atomic Energy Act and in typing the bill, those two words, "armed protection," were accidentally left in there. They should be deleted.

We caught that, and I planned to write you a letter about it. I simply had not gotten around to doing that. I might also add, going back to section 17, part of a sentence has been left out of the House bill. When I checked the Senate bill, I found it was copied verbatim and the same clause was left out of the Senate version. I will give the wording to you but you can simply refer to the Atomic Energy Act.

MR. SOURWINE. What line is that, that you refer to? I have to read it to find it. Just a minute. After the word "Committee" in line 19—

MR. GRANT. The deletion begins after the word "Committee" in line 19. It does not make sense the way it is.

MR. SOURWINE. You will supply the language that you suggest?

MR. GRANT. Yes, sir.

MR. SOURWINE. You say it should follow the corresponding section of the Atomic Energy Act?

MR. GRANT. Yes. That section follows verbatim the corresponding section of the Atomic Energy Act.³

MR. SOURWINE. Now, some general questions, Mr. Grant.

Do you consider it of any importance to erect safeguards against possible political control of the organization you would set up here?

MR. GRANT. Direct safeguards against political control? Do you mean by that, Republicans, Democrats, or pressure groups or something of that nature?

MR. SOURWINE. You want it to be nonpolitical, do you not?

MR. GRANT. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. You spoke of bipartisanship in one part of your statement. There is a difference between bipartisanship and being nonpolitical. It is nonpolitical that you are aiming at, is it not?

MR. GRANT. That is correct, sir. If I may interrupt just a minute. That is the reason, I think I emphasized before, why we think a joint Senate-House committee to make continuing studies of the Freedom Commission is very important. I think if it is turned over to the executive branch of the Government and it is controlled exclusively by the executive branch—except of course as to amendments or getting appropriations—the public would have less confidence than if there is also this joint committee to check on the commission, and the Academy, and see what it is doing. Getting that full public confidence in the Commission and the Academy is the most important reason for having this joint committee.

Senator HRUSKA. Why did you suggest a division of 4 to 2?

MR. GRANT. I am sorry. I am a little hard of hearing.

Senator HRUSKA. In the bill I notice that it calls for a 4-to-2 division in the committee. Four members of one party and not less than two in the other.

MR. GRANT. Well, first of all, we thought that seven would be an ideal number. We went back to the original thought of the Orlando committee in setting up our committee down there. We tried to make the committee itself as broadly representative as possible and we thought the same idea, of course, should be carried into the Freedom Commission itself. If you had four or five members, that would not be quite enough appointments to make it broadly representative.

Secondly, we thought we would like to apportion the membership

³The complete sentence, beginning at line 15 of the printed bill, and the following sentence, as they appear in the December 1958 committee print of Atomic Energy legislation, at p. 68, read as follows: "The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the committee assent. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Joint Committee or by any member designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such Chairman or member."

between the two parties. Possibly 3 to 3 and the chairman from the majority party would be the best division.

Senator HRUSKA. Why did you not make it 4 to 3?

Mr. GRANT. I believe we did. I think that is the way we have it drafted. You will note that the division of the Commission, as distinguished from the joint committee, is four to three. You will also note that there are seven Senators and seven Congressmen on the joint committee and no more than four from either house may be from the same party. This is the four to three division. We followed the Atomic Energy Act almost verbatim in establishing both the Commission and the joint committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Isn't it clear to you, Mr. Grant, that a committee or a joint committee of Congress has to be political? There will always be one party in control.

Mr. GRANT. Well, I believe that is partially true; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is wholly true; is it not?

Mr. GRANT. Well, I don't know that I am an authority to argue that particular point.

Mr. SOURWINE. Isn't it perfectly clear you cannot have a congressional committee which is not dominated by one or another of the major political parties?

Mr. GRANT. I think that is correct; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. So, in setting at the top of this pyramid a joint congressional committee, you are making it essentially and inescapably a political matter; are you not?

Mr. GRANT. Well, I don't like to look at it that way.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, how else can you look at it?

Mr. GRANT. Well, we like to look on this joint committee as being made up of elected representatives of the people and it gives the people the best immediate direct check on what the Commission and the Academy are doing.

We believe the joint committee and the Commission can and should be above partisan politics when dealing with this area. I like to believe they will set an example for the rest of the country to follow. Our experience has been that once a representative group had done its homework in this area, then its liberal and conservative members can agree on a surprisingly broad range of anti-Communist action. I believe that will be done in the case of the Commission and the joint committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. But the committee itself would necessarily be a political committee in the sense that it would be nominated by the Republican Party or by the Democratic Party.

Mr. GRANT. Yes; to some extent I suppose we can expect that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your chairman and vice chairman would be from the party which was in power at the Congress at the time. Is that right?

Mr. GRANT. That is right.

Senator HRUSKA. I don't suppose that is of too great importance. When you drafted the bill, you did not consider that a major problem, I take it?

Mr. GRANT. No.

Senator HRUSKA. I don't know. Sometimes around here, they tell me that when one party or the other gets so heavy a majority, it is

difficult to tie this committee 4 to 3; but that would not trouble you too much if you had six Democrats and one Republican, would it?

Mr. GRANT. Well, I am a registered Democrat myself but in this area, I try to remain entirely bipartisan or nonpartisan, except as to the Soviets.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Grant, as the bill is drafted, the watchdog committee would have both legislative and investigative functions. Isn't that right?

Mr. GRANT. Well, investigative only to the extent of investigating what the Commission, the Academy, and the Information Center are doing. That is what we primarily had in mind, although presumably it would be helpful to the joint committee if they were able to call in independent witnesses to develop various aspects of counteraction. All laws or amendments to laws dealing with the Commission and the Academy would be sent to the joint committee, just as all laws dealing with atomic energy are sent to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. The duty which you impose upon the committee is to make continued studies of activities and problems relating to the development of counteraction to the International Communist conspiracies. Would that not embrace a great deal of what the existing House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee now do?

Mr. GRANT. I did not interpret it that way but since apparently, it has been subjected to that interpretation, I frankly think that that language should be modified to make it quite clear and quite plain that it will not supersede nor interfere in any way with the activities of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I am sure this committee can redraft sections 15 and 17 to take care of that matter.

We do not envision the joint committee investigating communism in the United States or drafting security laws. That is the business of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the Un-American Activities Committee. The last thing we would want to do is to interfere with these committees.

Mr. SOURWINE. As your bill is drafted, it provides for a systematic selection of those who will attend the Academy. It would not, therefore, be open to all, or to all who have certain academic background. Is this, in your opinion, desirable? Is this the democratic way to proceed?

Mr. GRANT. Well, I don't believe that we should have the Commission and the Academy open to just anyone who wants to attend it, any more than West Point or Annapolis or the Air Force Academy are open to anyone who wants to attend.

We have, regardless of the size in which this is undertaken—

Mr. SOURWINE. Let me interrupt you. Of course, it is open to anyone who passes an examination and is physically qualified and nominated by a Member of Congress?

Mr. GRANT. Which is a method of selection, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. It is much broader than this one which you suggest in this bill.

Mr. GRANT. What specific terminology do you refer to, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. In selection, you do not spell out precisely how that selection shall be accomplished. You do provide for selection, presumably to be in accordance with the rules and regulations fixed by the Commission. The Commission would have the authority to select in accordance with whatever standards it set up. It seems to be aimed at the creation of an elite corps and I wondered if that was what you had in mind.

Mr. GRANT. Not elite, in the sense of being exclusive. Now, you notice the language provides Academy students are to be selected, insofar as practicable and in the public interest, from a cross section of the diverse group within and without the United States in which the total political war is being fought.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that mean you have to have so many Catholics; so many colored persons; so many persons with brown skin; so many persons that belong to particular organizations? Does it mean that?

Mr. GRANT. No. Not at all. It means that the cold war is being fought in all types of organizations and all types of institutions. The people who can best lead counteraction, or develop strength within those organizations, are members of those very organizations. Consequently, those are the people in the private sector that we want to bring into the Academy and train.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, the cold war is being fought for example, in the PTA. Would you say there had to be a certain proportion of people from the PTA in the Academy?

Mr. GRANT. No. Not a certain fixed proportion, but we would certainly like to have a number of people from the PTA come in and attend these courses.

Mr. SOURWINE. Since the cold war is being fought among all the minority groups, would you have representatives from all the minority groups in the selected student body?

Mr. GRANT. I would certainly hope that eventually we would get members of all those minority groups to attend the Academy so they could go back and focus the attention of their organizations on the survival question and inform them of the character and methods of the Soviet conspiracy and provide their organizations with informed leadership which could show them how they could participate in the cold war.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this what you mean by cross sections?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir; always keeping in mind you don't want to bring a dodo or a moron into the Academy and try to train him. He has to have some ability before you spend the Government's time and money on him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you resist the idea of fixing certain minimum standards and then letting the Academy be open to all who could meet those standards?

Mr. GRANT. No. I would have no objection to that. I think those standards might be a little difficult to set up. The Orlando committee has not specifically explored that precise problem. I believe it would be wise, however, to give the Commission broad authority in student selection, keeping in mind the general policy directive set forth by the Congress in sections 2 and 7. The cold war situation is constantly changing and presumably the makeup of the student body would also change to some degree to meet new situations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, do you have in mind that the primary objective here would be propaganda, or education?

Mr. GRANT. Well, the word "propaganda" has certain inferences and implications which I don't like. What we are emphasizing here is developing methods and means by which freemen can defend themselves against the total Soviet threat. I think propaganda is an exceedingly poor term to describe that. What we are using is the truth. We are not compelled to use the conspiratorial forms or the conspiratorial techniques or to adopt the false propaganda poses of the Communist, insofar as this Academy is concerned. I presume the CIA is engaged in certain affirmative covert political activities. I don't know. I presume that. I hope so, anyway. This is not the area of the Academy. The Academy is entirely in the open area.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are going to teach.

Mr. GRANT. I do not think of it in terms of teaching these people propaganda to use in the sense of trying to present any distorted picture.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, truth is the best propaganda, is it not?

Mr. GRANT. It certainly is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Propaganda is simply the dissemination of information designed to effect the thinking and attitudes of people, is it not?

Mr. GRANT. Correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the information you disseminate is the truth, it is best calculated to achieve that purpose, and permanently retain its effect, is it not?

Mr. GRANT. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You spoke of creating a group of people able to fight the cold war. Are you going to exclude teaching them conspiratorial techniques?

Mr. GRANT. Certainly, as part of their training, they will have to understand Soviet conspiratorial techniques. Now, in defending itself, obviously, a free world or a free country or a Democratic country, particularly when it is faced with the sort of challenge we are, would be foolishly naive if it tried to confine itself entirely to open methods. The CIA operates in the covert area; not only in intelligence but probably in affirmative political activity. As far as the Academy is concerned it would not be operating in that field. The Academy is primarily concerned with the open part of the problem. But students should understand the covert part of the problem.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are we not caught in a little semantic trap here? Conspiracy can be open as well as covert. Conspiracy simply means the grouping together of individuals with a purpose of common action toward a common objective. Is that not exactly what we are doing here when we are trying to fight the world Communist conspiracy? We are entering into a conspiracy of our own, open, if you please, and avowed, but for the purpose of making our joint effort come to bear upon the joint objective of defeating the world Communist conspiracy. Is that not true?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, sir. I agree with that completely.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that in that respect, you cannot be afraid of the word "conspiracy," at its basic meaning. What we will be teaching here are the techniques of conspiracy against communism. Isn't that right?

Mr. GRANT. Well, you have explained conspiracy in such a way that I think it takes most of the onus off the term. We are seeking here to develop the organizational forms and the operational techniques by which freemen can organize anti-Communist strength against the total Soviet conspiracy. I think that is a better way of expressing it. We urgently need to develop all the latent areas of strength, and this can be done by using methods which do not do violence to our morality and ethics. Again I am speaking of what the Academy will train people to do, not what CIA does where their people must have a "cover."

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir. You spoke of indoctrination of members of the Armed Services. How will the Freedom Academy accomplish that?

Mr. GRANT. Well, there are a number of ways that immediately come to mind. For example, the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces run a very considerable education and information program.

Mr. SOURWINE. They do.

Mr. GRANT. I think that many of the officers within the Armed Forces who conduct that, who give lectures to troops, and so forth, if they would attend the Academy for 3 or 4 months, it would help them considerably in what they are doing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you any appraisal of the value of the pre-indoctrination program in the Armed Services? Do you think it is good or bad?

Mr. GRANT. I have made no study of that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know?

Mr. GRANT. I understand they have a very good Director and Deputy Director over there, John Broger, on that program.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know whether they would need the guidance or control of the Academy in order to do a better job or to do their job at all?

Mr. GRANT. I have not made a specific study of that problem. I prefer not to comment on that at this time. However, John Broger is very much in favor of this bill and has told me it will help them with their program. I understand this is the general feeling at the Pentagon. The Academy would not control any other department or agency, but the operational science developed by the Academy would be utilized by other agencies and they would use the Academy's training facilities.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you regard the Freedom Academy as, in any sense, a counterespionage agency?

Mr. GRANT. No; I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not. I think you said something which indicated that you thought that the Freedom Academy would produce a group or a cadre of professional political warriors.

Mr. GRANT. Well, I certainly think that those who are operating in our Government cold war agencies should be developed to the very highest professional levels. Obviously, many private citizens who will attend the Academy, particularly those who are taking shorter courses—I think the Academy would give some courses, of 1, 2, or 3 months' duration—will not reach professional level, but will prove very useful. For example, suppose an oil company wants to send

people to Latin America. They may be willing to send them to the Academy for 1 month. Even in a month they can receive sufficient training to greatly increase their usefulness. High-school teachers might want to attend summer courses and take 2 or 3 months of training in this area, so they can go back and organize courses. In 2 or 3 months, you cannot raise these people to professional level. But we also need people, both in private life and government, who will receive 1, 2, 3, even 4 years' training in this Academy and related schools so they can understand the overall problem, and intermesh the whole spectrum of counteractivity into a true operational science which, at that level, will certainly require a high level, professional type of person.

Furthermore, it is of utmost importance that Academy training be of a caliber and intensity which will inspire true dedication in the students and a determination to do whatever is necessary to meet the total Soviet challenge. Counteraction can no longer be entrusted to half-committed people. To paraphrase Lenin, we need people who will devote to counteraction not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would there be any effort to keep liaison with and control over the graduates of the Freedom Academy so as to direct their activities toward a coherent operation?

Mr. GRANT. Not directly. I think that if that was done—while you can argue it either way, if that were done, there would be many objections raised: that there was too much Federal interference in the private sector; it would be asserted that we were trying to set up a super organization that is interfering in private sectors or interfering in foreign countries, and so on.

You can imagine how the Communists could pick up that propaganda ball and run with it. However, instead of that, what we have proposed is the establishment of an information center. The information center would provide materials to any interested group or individual who is working against the Soviet conspiracy and to this extent could give organizational support to Academy graduates. Let me give an example.

Back in 1950, when we set up this school program, there was no place we could turn to for help. In the course of 2 years, a couple of us read just about everything that had been printed in the English language on the subject of world communism that was available in our libraries. We used to start out at 7 in the evening, and read until 3 and 4 in the morning, and put in a full day in the law office the next day. Unfortunately, I don't think there are too many groups who would be willing to spend that amount of time preparing but, in the future, when a group like the Orlando Committee wants to set up a school program like that, there ought to be some central organization they can turn to for top level help and material. They have not even produced textbooks in this area yet. The information center, authorized in section 9, would fill this urgent need. The information center working with the Academy and Hollywood, could, for example, turn out a series of high-caliber training films to be used by high schools, colleges, and community study groups.

There ought to be textbooks to guide teachers; all types of visual aids and training aids including films and so forth, available. The

information center can provide these and also suggest programs. The Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy would not be engaged in operations other than that. Everything they are doing is in the development and training area; not in the operations area. So there is no overlap. That type of operation will not conflict in any way with the U.S. Information Agency. One of the objections raised was overlapping here, and duplicating. I think we very clearly are not.

Getting back to your question: Congressman Herlong, in his maiden floor speech on this bill, stated that Academy graduates would have no strings attached when they left the Academy. But we can expect those who have trained together to cooperate with each other when they have left the Academy. This is most desirable. We can expect them to form their own liaison committees without any intervention by this Government. Unless they do this on a voluntary basis, their training has not been very effective.

Does that answer your questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

You are speaking of getting people from foreign countries, making them good cold war fighters, then sending them back. Is there any danger that, in the first instance, the efficiency of such people as fighters of communism would be circumscribed because they would be labeled in their countries as American spies?

Mr. GRANT. Certainly that is a possibility, and it is something we have thought about a long time. Back in 1953 and 1954, when we were originally considering the academy as a private institution, we considered setting it up in the Philippines or in Switzerland, for example, just to prevent any possible onus from having attended a U.S. political academy. On the other hand, I think we can get overly defensive about this matter. We can think of all the things, the clubs that the Communists are going to pick up and hit us with. As a result, we get completely frozen in place. We think, "My God, when we do this, the minute those people go back, they will be branded covert agents of the CIA," and so on, regardless of what we do. But that mere possibility should not stop us from going ahead and establishing an academy which we think is desperately needed. The danger exists, but I am sure the Commission can find the means to reduce this danger.

You should also keep in mind that once a foreign student has received Academy training, he will know how to handle any accusation that he is an American spy. He will keep the other side on the defensive.

Let me give an example of where we can get students. There are between 35,000 and 40,000 exchange students in this country at all times. Now, I believe that a significant number of those students would volunteer to attend this Academy. Not necessarily for 1, 2, or 3 years, but possibly for a 3 months' course or a 6 months' course, and if they did that, they would be so much more effective in preserving the free world than they are now, where we simply send them back as individuals without any idea of what they are going to do or sense of mission. I understand many of them join the Communist Party when they get back because the Communist Party appears to be the only group that has a dynamic program, and knows where it is going.

In addition to that, I am certain there are many persons overseas who would like to volunteer to come to this Academy. Originally, the Orlando committee thought one of our greatest problems would be recruiting overseas students to come here. Obviously, any recruiting overseas would have certain propaganda overtones that could be used against us, but I have discussed this with other people who are in contact with overseas organizations. They tell me our problem is not going to be to get enough students but trying to select from the many applications we have, the few that we will be able to train. In other words, we will have so many people applying, we will not be able to train all those who want to attend this Academy.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have just one more question.

In your provision for bringing in foreign students, the bill calls for admission of those foreign students who are selected; as presently drafted, this would appear to override the authority of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the Attorney General. I take it, you would have no objection to amending the bill so no one could come in unless they meet the regulations of the immigration law?

Mr. GRANT. That section was adopted, almost verbatim, from that part of the U.S. Information Service Act which sets up the student-exchange program, and provides the same safeguard—namely, that students shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under such circumstances and conditions as may be prescribed by the regulations of the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. They can be deported at any time if they engage in adverse political activity.

Senator HRUSKA. Isn't that what we do now with other students? We bring them here for health purposes; research.

Mr. GRANT. We have no objection to such an amendment. I wanted to point out that section 7 is adopted from the U.S. Information Service Act, setting up the student-exchange program, and has the same safeguards.

Senator HRUSKA. I don't think you have any great problem there.

I think you have a very good idea. If it does nothing else, I hope it will put an end to the constant apology, "We did not know about the Communists, when they did these things." This has been going on for 25 years at least. We would have a place where everybody can get the information. It would be given out every day. If we can do that, we would have done something worth while, in my judgment. I think your testimony is very good and very impressive and very helpful. I am grateful to you.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WESLEY LOWRY, CHAIRMAN, FOUNDATION FOR RELIGIOUS ACTION IN THE SOCIAL AND CIVIL ORDER (FRASCO)

Senator HRUSKA. You are chairman of the Foundation for Religious Action; is that right?

Mr. LOWRY. That is correct. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Good of you to take your time to help us out. Will you state your name and address for the record?

I am sure you have a prepared statement.

Will you give it to us, too?

Mr. LOWRY. Charles Wesley Lowry, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington 6, D.C. I am chairman and director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, commonly called FRASCO. This is an all-faith organization, dedicated to combating communism with spiritual weapons, and to launching a spiritual intellectual counteroffensive against communism.

Senator HRUSKA. I have to make a telephone call. I have a copy of your statement. I am coming right back. You go right ahead.

Mr. LOWRY. Certainly. Thank you very much, indeed.

(Senator Hruska retired to an anteroom, returning within a few minutes.)

Mr. LOWRY. I am very much privileged to have the opportunity of supporting S. 1689, commonly referred to as the Freedom Commission Act. I would like to say, in starting, that I personally believe that we can win the cold war if we have the will to win it. The thing that I think has, to a great extent, been lacking in the free world, and even in the United States, is a definite, strong will to face the situation, to exert the power necessary—and I use power very generally there to cover more than simply physical or military power—to win this struggle. I think we can win it, provided we have the will and provided we effect the necessary concentrations of power. Using it again in that general sense, the paramount issue before mankind, I believe, is freedom; its security, survival, renewal, and extension as the divinely ordered, fundamental form of human existence alike for individuals and societies.

There is an ideology of freedom with an unlimited potency of moral force and psychological appeal, provided that the inheritors of freedom in this country and the world awake to the realization of what they have in their hands and provided, also, that free men face realistically, before it is too late, the gigantic scope and organized character of the counteroffensive launched in our advanced 20th century after 300 years of relative passivity and quiescence, by the massed forces of despotism and total tyranny.

In very truth, freedom has not known such peril since the westward thrust of the Ottoman Turks in the 15th and 16th centuries, perhaps since the battle of Tours in 732, possibly since the days of the Caesars and the persecution of Christianity prior to the conversion in 311 of Constantine the Great.

I have discussed the ideology of freedom at some length in a consultation on June 5, 1958 with the House Committee on Un-American Activities—a document published as “The Ideology of Freedom versus the Ideology of Communism.” To emphasize also the necessity of the positive side of this whole issue—that there is an ideology of freedom—in the earlier discussion with the House committee, I tried to bring out the cardinal import of the American experience and constitutional tradition for the right understanding of freedom. And I believe this is a too much neglected, or at any rate, too little drawn out and explicitly developed aspect of this total issue.

Now, in what I have to say today, I would like to emphasize the peculiar configuration of the forces that threaten freedom, democracy, and religion under the name of a new “ism”—totalitarianism. This “ism”, which could perhaps be defined simply as a total state tyranny, is a product in part of advanced technology and applied psychology.

Karl Marx had a prophetic understanding of the role of technology and its use by capitalism. Contemporaneously with him, of course, he also believed that this commanded the future. I think as we look on the great technological achievements of communism today, we should remember this was a division of the founders of this extraordinary ideology. Here is a passage from the "Communist Manifesto" which has been, in my opinion, insufficiently noted. I quote:

The bourgeoisie has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades.

The Russian physiologist, Pavlov, and the American psychological behaviorist, Watson, contributed to the belief widely entertained by scientists and sociologists that the human being is essentially plastic and malleable and can be indefinitely conditioned and conformed according to patterns desired by those in a position to experiment. This belief underlies the techniques subsumed under the phrase "brain-washing," given wide currency, I believe, by the writings of Edward Hunter.

Actually, all this was based on a false view of man. The East German uprising in 1953—and the anniversary of which we observe today, incidentally, June 17—the reaction of Russians, even party leaders, in the years following the death of Stalin, and the Polish and Hungarian revolutions of 1956, all gave the lie to the idea that man is in nature exactly as an animal or a thing and can, therefore, be indoctrinated away from the desire and love of freedom. One of the most brilliant women of our time, Miss Hannah Arendt, has said that the 12 days of the Hungarian revolution contain more history than the 12 years after the Red army supplanted the Nazis. At the same time, she warns, imperialism has a much greater chance of success when directed by a totalitarian government. And in many ways, that is our problem. We are democratic, a free society, engaged in a struggle with the most highly developed form of totalitarianism of all times.

This is a subject I have given a great deal of thought to. Totalitarianism is the genus or broad class; the species or specific instances under this class are communism, fascism, socialism—national socialism—and, I would add, Peronism, with its utilization for the first time of the feminine element in mass psychology and tactics of government. No doubt there are and will be other instances. The important thing to note now is that communism was the first experiment in totalitarianism. It began with Lenin in Russia in 1917. It has outlived the other major experiments in state tyranny under modern conditions and communism has managed to get itself into a position of enormous power, politically, economically, and internationally, with the result that the Marxist-Leninist vision of world revolution and universal communism is more than an assertion of a specter, haunting Europe—it is a tangible force moving out everywhere like an octopus, threatening all unstable societies and haunting, without exception, all non-Communist governments.

Why has Communist totalitarianism contrived a success so shattering in its assault on free institutions, free civilization, and the very citadel—the ideal of freedom itself? The answer is to be found in

the fact that communism combines a materialistic ideology adapted to an age of great material forces with an organizational weapon and a subversive genius unmatched in the long human story. Add to this the vast unrest of our disordered, aroused time, expressing itself in a world outreach toward human dignity, freedom, independence, and decent living standards—incidentally, largely inspired by the ideals, the traditions and the accomplishments of the United States of America—and you have a description of an unprecedented configuration of history-making forces.

This configuration of forces could make our age the greatest the world has ever known. This will happen if freedom does indeed have a new birth, both as a compelling ideal and in practical effectiveness. On the other hand, communism is poised with its doctrine of world revolution developed into a system of nonmilitary warfare that amounts to a technical breakthrough. Many factors favor it. There is much to justify the pervasive pessimism alike of liberals and conservatives in our society and throughout the free world. Unless the giant, America, the creation of men who believed in God, in freedom, and in the moral law, awakes and rises to the challenge of a new breed of political and technical titans, our age will prove to be the graveyard of humanism, reason, and democracy, and the world will be engulfed in a new and uncharted *Götterdämmerung*, a twilight of the gods. And this will happen, ironically—as an able student, himself trained in an earlier period of his life in the Leninist Academy in Moscow, has said, strikingly—it will happen just when the ideological gods are moving westward.

This is by way of stating, and, as it were, laying out before you diagrammatically, the position and point of view in relation to world affairs which I hold and from which I speak in advocating, emphatically and strongly, the Freedom Commission Act which is now before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

In view of the analysis just offered, you will not be surprised when I say that the proposed legislation setting up a Freedom Commission, with a directive to establish a Freedom Academy, is, in my judgment, one of the most important, indeed momentous, developments in nearly 14 years of cold war. And may I add that political warfare began, in its present phase, in 1940—1939 and 1940—it did not really begin as late as 1945. The great disaster from our standpoint was that the Soviets had the courage, they had the guts, they had the insight to wage political warfare from the onset of World War II. Now, if Congress adopts this legislation, it will, in my opinion, be a wholesome indication that the United States means business in the most positive sense with regard to the world struggle for liberty. If Congress adopts this legislation in its essential form, it will demonstrate concretely that we have accepted the hard fact that we are in for a cold war of indefinite duration. It will be a welcome and encouraging sign that we intend to win the total political war that has been thrust upon us and all independent states.

Up to this time, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that our people, though in many ways their response to the problems and crises of a troubled period has been excellent, yet, up to this point, our people have not been clearly told that we are in a continuing national and world emergency, and that business as usual is not enough. I speak

here with very special conviction and, I hope, some authority. For more than 10 years I have believed that we must devise and adopt extraordinary measures to meet the situation of unending emergency. Otherwise, we are certain to lose what is in effect a planetary civil war, for our enemy is mobilized and is directed at every point by a fanatical ideology expressing itself in a revolutionary psychology. And it is right here, the matter of ideology and psychology, that we lack, it seems to me, so much from the standpoint of our mobilization.

I have believed that this doctrine of the indefinite emergency must be accepted by our churches, our universities and schools, and our business and industrial concerns and labor unions, and our civic and voluntary associations as well as by the Government of the United States. Under the influence of this conviction, I kept a copy of the Communist Manifesto by my bedside table for 9 months in 1950-51; I wrote in 1951 my book, "Communism and Christ," which Dr. Billy Graham later sent to every Member of Congress as a present; and I resigned in 1953 as rector of a marvelous parish in Chevy Chase to throw my whole weight into the emergency and to organize, with Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, FRASCO. This foundation, of which I am chairman and executive director, is an all-faith action organization, dedicated to opposing communism with spiritual weapons and to working for the moral and religious revitalization of American democracy.

I need not repeat what I said earlier, except, looking back now over a decade, I believe that I have been abundantly vindicated as a prophet. We believe we must not only oppose communism but we must find a way to revitalize, spiritually, our democracy and whole concept of Democratic government and a free society in our world.

But I am compelled to conclude that a more powerful concentration of force is necessary than any voluntary association or coalition of associations is likely to bring about. So far there has not been any significant, concentrated mobilization of power directed to the world emergency in the voluntary sector of American society or that of the free world. On the contrary, private efforts have become more fragmented and duplicative, possibly because of the very stimulus of crisis and danger.

It follows that there is a vacuum in the power structure which must be filled if we are to survive, let alone fulfill our true mission as a leader nation. This can be done satisfactorily only if an organ of government like that of the proposed Freedom Commission be set up with the authority and the financial means to utilize, on a voluntary basis in a Freedom Academy, the best talent available, with a view to thinking through the problems of total political warfare and devising appropriate methods and techniques, both of concentration and of positive, originative, creative action.

There are, I am sure, many details in the proposed bill which raise questions. Perhaps there are some substantive issues inevitably presented by any legislation in this field. I shall be glad to give my views on such matters if they are desired, not as an authority on legislative questions as such, which I am not, but as an ordinary citizen deeply concerned with the gravest crisis the United States has ever faced. In any case, I would like to emphasize the importance,

in all discussions of what is proposed, of keeping the main object in view and not losing sight of the woods by getting too close to one tree.

Details should be revised where experience and more careful consideration indicate such to be desirable. Means should be refined and improved wherever possible. But the heart of the bill, which is the Freedom Commission, with large powers in a carefully delineated area, and the Freedom Academy, is so evidently necessary and so imperatively urgent that I hope and pray for its speedy enactment.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your courtesy in according me this opportunity to appear before you on behalf of S. 1689.

Senator HRUSKA. We are grateful to you, rather; no thanks to us. This has been valuable testimony and we appreciate the fact that you took the time to come here and tell us your views.

Mr. LOWRY. I was happy to do it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, there are several communications which should be offered for the record.

This is a letter from Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, which expresses his views with regard to this bill.

Senator HRUSKA. It may be included in the record.
(The letter of Chief Judge Brune reads as follows:)

COURT OF APPEALS, MARYLAND,
Baltimore, Md., April 27, 1959.

Hon. J. G. SOURWINE,
General Counsel, Subcommittee on Internal Security,
Committee on the Judiciary,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: I have received your letter of April 24 and have read S. 1689 enclosed therewith. This bill lies almost entirely, I think, outside of the field with regard to which I testified on April 23, and the comments below are offered only in response to the direct request of the committee.

I would suggest that section 2(a) (4) be amended by striking out all the text except the last clause, which begins in line 4 on page 3, so that paragraph 4 would read: "The continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival." It seems to me that the portion of paragraph 4 which I would suggest be omitted, might have a considerable propaganda usefulness to the Soviets.

In section 6(2) on page 7, lines 20-21, I suggest that it might be advisable to omit the concluding phrase "other than the methods and means already being used." I suppose that the purpose of this exception was to avoid possible conflict or overlapping between different Government agencies, but it would seem to me that if our Government is already using desirable methods and means it would be advisable to include any instruction therein which could be given without danger to our national security, and perhaps the Academy could develop suggestions for improvements in methods or means already in use.

I am pleased to note in section 12(7), page 13, that the program contemplates making use of the cooperation of State or local governmental agencies.

On page 18, is the heading of section 18 correct in including the term "armed protection"? I find no specific mention of such protection in the body of section 18, though it may be included in the general authorization for the utilization of services, information, facilities and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

I am generally in favor of the bill.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your courtesies during my visit on April 23. I trust that you have by now received from the University of Chicago a copy of the monographs which I promised to have sent. You will note that the volume as published contains several monographs or addresses to which I did not refer last Thursday, as well as those which I did mention. I believe that some relatively minor revisions have been made. For example, at

pages 44-45, Professor Cramton has brought his comments down to date by including the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Beilan and Lerner cases. These had not been rendered at the time of the preparation of his original monograph.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK W. BRUNE.

Mr. SOURWINE. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, Lawrence E. Walsh, on this bill.

Senator HRUSKA. It shall be included in the record.

(The letter of Deputy Attorney General Lawrence E. Walsh reads as follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to the request of Senator Dodd, Vice Chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (S. 1689) "To create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war."

The bill would create a Freedom Commission with responsibility for training Americans and selected foreign students to better understand the nature of the international Communist conspiracy and for developing effective methods for combating it. The Commission would function, to a large extent, through a Freedom Academy and information centers which it is authorized to establish. A Joint Congressional Freedom Committee would also be established, to make continued studies of the activities of the Freedom Commission and of problems relating to the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy.

The Department of Justice is wholly in accord with the view that a greater awareness throughout the free world of the extent and operations of communism and methods of combating it is most desirable. However, there would seem to be no need to create a new agency in order to accomplish this objective. Rather, existing agencies, for example, the U.S. Information Agency, and others in the security field, could be utilized with less risk of confusion, overlapping of responsibilities, and duplication of effort.

Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. SOURWINE. Here is a letter from Mr. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of Radio Corp. of America, together with a copy of his brochure "Program for a Political Offensive Against World Communism."

Senator HRUSKA. They shall be included.

(The letter of David Sarnoff and the brochure above referred to read as follows:)

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., May 1, 1959.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I beg leave to put on record my personal endorsement—in principle—of the Freedom Commission Act, S. 1689, on which, I understand, your Internal Security Subcommittee is planning to hold hearings.

I say "in principle" not because I have any reservations on the basic proposal but because I have not yet had an opportunity for close study of the bill.

My purpose, therefore, is to support the proposal in general rather than in detail.

On April 5, 1955, I submitted to the President of the United States a memorandum entitled "Program for a Political Offensive Against World Communism," which was later made public. (A copy of this memorandum is attached hereto.)

The memorandum emphasized the magnitude of Communist strategy and organization for the conduct of political and psychological warfare—what is generally called the cold war—against the free world and especially against our own country. It argued that this type of warfare is not a sideshow but a life-and-death threat to the survival of our civilization—that if we lose this contest in the cold war, the defeat could be as final as if we had lost a hot war.

Because our understanding of this challenge and our counteraction have been inadequate, the memorandum declared, we have been losing its battles by default; and unless we did grasp the urgency of the contest and acted boldly to meet its challenge on a scale geared to victory, we could lose the entire struggle by default.

Accordingly, I outlined a course of suggested action, part of which is pertinent to the bill before you. Under the caption "Training of Cadres," I said in part:

"The immediate and prospective activities of the cold war offensive will require ever larger contingents of specialized personnel for the many tasks; to provide leadership for resistance operations; to engage in propaganda * * *, infiltration of the enemy, et cetera.

"Already, limited as our political efforts are, there is a shortage of competent personnel. Meanwhile thousands of younger men and women among the emigres are being lost to factories, farms, menial jobs. This amounts to squandering of potentially important human resources.

"We need a network of schools and universities devoted to training cadres for the cold war. The objective is not education in a generic sense, but specific preparation for the intellectual, technical, intelligence and similar requirements of the ideological-psychological war.

"This training, of course, should not be limited to people from the Soviet areas. A sort of 'West Point' of political warfare—analogue to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow—might be established. Staffed by the ablest specialists obtainable, it would seek out likely young people willing to make the struggle against communism their main or sole career."

The Freedom Commission Act, it appears to me, goes a substantial distance toward implementing this suggestion. I note, indeed, that Life magazine, in an editorial approving the act, has used the very phrase I did to describe the Academy envisioned by the bill: namely, "a West Point of Political Warfare."

In the 4 years since the memorandum was submitted, I believe the issue has become even more important; the need for action even more pressing. Communist depredations by techniques that are essentially political—although often supported by force of the threat of force—have in this period been accelerated.

The Western position in the Middle East has been deteriorating. Communist infiltration of the newly independent countries of Africa has gained momentum, and similar penetration of non-Soviet areas is underway in varying degrees throughout the free world, in other parts of Asia and Africa, in Indonesia and Ceylon and India, in Latin American countries. Moscow and Peiping have confronted us with a series of crises, provoked by them and timed by them (Quemoy, Lebanon, Berlin, Iraq, etc.), all calculated to keep the free world off balance and troubled.

More than ever before, we need to see the larger pattern, of which such crises are only parts. Only a clear comprehension of the total and permanent Communist strategy will enable us to deal with it effectively. The Academy proposed by the act could make a vital contribution in this respect.

In these 4 years, moreover, progress in the development of devastating nuclear weapons, both by Soviet Russia and free nations, has tended to create a balance of dreadful terror which is likely to inhibit nations from touching off a world war. However, I do not rule out the possibility of such a war, which could come through miscalculation or accident. It is self-evident that our country must make the necessary sacrifice to maintain maximum military preparedness to provide for our national security and to deter aggression.

The risks involved in a hot war that would be unleashed by a major power today or in the foreseeable future are indeed great. The logical consequence of this is that struggle by methods short of war—political, economic, psychological—attains greater significance than ever in the past. It is the area of action in which I believe there exists the greatest danger for us as a Nation as well as for the rest of the free world. Again, therefore, an Academy of Political Warfare can play an exceptionally useful role. Not even the sponsors of the bill, I feel sure, would claim that it is the whole answer to our problem, but it is an important step in the right direction.

There is good reason to believe, indeed, that the work of such an Academy, over and above its direct contribution, will help alert the public and Government to the larger need for a complete and effective answer.

Respectfully,

DAVID SARNOFF.

PROGRAM FOR A POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM

A Memorandum by David Sarnoff, April 5, 1955

INTRODUCTION

Our best and surest way to prevent a hot war is to win the cold war. Individual Democratic leaders have long been aware of this truth, but it has not yet been fully grasped by the free world.

Because the label is of recent coinage, many people assume that the cold war is a new phenomenon. Actually it has been underway ever since the Bolsheviks, entrenched in Russia and disposing of its resources, launched the Third or Communist International.

World communism has been making war on our civilization for more than three decades. And the term "war" is not used here in a merely rhetorical sense. It has been a war with campaigns and battles, strategy and tactics, conquests and retreats. Even the postwar years, it should be noted, have seen Red retreats—in Greece, Iran, Berlin, for instance—as well as victories; but such retreats have occurred only when the West acted awarely and boldly.

I. HOW THE COMMUNISTS WAGE COLD WAR

There have been intervals of truce in the cold war but not of true peace. Periods of seeming Communist moderation have been used as a cover for frantic buildups and deployments for the next big push. There has not been a single year when the Kremlin did not, with single-minded concentration, make the most of its opportunities by methods short of general war.

Not a single country today under Communist rule was conquered by outright military assault. Russia itself fell to the Bolsheviks through a political coup, after other parties had overthrown the old regime. The East European satellites were placed behind the Iron Curtain by cunning diplomacy and brute extortion. China was joined to the Soviet sphere by "rear operations" performed from inside.

It is useful to break down Moscow's political-psychological techniques for easier observation. But it should be remembered that they are all inextricably intermeshed, that they are stepped up or soft pedalled as required, that they are supplemented with physical force and the menace of such force according to circumstances. The listing that follows is therefore overlapping.

1. Propaganda

The massive use of all media of communications by the Soviet Government, its puppet governments, local Communist parties, and by ostensibly independent groups under Moscow control or influence, is vast but impossible to measure.

In 1948 Soviet broadcasting to foreign targets totaled 528 hours per week. By 1954 this figure was increased to 1,675 hours. In addition, the Soviet news agency Tass broadcasts 121 hours daily to the foreign press. By comparison, the Voice of America broadcasts only 716 hours a week.

It is estimated that over 1,000 Soviet transmitters are engaged in "jamming" our signals. The Kremlin spends more for jamming it than we spend on all operations of the Voice of America. The Soviet and satellite expenditures in all types of foreign propaganda cannot be accurately gaged—nearly everything Communists do has a propaganda content—but these costs run into billions of dollars annually.

Printed matter in tremendous quantities pours out of the U.S.S.R. into the non-Soviet world. Several large publishing houses in Moscow and elsewhere do nothing else but feed this flood. Besides, the Kremlin operates a chain of large publishing enterprises on foreign soil. Their Red tide of books, pamphlets, reports, posters, etc., inundates the world.

In nearly every non-Soviet country and region there are newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, either overtly under pro-Communist control or in "liberal" disguises. These speak in local tongues, but the voice is Moscow's. In addition, thousands of Kremlin-oriented individual writers, commentators, editors, and trained propagandists are smuggled into strategic non-Communist spots to plug the current Moscow lines.

All available forums, from the United Nations to cultural and sports gatherings, are exploited to advance the battle for men's minds.

Special emphasis is given in Communist plans to what is called the "propaganda of acts"—strikes, riots, demonstrations, mass meetings in support of Soviet objectives or in protest against local policies distasteful to the Soviets, and contrived events of every kind.

Soviet films are rated high in the Communist propaganda plans. Pure entertainment in films, of course, is almost nonexistent. The result is that any and all pictures made in the Soviet sphere, however disguised as art, contain a message which contributes to their cumulative effort to brainwash the non-Soviet world.

2. Infiltration and subversion

Through Communists, fellow travelers and assorted sympathizers, there is a systematic "colonization" of governments, labor unions, educational and scientific institutions and social organizations. The goal is to weaken the infiltrated bodies or to use their leverage to influence public opinion and official policy in the Kremlin's direction; to undermine traditions and subvert loyalties which block the road to Communist thinking.

In the infiltration of government agencies, espionage is by no means the chief purpose. Far more important to the Soviets is the subtle pressure an infiltrator can bring to bear upon the shaping of national policy and the influencing of national moods. The theft of secret documents is routine. The subversion of a government's self-interest, the sowing of disunity, the careful sabotage of policies unfavorable to Soviet interests—these require and receive more polished methods.

3. Fifth columns and false fronts

Communist Parties, whether legal or proscribed, are the primary fifth column. They function under direct instructions from Moscow headquarters, usually under leaders assigned from outside.

But this is the beginning, not the end, of the apparatus of power reaching into every corner of the free world. Innumerable committees, congresses, leagues are set up, outwardly devoted to legitimate and even noble causes like peace, race equality, antifascism, but actually controlled and manipulated by Communists for strictly Communist objectives.

These false-front outfits are spawned continually, discarded when their purpose has been served. In the United States, where this technique has been widely practiced, they have run into scores. Every new situation produces its organizational instrument. At times a front started for one purpose is shifted overnight to its opposite; thus fronts for keeping America out of the war during the life of the Moscow-Berlin pact were converted into fronts for putting America into the war after the Germans attacked Soviet Russia.

Besides creating these fifth-column devices, the Communists also are expert at "capturing" organizations started by others. By joining some existing society or committee, acting as a disciplined minority bound by caucus decisions, a dozen persons have frequently succeeded in taking effective control of organizations with thousands of members.

4. Sabotage and terror

The use of these weapons in time of war is familiar, but its systematic use in peacetime is the great Communist innovation. In all free countries the main targets of infiltration are defense industries, communications, transport, and police systems—all of which offer ample opportunity for mischief affecting a nation's security. Strikes at strategic points and strategic times, as well as overt physical sabotage, can slow up a country's preparations for defense or actual warmaking capacity.

In regions where it is useful and feasible, the Communists do not disdain raw terror: incendiarism, kidnapping, assassination. A special research section of the MVD (Soviet secret police) is devoted to developing murder weapons, poisons, and the like.

5. *Civil strife*

Internal discontents and economic crises are stimulated and then systematically exploited to produce inner disunity, chaos and actual civil insurrection. Guerilla forces under professional military leaders are frequently reinforced by "volunteers" from outside.

Paramilitary formations, underground organizations of every variety in line with local conditions and opportunities, are standard techniques. Genuine grievances are channeled and exploited through local "nationalist" or "anti-colonial" and "anti-imperialist" movements, either started by the Communists or infiltrated and captured.

6. *Preparation of "cadres"*

In Soviet Russia and now in its colonial states there are schools and universities of revolution. Students, drawn from all countries, are taught the theory and practice of political warfare, sabotage, guerilla operations, propaganda methods.

Virtually all heads of Red satellite states and insurrectionary movements in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are products of such institutions. Tito, dictator of Yugoslavia; Ho Chi Minh, No. 2 Communist of Indochina; Rakosi, the top leader in Red Hungary; Bierut, President of Red Poland; Liu Shao-Chi, Vice President of Communist China, and General Liu Po-Cheng, one of the foremost military leaders of Red China. The same is true of many leaders of Communist Parties in non-Soviet countries.

The job of preparing cadres to implement the cold war and to provide generalship for civil conflicts and other revolutionary actions has been going on since the 1920's. Even during the last war, while the Kremlin ostensibly was on terms of friendship with its allies, the training of leaders for revolutions in the allies countries was not slackened.

7. *Preparation of reserves*

The Communist high command does not depend only on the faithful Communists. It attaches great value to its peripheral reserves—groups of sympathizers or innocent collaborators willing to travel along the Communist road part of the distance. These are mobilized and brainwashed through the false-front organizations, united and peoples fronts, the spread (as required) of pacifist or neutral sentiment, doctrines of class struggle, belief in the inevitable collapse of capitalism and free societies.

In advanced countries like the United States, Britain, France, some segments of the so-called intelligentsia have proved especially vulnerable to Communist indoctrination. Not only their self-doubts and frustrations but their most generous idealistic instincts have been canalized and perverted to promote victory for the Soviets in the cold war.

The turnover in these reserves is of course high. Fellow travelers by the thousands are likely to become disillusioned with every new Soviet policy zigzag. But expert manipulation of public opinion serves to retrieve such losses.

8. *Treacherous diplomacy*

In its cold war operations the Kremlin enjoys the advantage of working on two levels—as a conventional state dealing with other states and as a conspiratorial movement embracing the whole globe. In its guise of just another government the Politburo can make promises and engagements which world communism is under orders to violate.

Soviet diplomacy takes full advantage of the moral code and political naivete of some free countries and especially of their eagerness for peace, sometimes peace at any price. It uses the threat of war as a species of blackmail, and is past master at playing off one country against another. It appeals to the profit motives of competitive economies, and in general exploits what it refers to as the inner contradictions of the free world.

It can make the most of amorphous slogans like "peaceful coexistence"—a phrase coined by Lenin, repeatedly used by Stalin and candidly defined in Communist literature as a "tactic" or "stratagem" to gain time, deploy forces, undermine enemy vigilance.

In the arena of foreign relations the Kremlin can blow hot or cold, inflame our fears or our hopes to any required temperature, and use trickery to induce its enemies to drop their guard. Its announcements of policy, negotiations and talk of negotiations, tourists to Red areas, artistic and cultural missions abroad—everything is grist for the cold war mills.

The Communist high command recognizes no restraints, no rules of fair play, no codes of civilized behavior. It regards its great "historical mission" as a mandate which cancels out traditional values in the relations between man and man or country and country. In pursuance of that commitment it considers any cost in life and substance to be justified. A system of power which has not hesitated to liquidate millions of its own citizens cannot be expected to hesitate to wipe out lives anywhere else.

Moscow has brought one-third of the human race under its iron control by means short of a hot war—by shrewd diplomacy, deception, propaganda, the blackmail of threats, fifth-column subversion, guerilla forces and, where expedient, localized shooting wars. These political and psychological methods—the cold war—have paid off, at smaller risk and infinitely lower cost than a hot war would entail.

Accordingly they are being applied without stint to the conquest of the rest of mankind. For world communism, with its high command in the Kremlin in Moscow, the cold war is not a temporary or holding operation, nor a prelude to a hot war. It is the main bout, the decisive offensive, conducted on an unlimited scale, with total victory as its goal.

In a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court (vol. 339, May 8, 1950), an opinion written by the late Justice Robert H. Jackson stated the case against communism in language that is clear and penetrating. He said:

"The goal of the Communist Party is to seize powers of government by and for a minority rather than to acquire power through the vote of a free electorate.

"It purposes forcibly to recast our whole social and political structure after the Muscovite model of police-state dictatorship. It rejects the entire religious and cultural heritage of Western civilization, as well as the American economic and political systems. This Communist movement is a belated counterrevolution to the American Revolution, designed to undo the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights, and overturn our system of free, representative self-government.

"Goals so extreme and offensive to American tradition and aspiration obviously could not be attained or approached through order or with tranquillity. If, by their better organization and discipline, they were successful, more candid Communists admit that it would be to an accompaniment of violence, but at the same time they disclaim responsibility by blaming the violence upon those who engage in resistance or reprisal. It matters little by whom the first blow would be struck; no one can doubt that an era of violence and oppression, confiscations and liquidations would be concurrent with a regime of communism.

"Such goals set up a cleavage among us too fundamental to be composed by democratic processes. Our constitutional scheme of elections will not settle issues between large groups when the price of losing is to suffer extinction. When dissensions cut too deeply, men will fight, even hopelessly, before they will submit. And this is the kind of struggle projected by the Communist Party and inherent in its program.

* * * * *

"Violent and undemocratic means are the calculated and indispensable methods to attain the Communist Party's goal * * *. In not one of the countries it now dominates was the Communist Party chosen by a free or contestable election; in not one can it be evicted by any election. The international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'etat, terrorism, and assassination. Not only has it overpowered its critics and opponents; it has usually liquidated them."

II. WE DARE NOT LOSE THE COLD WAR

If we ignore these facts, or do not counteract them effectively in good time, we shall lose the cold war by default. For the United States and other free nations, defeat of this sort would be as catastrophic and as final as defeat in a shooting war. Whether we freeze to death or burn to death, our civilization would be equally finished.

Were the Communists willing to settle for a permanently divided world, each half pledged not to interfere with the other, they could readily arrange it. But

they are not interested in a stalemate. In the nature of their ideology and worldwide apparatus of action, they must continue to drive relentlessly toward their ultimate objective. They are irrevocably dedicated to winning the cold war. They prefer to attain world dominion by nonmilitary means because:

(a) They consider themselves masters of cold war techniques pitted against those whom they regard as amateurs; their chances of victory seem to them incomparably greater than in a conventional military showdown.

(b) Political warfare does not directly endanger their own territories, industry, manpower and above all, their mechanism of dictatorial power.

(c) Clear-cut victory in the cold war would give them access to our technology and resources, our great cities and treasures, intact and ready for exploitation; whereas a military victory would give them only the ruins of nuclear devastation.

Now as in the past, they proceed in the conviction that they can gain world hegemony by methods that, in the phrase of Leon Trotsky, constitute "neither war nor peace." For Moscow, the real alternative to a nuclear showdown is not "peace" but political-psychological warfare of a magnitude to weaken, demoralize, chip away and ultimately take over what remains of the free world.

III. TO PREVENT A HOT WAR, WE MUST WIN THE COLD WAR

Political psychological offensives are not new. They have frequently been employed in wartime to supplement ordinary military action. We used them ourselves in both World Wars. Their purpose has been to soften up the enemy's will to resist, to win friends and allies in hostile areas, to drive wedges between belligerent governments and their citizenry.

The democracies are familiar with warmaking in the normal military sense, and hence do not hesitate to make huge investments and sacrifices in its name. They do not shrink from the prospect of casualties. All of that seems natural. But they are startled by proposals for effort and risk of such dimensions in the life-and-death struggle with nonmilitary means.

Under these circumstances it has become incumbent upon our leadership to make the country aware that nonmilitary or cold war is also terribly real—that the penalty for losing it will be enslavement.

Hot war is always a possibility. It may come through force of circumstances even if no one wants it. Limited, localized wars are also a continuing threat. Nothing in this memorandum should be construed as a substitute for adequate military vitality. On the contrary, superior physical force in being is the indispensable guarantee for effective nonmilitary procedures.

We must maintain our lead, and accelerate the tempo of progress in the race for ascendancy in nuclear weapons, guided missiles, airpower, early warning systems, electronic know-how, chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare. We must maintain adequate and well-balanced forces for the ground, sea, and air. These conventional military forces must be ready and capable of deterring or meeting an outbreak of peripheral or small-scale wars this side of a general showdown. They will be indispensable in a general war if one should be fought without nuclear weapons. We must stockpile and protect the sources of vital strategic materials.

But short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants, the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly, tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. Because there is no immediate sense of overwhelming menace, no thunder of falling bombs and daily casualty figures, we are apt to think of this period as peace. But it is nothing of the sort.

The primary threat today is political and psychological. That is the active front on which we are losing and on which, unless we reverse the trend, we shall be defeated. Its effects are spelled out in civil wars in parts of Asia, legal Communist Parties of colossal size in some European countries, "nationalist" movements under Communist auspices, "neutrality" and rabid anti-Americanism in many parts of the world—in pressures, that is to say, of every dimension and intensity short of a global shooting war.

Unless we meet this cumulative Communist threat with all the brains and weapons we can mobilize for the purpose, the United States at some point in the future will face the terrifying implications of cold war defeat. It will be cornered, isolated, subjected to the kind of paralyzing fears that have already weakened the fiber of some technically free nations. We will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. I repeat: We can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

Our counterstrategy

Logically we have no true alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. We have only a choice between fighting the cold war with maximum concentration of energy, or waiting supinely until we are overwhelmed. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

We must meet the cold war challenge in our own household and in the rest of the world, and carry the contest behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We must seek out and exploit the weak spots in the enemy's armor, just as the Krenlin has been doing to us these 30-odd years. We must make our truth as effective and more productive than Moscow's lie.

Our political strategy and tactics should be in terms of a major enterprise, on a scale for victory, with all the inherent risks and costs. We cannot fight this fight with our left hand, on the margin of our energies. We have to bring to it resources, personnel and determination to match the enemy's. This is a case where, as in a military conflict, insufficient force may be as fatal as none at all.

If obliged to make tactical retreats, moreover, we must not bemuse ourselves that they are enduring solutions. To do so would be to disarm ourselves and open ourselves to new and bigger blows. This is a principle of particular importance during intervals when negotiations with Moscow or Peking are being discussed or are in progress.

The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clearheaded determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and private groups—to win the contest.

Our countermeasures and methods must be novel, unconventional, daring and flexible. They must, moreover, be released from the inhibitions of peacetime, since it is peace only in outer forms.

Almost against our will, in point of fact, we have launched more and more cold war activities. But they have been piecemeal, on a inadequate scale and often without the all-important continuity of action. Worst of all, they have not been geared for total victory, being treated as extras, as harassment operations, while hoping against hope that there will be no outbreak of war or that there will be a miraculous outbreak of genuine peace.

Our current posture shares the weakness inherent in all defensive strategy. The hope of a real compromise is a dangerous self-delusion. It assumes that Soviet Russia is a conventional country interested in stabilizing the world, when in fact it is the powerhouse of a dynamic world movement which thrives on instability and chaos.

Our duty and our best chance for salvation, in the final analysis, is to prosecute the cold war—to the point of victory. To survive in freedom we must win.

The enemy is vulnerable

The free world, under the impact of Moscow's cold war victories, has tended to fix attention on Soviet strengths while overlooking or discounting Soviet weaknesses.

The Communists expertly exploit all our internal tensions, injustices and discontents. Yet within the Soviet empire the tensions are incomparably greater, the injustices and discontents more vast. Our opportunity, which we have failed to use so far, is to exploit these in order to undermine the Kremlin, exacerbate its domestic problems, weaken its sense of destiny.

The nature of a malady can be deduced from the medicine applied. In its fourth decade of absolute power, the Soviet regime is obliged to devote a major portion of its energies, manpower, and resources to keep its own subjects and captive countries under control, through ever larger doses of terror. There we have the proof that the Communists have failed to "sell" their system to their victims.

Even a ruthless police-state does not maintain gigantic secret-police forces, special internal security armies, colossal networks of forced-labor colonies just for the fun of it. These are measures of self-defense against actual or potential internal oppositions. After all discounts are made for wishful thinking and error, ample evidence remains that in the Soviet sphere the West has millions of allies, tens of millions of potential allies.

Whether the potential can be turned into actuality, whether the will to resist can be kept alive and inflamed to explosive intensity, depend in the

first place on the policies of the non-Soviet world. Our potential fifth columns are greater by millions than the enemy's. But they have yet to be given cohesion, direction, and the inner motive power of hope and expectation of victory.

No one knows whether, let alone when, the internal Soviet stresses can reach a climax in insurrectionary breaks. It would be frivolous to count on such a climax. But we have everything to gain by promoting a spirit of mutiny, to keep the Kremlin off balance, to deepen existing rifts, to sharpen economic and empire problems for them.

For the purposes of our cold war strategy it suffices that the potential for uprisings exists. Soviet economic conditions are bad, particularly in the domain of food production. Nations which used to be exporters of bread (Hungary, Poland, Russia itself) now lack bread for themselves. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson said recently: "Failure of the Soviet system to provide for the basic needs of its own people could be one of the most important historical facts of our time."

The Soviet peasants, still the overwhelming majority of the Kremlin-held populations, are everywhere bitter and restive. The Politburo knows that it cannot count implicitly upon the loyalty and allegiance of its subjects. At the same time it has failed utterly to assimilate the captive countries, so that it has no allies but only sullen colonial puppets.

In the last war the U.S.S.R. fought on two fronts—against the foreign invaders and against its own people. There is reason to believe that Hitler's psychological blunders, in insulting and alienating the Russian peoples, helped save the Stalin regime from destruction by its own subjects. In the present cold war, too, the U.S.S.R. must maintain its fight against the Soviet citizenry, and at the same time deal with seething dissidence in the subjected countries.

The basic conditions for successful cold war counterstrategy thus exist.

Guidelines for political offensive

Our guiding objectives in an all-out political offensive are fairly obvious. They must include the following:

1. To keep alive throughout the Soviet Empire the spirit of resistance and the hope of eventual freedom and sovereignty. If we allow that hope to expire, the Kremlin will have perpetuated its dominion over its victims.
2. To break the awful sense of isolation in which the internal enemies of the Kremlin live—by making them aware that, like the revolutionists in tsarist times, they have devoted friends and powerful allies beyond their frontiers.
3. To sharpen by every device we can develop the fear of their own people that is already chronic in the Kremlin. The less certain the Soviets are of the allegiance of their people, the more they will hesitate to provoke adventures involving the risks of a major showdown.
4. To provide moral and material aid, including trained leadership, to oppositions, undergrounds, resistance movements in satellite nations and China and Russia proper.
5. To make maximum use of the fugitives from the Soviet sphere, millions in the aggregate, now living in free parts of the world.
6. To appeal to the simple personal yearnings of those under the Communist yoke: release from police terror, ownership of small farms and homes, free trade unions to defend their rights at the job, the right to worship as they please, the right to change residence and to travel, and so forth.
7. To shatter the "wave of the future" aura around communism, displacing the assumption that "communism is inevitable" with a deepening certainty that "the end of communism is inevitable."
8. To inspire millions in the free countries with a feeling of moral dedication to the enlargement of the area of freedom, based on repugnance to slave labor, coerced atheism, purges and the rest of the Soviet horrors.

This inventory of objectives is necessarily sketchy and incomplete. But it indicates the indispensable direction of the cold war effort.

IV. THE MESSAGE OF FREEDOM

We must be quite certain of our destination before we can begin to figure out means of transportation. There is little point in discussing the how of it until a firm decision for an all-out political-psychological counteroffensive is reached.

In hot war, you need a weapon and means of delivering it to the target. The same is true in cold war. The weapon is the message; after it has been worked

out, we can develop the facilities for delivering it to the world at large and to the Communist-captive nations in particular.

The essence of that message (and its formulation is the critical first step) is that America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war; that its ultimate aim is, in concert with all peoples, to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-bred communism.

Once that decision is made, some of the means for implementing it will become self-evident; others will be explored and developed under the impetus of the clear-cut goal. Agreement on the problem must come before agreement on the solution.

"To be effective," as one student of the problem has put it, "our decision must be as sharp edged and uncompromising as the Kremlin's; it must be spelled out as unequivocally as the Communists have done in the works of Lenin and Stalin and the official programs of the Comintern and Cominform."

Adjustment of our thinking in accord with such a decision to win the cold war demands clarity on at least the following points:

1. The struggle by means short of general war is not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest, in which the loser may not have a second chance.

2. It must therefore be carried on with the same focused effort, the same resolute spirit, the same willingness to accept costs and casualties, that a hot war would involve.

3. In order to establish credence and inspire confidence, our conduct must be consistent. Our philosophy of freedom must embrace the whole of mankind; it must not stop short at the frontiers of the Soviet sphere. Only this can give our side a moral grandeur, a revolutionary elan, a crusading spirit not only equal to but superior to the other side's.

4. We must learn to regard the Soviet countries as enemy-occupied territory, with the lifting of the occupation as the overall purpose of freedom-loving men everywhere. This applies not only to areas captured since the war, but includes Russia itself. Any other policy would turn what should be an anti-Communist alliance into an anti-Russian alliance, forcing the Russians (as Hitler forced them during the war) to rally around the regime they hate.

5. The fact that the challenge is global must be kept clearly in view. Red guerrillas in Burma, Communists in France or the United States, the Huks in the Philippines, Red agents in Central America—these are as much "the enemy" as the Kremlin itself.

6. We must realize that world communism is not a tool in the hands of Russia—Russia is a tool in the hands of world communism. Repeatedly Moscow has sacrificed national interests in deference to world revolutionary needs. This provides opportunities for appeals to Russian patriotism.

7. Though the Soviets want a nuclear war no more than we do, they accept the risk of it in pushing their political offense. We, too, cannot avoid risks. (It might become necessary, Mr. Dulles said recently, "to forgo peace in order to secure the blessings of liberty.") The greatest risk of all, for us, is to do less than is needed to win the cold war. At worst that would mean defeat by default; and at best, a situation so menacing to the survival of freedom that a hot war may become inevitable.

Our present lead in the possession of nuclear weapons and the ability to use them may be matched by the Communists in the next few years. This is the view expressed by competent statesmen, scientists, and military experts. If and when nuclear parity is reached, the enemy's fanatics (and there may be a powerful madman—a Hitler—among them) might be tempted to use them against us by throwing a sneak punch. Since our policy is not to throw the first nuclear punch but only to retaliate if it is thrown against us, we may find as more horror-weapons are unfolded, that to yield to the enemy the initiative of the first offensive punch, is tantamount to national suicide. All this further emphasizes the vital need for winning the cold war and preventing a hot war.

V. TOWARD COLD WAR VICTORY

1. Organization

An organizational framework for fighting the cold war already exists. It needs to be adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations.

A Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side, is suggested. It should function directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head. Top representatives of the

State Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Agency, should sit on this Board. Liaison on a continuous basis should be maintained with all other agencies which can play a role in the overall effort.

There will be various operations which the Board would undertake in its own name, with its own facilities. But its primary function should not be operational. It should be to plan, initiate, finance, advise, coordinate and check on operations by other groups and agencies, whether already in existence or created by the Board for specific undertakings.

One cannot, however, be too specific at this point about the organizational forms. John Foster Dulles wrote in 1948:

"We need an organization to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working and winning its victories. We ought to have an organization dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the present Secretary of Defense heads up the organization of military defense. The new department of nonmilitary defense should have an adequate personnel and ample funds."

2. *Financing*

On the matter of funds, likewise, one cannot at this stage offer specific estimates. But let us recall that appropriations over the past 4 years for our military defense averaged approximately \$45 billion annually. In contrast, it is significant to note that for the fiscal year 1955 the total appropriation for the U.S. Information Agency was \$79 million, of which \$17 million is available for the worldwide activities of the Voice of America.

As a working hypothesis it is suggested that a specific and more realistic ratio between military and nonmilitary appropriations be worked out: say an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of military defense appropriations to be granted to the Strategy Board for Political Defense—this, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure.

I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the stakes involved, and against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

3. *Implementing the counteroffensive*

We must go from defense to attack in meeting the political, ideological, subversive challenge. The implementation of the attack would devolve upon specialists and technicians. In gearing to fight a hot war, we call in military strategists and tacticians. Likewise, we must have specialists to fight a cold war.

This implies, in the first place, the mobilization of hard, knowledgeable anti-Communists who understand the issues and for whom it is not merely a job but a dedication. The specialist in communications is important; but the message to be communicated is even more important.

The main weakness of our efforts to date to talk to the masses—and even more so to the elite groups (Army, intelligentsia, etc.)—in the Soviet camp is that we have not always been consistent in what we had to say to them. Our message has been vague and subject to change without notice. As long as we regard Communist rule as permanent, we can have no strong psychological bridges to those who are under its yoke. The only free-world goal that is relevant to them is one that envisages their eventual emancipation.

With the formulation of a message, we will at last have something to say that interests them, not only us, and can devote ourselves to perfecting the means of delivering the message.

Before essaying a breakdown of cold war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking. The expanded offensive with non-military weapons must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

No outline such as follows can be more than indicative. Operations are necessarily related to current developments and opportunities opened up by events.

In all categories the arena of action is the whole globe. Our cold war targets are not only behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, but in every nation, the United States included. In the battle for the minds of men, we must reach the Soviet peoples, our allies, and the uncommitted peoples.

The agencies involved will be both official and private. The objectives must aim to achieve dramatic victories as swiftly as possible, as a token of the changed state of affairs. While the Kremlin has suffered some setbacks and defeats, its record in the cold war has been strikingly one of success piled on success. This trend must be reversed, to hearten our friends, dismay the enemy, and confirm the fact that Communist power is a transient and declining phenomenon.

4. Propaganda

If the weapon is our message, one of its basic elements is propaganda. It is the most familiar element, but we should not underestimate its inherent difficulties. Hot war is destructive: the killing of people, the annihilation of material things. Cold war must be constructive: it must build views, attitudes, loyalties, hopes, ideals, and readiness for sacrifice. In the final checkup it calls for greater skills to affect minds than to destroy bodies.

Propaganda, for maximum effect, must not be an end in itself. It is a preparation for action. Words that are not backed up by deeds, that do not generate deeds, lose their impact. The test is whether they build the morale of friends and undermine the morale of foes.

No means of communication should be ignored: the spoken word and the written word; radio and television; films; balloons and missiles to distribute leaflets; secret printing and mimeographing presses on Soviet-controlled soil; scrawls on walls to give isolated friends a sense of community.

5. Communist targets

The Communist sphere must be ringed with both fixed and mobile broadcasting facilities of a massiveness to overcome jamming. The Voice of America will acquire larger audiences and more concentrated impact under the new approach. Its name, it is suggested, should be expanded to "Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace." This slogan added to the name will, through constant repetition, impress the truth upon receptive ears.

Besides the official voice, we have other voices, such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberation. There are other popular democratic voices that should make themselves heard—those of our free labor movement, American war veterans, the churches, youth, and women's organizations.

Already there is a minor flow of printed matter across the Iron Curtain, especially aimed at the Red occupation forces. The volume and effectiveness of this effort can be enormously enlarged. Magazines and newspapers which outwardly look like standard Communist matter, but actually are filled with anti-Communist propaganda, have brought results.

A greater hunger for spiritual comfort, for religion, is reported from Soviet Russia and its satellites. Programs of a spiritual and religious character are indicated. They should preach faith in the divine, abhorrence of Communist godlessness, resistance to atheism. But, in addition, they can offer practical advice to the spiritually stranded—for instance, how to observe religious occasions where there are no ordained ministers or priests to officiate.

The enslaved peoples do not have to be sold the idea of freedom; they are already sold on it. The propaganda should, wherever possible, get down to specifics. It should expose the weaknesses, failures, follies, hypocrisies, and internal tensions of the Red masters; provide proof of the existence of friends and allies both at home and abroad; offer guidance on types of resistance open even to the individual. It should appeal to universal emotions, to love of family, of country, of God, of humanity.

6. Free-world targets

The fighting front is everywhere. The program of the U.S. Information Agency should be reappraised with a view to improvement and expansion. "The Voice of America—for Freedom and Peace" has tasks to perform in many nations of the free world second in importance only to those in the unfree world.

Merely to point up the inadequacy of our present effort, consider Finland, a country on the very edge of the Red empire and under the most concentrated Soviet propaganda barrage. Soviet broadcasts beamed to Finland total over 43 hours weekly. A television station is now being built in Soviet Estonia which

will be directed to a million potential viewers in nearby Finland. To maintain their morale under this pressure, the Finnish people, still overwhelmingly pro-West and pro-American, have desperate need of our encouragement. Yet the Voice of America in 1953 was compelled to discontinue its daily half-hour broadcast to Finland to save \$50,000 annually.

We need in every country, newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations consciously and effectively supporting our side. Those that exist should be aided materially to increase their range and vitality; others should be started with our help. The strongest individual anti-Communist voices must be provided with better facilities for making themselves heard in their own countries.

Mobile film units are already penetrating backward areas. The operation should be enlarged, its message and appeal perfected. In addition, mobile big-screen television units in black and white and in color can carry our message. Their very novelty will guarantee large and attentive audiences. Vast regions in Asia and elsewhere, where illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radios bars the spoken word, could thus be reached. To quote the Chinese saying, "One picture is worth 10,000 words."

The so-called backward parts of the world, particularly Asia, are under the most concentrated Communist psychological attacks. Of necessity the counter-offensive must take this into account, and develop special techniques for reaching both the masses and the elite of those areas.

7. *Radio receivers and phonographs*

Mass production of cheap and lightweight receivers tuned to pick up American signals are now feasible. They should be made available by the million at cost or gratis, as expedient, to listeners in critical areas and behind the Iron Curtain.

There are millions of persons in the world who do not have electric power receptacles, electron tubes, batteries, or any of the electrical and mechanical marvels which the free world has and takes for granted. A simple, hand-operated phonograph device costing no more than a loaf of bread, could be produced in quantities and supplied gratis to millions of people living behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and in other critical areas.

An unbreakable and intelligible record, made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of Coca-Cola, could carry our messages to these people. Such records could be dropped from the sky like leaflets and the messages they carried could not be jammed.

8. *Use of facilities in friendly countries*

Nearly all European and many Asian countries possess broadcasting facilities. We should seek to enlist their use to supplement and intensify American broadcasting on a worldwide scale.

In some cases this could be negotiated on a quid pro quo basis where we are providing military or economic aid; in other cases we may have to buy the necessary time for transmitting our message. Our friendly allies, such as Great Britain, have vast shortwave facilities of worldwide scope and range and have the same reasons as we have for seeking to win the cold war. We need their help in this field. We are fully justified in asking for such help and ought to receive it.

Propaganda is a large concept. In a sense it includes and exploits all other activities. Its successful use calls for imagination, ingenuity, continual technical research and, of course, effective coordination with all other operations that bear on the problems of the cold war.

9. *Passive resistance*

Pending the critical periods when active resistance in one or another Soviet country is possible and desirable, full encouragement and support must be given to passive resistance. This refers to the things the individual can do, with minimum risk, to create doubt and confusion in the ranks of the dictatorship, to gum up the machinery of dictatorship government.

The worker in the mine and factory, the farmer, the soldier in the barracks, the office worker are able to do little things that in their millionfold totality will affect the national economy and the self-confidence of the rulers. It is the method that comes naturally to captive peoples, especially in countries with a long historical experience in opposing tyrants.

Our opportunity is to give the process purposeful direction. In this concept the individual opponent of the regime becomes a "resistance group of one." He receives, by radio and other channels, specific suggestions and instructions.

The tiny drops of resistance will not be haphazard, but calculated to achieve planned results.

Special action programs of the type that do not require large organization—or at most units of two or three—would be worked out and transmitted. Our sympathizers in the Soviet orbit would feel themselves part of an invisible but huge army of crusaders. Symbols of protest would appear on a million walls. The rulers' morale would be deliberately sapped by a multitude of actions too small, too widespread, to be readily dealt with.

The special value of passive resistance, aside from its direct effects, is that it nurtures the necessary feeling of power and readiness for risk and sacrifice that will be invaluable when the passive stage is transformed into more open opposition.

10. *Organized resistance*

Pockets of guerrilla forces remain in Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, China, Albania, and other areas. There is always the danger of activating them prematurely. But their existence must be taken into the calculations and, in concert with exiles who know the facts, they must be kept supplied with information, slogans, and new leadership where needed and prudent.

Many of these resistance groups are so isolated that they do not know of each other's existence. The simple realization that they are not alone but part of a scattered network will be invaluable; methods for establishing liaison, for conveying directions, can be developed.

11. *Insurrections*

The uprisings in East Germany, the strikes and riots in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, the dramatic mutinies inside the concentration camps of Vorkuta in the Soviet Arctic, are examples of revolutionary actions that failed. But they attest that insurrection is possible.

We must seek out the weakest links in the Kremlin's chain of power. The country adjudged ripe for a breakaway should receive concentrated study and planning. A successful uprising in Albania, for instance, would be a body blow to Soviet prestige and a fateful stimulus to resistance elsewhere. (That little country is geographically isolated, ruled by a handful of puppets; able leadership is available in the Albanian emigration.)

Eastern Germany is among the weakest links. Its revolt would ignite neighboring Czechoslovakia and Poland. The time to prepare for such actions is now—whether the time to carry them out be in the near or distant future. Meanwhile we must not allow the Soviet propaganda to make unification appear as the Communist's gift to the Germans. It is a natural asset that belongs to West Germany and her allies.

12. *Collaboration with emigres and escapees*

Tens of thousands of self-exiled fugitives from Communist oppression emerge eager to plunge into movements for the freeing of their homelands. When they fail to find outlets for their zeal, disillusionment and defeatism set in.

Maximum exploitation of this manpower and moral passion is indicated. They must be drawn into specific, well-organized, well-financed anti-Communist organizations and activities; utilized for propaganda and other operations; enabled, in some cases, to return to their native lands as "sleeper" leaders for future crises.

Officers' corps of emigres can be formed: perhaps groups of only a score to a hundred, but available for emergency and opportunity occasions. The existence of such nuclei of military power—a fact that will be widely known—should help generate hope and faith among their countrymen back home.

13. *Planned defection*

Escapees have come, and will continue to come, spontaneously, now in trickles, other times in rivers. Beyond that the need is to stimulate defection on a selective basis. Individual "prospects" in Soviet missions and legations, in Red cultural and sports delegations, can be carefully contacted and developed. Types of individuals needed to man cold war undertakings will be invited to escape, assured of important work. Special approaches can be worked out to encourage defection of border guards, Army officers, secret-police personnel disgusted by their bloody chores, scientists, important writers, etc.

Escapees today are often disheartened by their initial experience. They are taken into custody by some foreign intelligence service, pumped for information, and sometimes then left to shift for themselves. Their honest patriotism is

offended by the need to cooperate with foreigners before they are psychologically ready for it.

It is suggested that emigre commissions be set up, composed of trusted nationals of the various countries. The fugitive would first be received by the commission of his own countrymen. Only when found desirable and prepared for the step, would he be brought into contact with American or British agencies.

14. Training of cadres

The immediate and prospective activities of the cold war offensive will require ever larger contingents of specialized personnel for the many tasks; to provide leadership for resistance operations; to engage in propaganda, subversion, infiltration of the enemy; even to carry on administrative and civic work after the collapse of Communist regimes in various countries, in order to stave off chaos.

Already, limited as our political efforts are, there is a shortage of competent personnel. Meanwhile thousands of younger men and women among the emigres are being lost to factories, farms, menial jobs. This amounts to squandering of potentially important human resources.

We need a network of schools and universities devoted to training cadres for the cold war. The objective is not education in a generic sense, but specific preparation for the intellectual, technical, intelligence and similar requirements of the ideological-psychological war.

This training, of course, should not be limited to people from the Soviet areas. A sort of "West Point" of political warfare—analagous to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow—might be established. Staffed by the ablest specialists obtainable, it would seek out likely young people willing to make the struggle against communism their main or sole career.

The present "exchange of persons" program is clearly valuable. Hundreds of foreign students go back home with a better and friendlier understanding of America. But beyond that, it is possible and necessary to educate invited young people from abroad, carefully selected along lines of more direct and specialized value to the cold war effort.

In a sense these shock troops of democracy would be like the "professional revolutionaries" on the Communist side. They would be equipped to operate openly or as secret infiltrates wherever the enemy's assaults need to be neutralized. Trained anti-Communists from Asian areas, dedicated and knowledgeable, would be available for countries under Red pressure, as today in south-east Asia; Latin Americans, Europeans, would serve similar functions in their respective regions.

Thus, from a largely amateur enterprise, our counteroffensive would gradually be transformed into a professional undertaking.

15. Campaigns by special groups

An American trade union in the clothing field played a major role in preventing Communist victory in the Italian elections in 1948. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (in which both the A.F. of L. and the CIO are active) is conducting important psychological drives in many countries and offsetting the mischief worked by the Moscow-controlled labor international.

Speaking as workers to workers, trade unionists have a legitimate approach to the laboring masses in the Soviet sphere. They have a special justification for exposing and publicizing forced labor, onerous laboring conditions and laws, phony totalitarian "trade unions."

In many countries—France and Italy, for instance—there are competing Communist-controlled and democratic unions. Free labor of all countries can throw its moral and material support to the anti-Communist federations. It can take the lead in breaking Moscow's grip on influential segments of world labor.

Corresponding political campaigns should be mounted on a telling scale by other nonofficial, popular groups; farmers' organizations and peasant unions would concentrate on the evils of Red collectivization; great church groups on the immoral and atheistic aspects of Communist theory and practice; youth organizations on the perversion of youth under communism, etc.

The scope of such focused group and class appeals is enormous. Some of them are being made already, but without the coordination of effort and continuity of impact that is called for.

What a specialized group can achieve has been demonstrated by the society of Free Jurists in West Berlin, which indicts and condemns in absentia persons guilty of Communist crimes. Its work is sowing the fear of retribution in East

Germany. Radio Free Europe has made successful forays of the same order—identifying brutal officials, exposing Red agents, etc. But the surface has only been scratched in this type of psychological pressure.

VI. DIPLOMACY IS A WEAPON

The Kremlin treats foreign affairs as a primary arena of ideological and psychological effort. It makes moves on the diplomatic chessboard for their propaganda impact: to rally its friends in the outside world, to win over a particular element in some country, to embarrass its opponents. In the measure that democratic diplomacy fails to do likewise, it is defaulting in a vital area of the cold war. Let us bear in mind:

1. Day to day conduct of foreign affairs is pertinent to the struggle for men's minds. The rigid observance of protocol, in dealing with an enemy who recognizes none of the traditional rules, can be self-defeating. We must make proposals, demands, exposés, publications of official documents, etc., that are carefully calculated to show up the true motives of the Kremlin, to put a crimp in Moscow political campaigns, to mobilize world opinion against Soviet crimes and duplicities.

For 10 years we have made one-shot protests against Soviet election frauds in satellite countries, against violations of treaties and agreements, against shocking crimes in the areas of human rights as defined by the U.N. Charter. The archives are packed with these documents. These should be followed up through consistent publicity, renewed protests, etc.

Even when nothing practical can be immediately accomplished, the facts of slave labor, genocide, aggressions, violations of Yalta, Potsdam and other agreements must be kept continually before the world. Diplomacy must champion the victims of Red totalitarianism without letup. At every opportunity the spokesmen of free nations should address themselves to the people in the Soviet empire over the heads of their masters; to the people of free countries in terms of universal principles of morality and decency.

2. The measures of reciprocity should be strictly applied to Soviet diplomats, trade and other representatives. These should enjoy no more privileges, immunities, access to information than is accorded to free-world representatives in Communist lands. Even socially they should be made aware of their status as symbols of a barbarous plexus of power. The desire to belong, to be respectable, is by no means alien to Red officialdom.

3. Economic leverages, too, must be applied. Trade can be turned into a powerful political weapon. The stakes are too high to permit business-as-usual concepts to outweigh the imperatives of the cold war. Where acute distress develops in a Communist country, our readiness to help must be brought to the attention of the people as well as their bosses. If and when food and other relief is offered, it must be under conditions consistent with our objectives—to help the victims, not their rulers.

4. In virtually all countries outside the Communist sphere there are large or small organizations devoted to combating communism, at home or abroad or both. There is little or no contact among such groups—no common currency of basic ideas and slogans, no exchange of experience. Without at this stage attempting to set up a worldwide anti-Communist coalition, or freedom international, we should at least facilitate closer liaison and mutual support among anti-Soviet groupings already in existence.

VII. SUMMARY

No claim is implied that the foregoing outline is complete, or that all of it can or ought to be launched at once. The program here suggested should not be judged on the basis of this or that specific proposal but on the overall concept and its underlying philosophy. As a practical matter, methods flow from correct policies, the availability of funds and trained manpower, the existence of leadership and organization prepared to take advantage of unfolding events.

Summarized, my observations and conclusions are:

1. We are in the midst of a cold war which the Communists are prosecuting vigorously on all fronts in an unswerving determination to win.

2. We dare not lose this cold war, because defeat may be as fatal as would defeat in a hot war. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

3. Our best and surest way to head off a hot war is to win the cold war which is already in full blast all over the world. But for the reasons mentioned, such

as insufficient funds and inadequate tools, our efforts in this decisive field are strikingly little compared with the enemy's and are wholly inadequate to achieve victory. We must meet the political-psychological challenge of world communism fully and on a scale geared to winning the struggle.

4. We should organize our efforts to win the cold war on a basis comparable to our organization for winning a hot war which we seek to prevent. To this end it is recommended that a Strategy Board of Political Defense (or some other suitable name) be set up to function as the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the military side. Top representatives of the State and Defense Departments, C.I.A. and U.S.I.A., should be members of this Board. Its activities must be effectively coordinated with all departments and agencies of our government concerned with this effort. This new strategy board should function directly under the President and its head should have Cabinet status.

5. Our decision to win the cold war should be communicated to the entire world as a fixed goal of American policy. This will not rule out conventional relations on the governmental level, where the Kremlin, too, functions despite its clear commitment to world revolution.

6. The American public should be made promptly and fully aware of the nature of the present cold war, the importance of our winning it, the costs and sacrifices that this may entail. The significance and urgency of the problem should be conveyed to the American people, through discussion over radio, TV, and in the press.

7. The idea of our determination to win the cold war must be presented for what it actually is: a project that can be carried through successfully and thereby prevent a general war that could force a devastating nuclear show-down. Once grasped, this prospect would help to offset the fears and frustrations generated in the public mind by constant emphasis on the horrors of atomic war. The alternative presented is understandable and hopeful. Instead of concentrating on the perils of defeat, we can dwell on the prospects for victory.

8. Key leaders in Congress should be drawn into the philosophy and purposes of the cold war counteroffensive from the outset. No program of the scope suggested here can be undertaken and executed without adequate funds that only Congress can appropriate. In addition to legislative support the Congress can aid immeasurably by stimulating united, patriotic effort as complete and nonpartisan as in a hot war.

9. To wrest from the Communists the advantages they gain through constant use in their propaganda of the appealing word "peace," while casting us in the role of "war-mongers," it is recommended that the present name of the "Voice of America" be extended to the "Voice of America for Freedom and Peace."

10. Our diplomacy should be used as a weapon against world communism and our message to their captive peoples should contain the hope for their eventual freedom. Our message of truth should tell the world the truth about Communist objectives, methods, and practices as well as the truth about ourselves.

Mr. SOURWINE. A letter from Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director, Department of Legislation, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Senator HRUSKA. It shall be included.

(The letter of Andrew J. Biemiller reads as follows:)

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1959.

Senator JAMES EASTLAND,
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Judiciary,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I have enclosed a statement on S. 1689, the bill to create a Freedom Commission and a Free World Academy.

We would appreciate it if this statement could appear in the record of the hearings on this bill.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, ON
S. 1689

We have examined the purpose and contents of S. 1689, a bill to create a Freedom Commission and a Free World Academy.

The AFL-CIO concurs in the general aims of this bill and urges its passage at the earliest possible moment.

The AFL-CIO has been among the first that have consistently pointed to the threat posed to the free world by the attempt of world communism to conquer and dominate the world. The Communist conspiracy works on every level and works 24 hours a day. Its agents are hard-working fanatics who have been especially trained at their jobs of infiltration and subversion. The necessary effort of defense and counterattack on our part cannot be successfully achieved by hit and miss, uncoordinated efforts. Our country needs a coordinated effort on all levels, using men well grounded in knowledge of all aspects of Communist ideology and endeavor, and skilled in countering its agents all over the world in their moves on the economic, political, social, religious, moral, cultural fields.

For these reasons we favor the passage of this bill whose aim is exactly to provide the means whereby the training of this necessary personnel will be achieved.

Mr. SOURWINE. A letter from Sidney Hook, head of the All University Department of Philosophy, New York University.

Senator HRUSKA. It shall be included.

(The letter of Sidney Hook reads as follows:)

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., June 12, 1959.

Mr. J. G. SOURWINE,
*Chief Counsel, Subcommittee to Investigate the
Administration of the Internal Security Act,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SOURWINE: In reply to Senator Dodd's invitation to express my opinion on the bill (S. 1689) to establish a Freedom Academy I wish to transmit the following communication:

I am firmly convinced that the international Communist movement, centered in Moscow and Peking, is still unremittently dedicated to a program of world domination. During my travels in Europe and Asia I have observed first hand the highly organized efforts made in all countries to further the Communist campaign against the free world. What I have observed confirms the conclusions I have reached in consequence of a quarter century's study of the theory and practice of Communist totalitarianism.

To a large extent the success of the Communist movement and its propaganda depends upon the ignorance and naivete of those who oppose it as much as of those who are taken in by it. Few individuals are aware of the variety of the organizational disguises, the boldness and subtlety of the strategies, and the flexibility of the tactics which the Communist movement commands. This is not the whole story of course but at certain times its ideological warfare, open and concealed, together with its organizational power has a decisive influence. Particularly adept are the Communists in exploiting the principles and watchwords of liberalism and harnessing to their own political cause legitimate grievances and desires for greater social justice. They score some of their greatest successes when they are able to pretend that the issue is simply one of choice between "reactionaries" and "progressives". They suffer their greatest defeats when genuine liberals who are informed and active take the lead against them.

The greatest lack in the world today in the struggle against communism is the absence of a large trained body of men and women dedicated to the ideals of freedom who are experts in the theory of communism, informed of its practices, and able to give positive leadership in the struggles against them for a freer and better world. The Freedom Academy should be an open, public center run like a great university where specially gifted and qualified individuals can study all relevant aspects of the Communist movement. It should undertake research and publication projects. It should be open to persons who are scholarship and in pursuit of the truth. Because its objective is the truth their devotion to freedom more effective by thorough study and training.

It should be organized in such a way as to make it independent of partisan political control.

The Freedom Academy should not be regarded as an institution for dissemination of propaganda. Its work should be conducted on the highest levels of appropriately qualified from all countries of the world who desire to make about communism and the exploration of the ethics of freedom it will easily be able to withstand in the court of world public opinion the campaign of calumny which the Communist world will launch against it.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY HOOK,

Head of the All-University Department of Philosophy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Finally, Mr. Chairman, here are a number of individual letters which appear to be identical in text. I respectfully suggest that the text of only one such letter be printed, and the names of the other signers of similar letters be appended.

Senator HRUSKA. Very well. So ordered.

(The letter above mentioned reads as follows:)

St. LOUIS, Mo., *May 19, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: We want to take this opportunity to let you know that we favor the H.R. 3880 bill known as the Freedom Commission Act providing that people such as Senator James O. Eastland and Kenneth Goff, an ex-Communist who has testified many times in Washington, be placed on the committee at least in an advisory capacity. We feel that only those who have a good knowledge of how and where communism works should be on the committee.

Please do everything in your power to see that this bill is passed with the provision stated above.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Mrs. CLAUDE STOUGH,
CLAUDE V. STOUGH.

Similar letters were received from the following:

Mr. and Mrs. Coats Shiverdecker, St. Charles, Mo.

R. A. Adams and Grace Adams, St. Charles, Mo.

Rev. James O. Poe, St. Charles, Mo.

John Hockmeyer and Mrs. Marie Hockmeyer, St. Charles, Mo.

Virgil I. Miller, St. Louis, Mo.

Senator HRUSKA. We will be adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the committee adjourned to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. Thursday, June 18, 1959.)

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND FREEDOM ACADEMY

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:05 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Thomas J. Dodd presiding.

Present: Senators Dodd and Roman L. Hruska.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator DODD. The subcommittee will be in order.

We shall resume our hearings on Senate bill 1689.

The first witness this morning, I understand, is Mr. C. D. Jackson.

TESTIMONY OF C. D. JACKSON, NEW YORK CITY

Senator DODD. Good morning, Mr. Jackson. I am glad you appeared. These are matters on which you speak with authority and knowledge.

Will you give us your name and address for the record, please?

Mr. JACKSON. My name is C. D. Jackson, and I live at 1 West 72d Street, New York City.

Senator DODD. Off the record, just a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator DODD. Go right ahead, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a really quite brief statement that I would like to read, so that I can keep it straight.

Senator DODD. Yes, of course.

Mr. JACKSON. I have given you my name, and my address. Also, I am vice president of Time, Inc., which is a magazine publishing firm.

For the past 16 years, I have been closely connected with the activity known as "psychological warfare" or "political warfare."

During 1942 and the early part of 1943, I was Special Assistant to the U.S. Ambassador in Ankara, Turkey, Mr. Laurence Steinhardt, and there had a general portfolio in political warfare.

From the spring of 1943 until January 1944, I was Deputy Chief of the Psychological Warfare Branch of Allied Forces Headquarters in North Africa, Sicily, and Italy.

From 1944 until V-E Day, I was Deputy Chief of the Psychological Warfare Division of Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, in London and France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and finally Germany.

In 1951, I was president of the Free Europe Committee, which operates Radio Free Europe.

I came down here in 1952 and 1953 to be a member of the so-called Jackson Committee. It was so called because William Jackson was the chairman, not I, and that was to study the entire spectrum of political warfare and see what was being done, what ought to be done, and make recommendations.

Then, from February 1953 until May 1954, I worked out of the White House as special assistant to the President in cold war planning.

Now, if there is a single common denominator running through these different experiences—military, civilian, governmental, and private—it is the difficulty of finding Americans who have not only an instinct or a flair for political warfare, but also the elementary knowledge and training on the nature of the conflict and how to go about our end of the conduct of this very real and continuing warfare.

During World War II, both in AFHQ and in SHAEF, had it not been for the large number of Britishers and Canadians who had this political warfare “feel” and knew the technical subtleties involved, we would have been hard put to adequately staff the top-thinking jobs.

Since the war, the same difficulty has continued. But it is a far more dangerous difficulty now, because our enemy is communism, and the Communists are the supreme masters and unrelenting practitioners of political warfare. Indeed, it is by the persistent and pervasive use of this weapon, with or without military threats, that the Communists hope to accomplish their ultimate aim of destroying the United States. Unless we learn to resist and counter their use of this political weapon, we shall have no recourse, in the long run, except to military force.

Winning the cold war is therefore the only way we can avoid a hot war.

But to win the cold war, to master communism in political combat, we must have more and better trained political warriors. Nowhere in the United States today can this art be learned in concentrated and systematic form. There are many excellent institutions where bits and pieces of political warfare are taught. And certainly our American press, radio, and television “communicate” amply on the subject. But to the average intelligent, interested, young American, these constitute disconnected and uncoordinated impressions. Even if he realizes that the men of the Kremlin are actively plotting his personal destruction, there is little or nothing he can do about it. There is no single place he can go to learn all that is known about communism and how to combat it.

Confronted with the monolithic attack of communism, it is not enough for Americans to be generally aware of the nature of the conflict in one place and at one time, to study the depth and scope of the Communist conspiracy to destroy the United States and conquer the world in another place and at another time, and to learn the methods by which the Communist conspiracy can be counteracted in

still another place and still another time. It is only by uniting the study and teaching of these elements in one place and one time that the challenge can be fully comprehended and adequate response generated.

To be a Communist is to make political warfare a fulltime job and a life commitment. For Americans it is at best a part-time aspect of some other job, conducted intermittently and with grossly inadequate training. There are far too few Americans who are both dedicated enough and knowledgeable enough to combat communism effectively on a full-time basis. If the Communists are scoring steady political gains—and we know they are, in all corners of the world—it is because they take their political warfare seriously and we do not. Our greatest danger, it seems to me, is that we may let the victory go by default, simply because too few of us realize the nature and understand the weapons of the struggle.

The Academy proposed in Senate bill 1689 is, to my mind, an intelligent and important step toward rectifying the present dangerous situation. It would furnish this country with a professional and dedicated corps of political warriors—something we sorely need and need immediately.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat and paraphrase, I am sure that there is a general impression that adequate instruction places exist where this art or this profession can be studied. Actually, sir, there is no existing place where the whole problem is pulled together and taught in concentrated form and not in bits and pieces. That is why I think this is a good idea.

Senator DODD. We are very grateful to you, Mr. Jackson. As I said when you prepared to make your statement, I feel personally, and I am sure that my view is shared by other members of this subcommittee, that you are extremely competent in this field, and your observations have great weight and influence with us.

Do you have any questions, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a few questions.

Senator DODD. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. I noted, Mr. Jackson, your stress on “political warrior.” I suppose you mean enlistment for the duration for Americans, also. Do you advocate this?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, sir, when—“political warrior” is a sort of catch phrase to tie in with “political warfare.”

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, I know.

Mr. JACKSON. More Americans should dedicate more time to this work than has happened in the past. A lot of us sort of dart in and out of it. We take an assignment for a year or a year and a half. It will take us the first 6 months to learn what it is all about, and then for one reason or another, we get out. More of us should spend more time at it.

Furthermore, I use the phrase “political warrior” because there is another great element of confusion, and that is that there is a fundamental difference between diplomacy and political warfare, and most of the existing institutions teach diplomacy; they do not teach political warfare.

A diplomat is in business for a totally different reason. Diplomats should know about political warfare, but political warriors should also know about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. What I was trying to get at is whether you feel that the Freedom Academy, which this bill proposes, might be a means of getting full-time and dedicated political warriors in this country?

Mr. JACKSON. I think so, sir. It is too much to expect that everybody that goes through it will stay there for life, but it is the first time that a beginning of a corps of highly-trained professionals in this work would be available.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think it would be the objective of such an Academy to create such a corps?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You would advocate, then, keeping contact, maintaining liaison with the graduates of the Academy, if I may use that word, "graduates"?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you advocate also a policy of attempting to place Academy graduates, put them where they can do the most good?

Mr. JACKSON. I think so. I think the answer is yes.

On the other hand, there is such great need for these people in various private and governmental organizations right now, that I have no doubt that they would be absorbed, well absorbed, as fast as they could be turned out.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Jackson, do you see this Freedom Academy bill as, in a sense, a congressional declaration that we are in fact in this cold war and we need to fight it?

Mr. JACKSON. I hope it would be interpreted as such, because we have made noises about being in the cold war, but we have not pursued it at all times.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have done a few things around the periphery, without ever—

Mr. JACKSON. Well, we are running around the periphery, and every now and then we dart into the middle, but then we get right out again.

Mr. SOURWINE. Could you tell us something, sir, about what you would consider to be the qualifications of individuals to be selected for this Freedom Academy?

Mr. JACKSON. I think that the first qualification is dedication to the aggressive defense of this country.

Mr. SOURWINE. In other words, the students should be dedicated anti-Communists?

Mr. JACKSON. That is right. I do not think it would be serving its purpose if a student approached this Academy sort of as an, oh, another way of passing a few months, learning something.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not want dilettantes?

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you perhaps see this Academy as something for which definite criteria for entrance should definitely be worked out?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; but there you run into a difficult human problem. If I may speak in sort of first-person-singular experience, in all these jobs that I have had in this work, you never can tell when the guy with this particular feel and dedication is going to show up.

Well, to make it very real, one of the ablest young men that I have run into in this work—he is not in government—happens to be an extremely pleasant, handsome, well-educated, rich son of a Wall Street broker. Only he just happened to have it.

Another associate of his, one of his ablest associates, is a Rumanian refugee exile who, when he skipped over, was a Marxist, an anti-Stalinist, Socialist. Those two are now teamed up into a most effective pair.

A third one, to sort of give the picture, is a young Harvard doctor of philosophy in history from upstate New York. If these three men were to walk into this room, a more unlikely and dissimilar trio just could not be imagined. But they have that element, and, unfortunately, they had to learn it the hard way—all except the Marxist. The Rumanian Marxist had it at his fingertips when he skipped over.

The two Americans had to learn it the hard way, whereas had this Academy existed, and had they convinced the entrance board or the dean, or whatever the proper official or group would be, that they really meant to get into this work, they would have been infinitely ahead of where they were at any given time because of the concentrated learning they would have been able to acquire.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the basis of what you say, do you think that the selection of students for the Academy should be on the basis of beating the bushes to look for them, or should the selection be made primarily or entirely from those who seek entrance to the Academy?

Mr. JACKSON. I would say a little bit of both, sir. I think the announcement of the existence of the Academy will attract, immediately attract, a sizable number of young Americans, because there is great interest in this and a great sense of frustration, a feeling of "what can I do, where can I go to do something, to learn something?" The announcement will attract, I am sure, a sizable group.

On the other hand, a certain amount of intelligent bush-shaking should also be done.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does it correctly reflect your view to say that you regard the proposed Academy as more than a mere institution of learning, as a place for training for action?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir; and quite emphatically. I think that personally, if this were to turn into just another academic machine, it would not be doing what it is supposed to do. It is not just an academic machine; it is a place where a concentrated global course on a little-known subject can give the kind of instruction and produce in the minds and hearts of the proper group of young people, a knowledge and a feel and a drive that we sorely need. I emphasize the word "drive" because of your question. If it is to be just another academic institution, you can emerge from that full of knowledge but not necessarily drive.

If this institution does not also produce the drive along with the knowledge, I do not think it will be living up to what its sponsors intend it to be.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think an institution of this nature can produce drive, or does it have to find people that have it?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, the institution can produce the drive if it is a wedding of the right kind of management, instruction and student body, and if right from the beginning, the philosophy of the institution contains the element of drive.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think, then, this should be an action institution?

Mr. JACKSON. If you mean should these young fellows go out and put a timebomb under Khrushchev's seat in Geneva, the answer is "No." But they should be thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that political warfare is not a passive action, and that, unless they have the concept of moving forward in political warfare instead of constantly fighting these desperate rearguard actions which we are always fighting, we shall not win the conflict.

Mr. SOURWINE. What I had in mind was that there might be said to be some question whether political warfare can be learned wholly, as an art, out of books, or whether there has to be some on-the-job training, so to speak.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I think there should be on-the-job training, but you can have the sort of case technique, because, from the State Department, from the Central Intelligence Agency, from certain private institutions in Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, all over the country, instructors in the case method can be found, and also, just picking up the morning newspaper and deciding what you would do if you were in a position to do it constitutes a daily case in political warfare, because political warfare is just all around us. We are living it now.

Coexistence and political warfare are one and the same thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. You spoke, sir, of the need for dedication. There really is not any way to measure that in a man, is there?

You would not, I take it, advocate limiting the enrollment in the Freedom Academy to persons who had already demonstrated by vigorous activity their anti-Communist attitude?

Mr. JACKSON. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That would pretty well curtail the enrollment.

Mr. JACKSON. It sure would.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you, sir, see any possibility of disillusionment and frustration of the graduates from this Academy who might find no occupational outlet for their training?

Mr. JACKSON. No. As I said, I am pretty sure that both in Government and in private organizations in this work and in U.S. business and in industry, there will be plenty of opportunities for these people to have an operational outlet.

Of course, when you are young, you think that everything can be settled in 24 hours. Well, they will have the frustration of realizing that it may take a year, but that is a frustration that we all get, one time or another.

Mr. SOURWINE. You spoke earlier of the Academy keeping contact with these graduates. Do you have in mind that there would be any after-direction of their activities, that is, after graduation, or would they be turned loose to go, as you say, to business, industry, and Government, where their activities would be entirely controlled and guided by the agency they went to?

Mr. JACKSON. Sir, I think, off the top of the head, I think two things on that. One is that the basic course, however, long it takes, may not, in the case of certain individuals, be the ultimate answer, and that the Academy might be set up in such a way that beyond the basic course of x number of months, if a graduate finds that

he needs more intensive study, more intensive training in some specialized branch of this, it ought to be possible for him to come back and either have a refresher or an extension course.

In the second place, I think the graduates should be kept in touch with, even if it is on the most elementary level, such as a monthly bulletin or newsletter, or alumni weekly, or alumni monthly, because one of the things that I have observed in American efforts in post-war education of foreign students is that the facilities are superb for getting them over here, and the facilities of education are superb while they are here, and everybody pats them on the back and gives them a great farewell party when they go. But then they go back to France or Italy or Africa, or wherever they came from, and the institution does not keep in touch with them any longer, except in a few cases. By and large, they do not. Whereas, the Communists' equivalent of that—and the Communists are training innumerable students, thousands of them all over the world in various institutions—that student is never let go of. The Communists don't attempt to control him in his work in corporation X or activity Y, but that booklet, that pamphlet, that letter, follows him wherever he goes and furnishes the emotional and intellectual tie to what he originally learned.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you see either the Freedom Academy or Freedom Commission as in any sense a coordinating agency or directing agency for Government activity in this whole field?

Mr. JACKSON. I have not thought about that one, but sir—again off the top of the head—I would say that would be a bad idea. I do not think it is the business, or would be the business of the Freedom Academy to be an operating branch of Government. It would be a contradiction in terms, and the Academy would not last for a year if it started pushing the State Department around.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not, then, like to think of the Academy as another tier in the bureaucratic pyramid?

Mr. JACKSON. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I note the bill provides rather broad authority for the Academy or the Commission for the publication of textbooks and doing a great many things that might be termed in the psychological warfare field. That would necessarily make it an operational agency, would it not?

Mr. JACKSON. I am really not competent—I really do not know the answer to that. I have read the bill and frankly, sir, I do not know how that would work. But I am convinced that it would be bad, it would be a bad thing if the Academy turned into an operating agency in political warfare or in foreign affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of course, the Academy, as a group, would be separate from the Freedom Commission, although the Freedom Commission would establish the Academy. The bill gives the Freedom Commission these duties and authorities with regard to publication, preparation of materials, and so forth. Do you consider that is perhaps something that the Congress should look at carefully to consider whether the Commission should do this, or whether this type of thing should be left to the existing agency of the Government?

Mr. JACKSON. I think that Congress should look at the whole bill, and if there is anything in the bill that they think duplicates an operating activity of the Government, or is moving in on the State De-

partment or the CIA or what have you, that should be reworded. I do not think that the language of the bill as proposed—I did not interpret it as final. I imagined that if the Congress accepted, let us say, the philosophy which inspired the bill, it would then be able to work out the details so that the bill would be the right kind.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not trying to put you in a spot.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand, and I am not trying to evade. I just do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. The sponsors of the bill are frank to say they do not think it would be the be-all and end-all, and I am trying to get for the record your own particular feeling about this phase as an operating agency, just how much authority should be given to the Commission in that field. We all know that, if you create an agency and give it authority, it is going to exercise the authority and probably expand it as time goes on. I wondered if you could give us just your own view as to whether the Congress should be careful in limiting that or leave it open. What should be the policy in that one respect?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I assume that the reason for setting up this double-barreled arrangement, the Commission and then the Academy, was to find a way by which the Academy would not be niched into an operating branch of the Government. In other words, not an administrative offshoot of the State Department or CIA or the White House, or something like that. It was a device. I think that the Commissioners are given very broad powers in here, and if the Commissioners were the right kind of Commissioners, I am sure that the more freedom they were given, the better the Academy would be.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is one more point I should like to ask you about, sir. It has been suggested the creation of a joint congressional committee as a sort of watchdog over this whole affair involves a threat to the jurisdiction of existing congressional committees, in both the House and the Senate, in that the new committee might take over functions of existing separate committees. The sponsors of the bill say that there was no intention to do that. Without any effort to put you on the spot, I should like to ask you, is this something that you would favor—that is, the coordination of the work in a single joint committee—or do you feel that the existing committees should continue, and if there is to be a joint committee, it should be made clear that its function has entirely to do with the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy?

Mr. JACKSON. Oh, absolutely the latter. I think it would be inconceivable that the joint committee for this Academy should have any thought of moving into the existing committees. They are in business for totally different reasons, and it would be very bad if that were an overt or a covert purpose behind this. This joint committee should be concerned with the Academy, period.

Mr. SOURWINE. If there is to be a joint committee, do you think it needs broad investigating powers, subpoena powers?

Mr. JACKSON. I just do not know the answer to that. Again, it read as though this were standard language for committees.

Senator DODD. I think that is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. Perhaps I have overstressed, Mr. Chairman, the threat to existing committees in this particular field. It would seem

rather clear that the joint committee's authority as the bill is now drafted would impinge on the jurisdiction of various other committees in the Senate and House—Foreign Relations, possibly Armed Services, surely Government Operations, and possibly Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at least. It is in this whole area that I am inquiring.

Senator DODD. I think something could be worked out satisfactorily so that we could make rather clear the jurisdictional lines.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. Once again, Mr. Jackson, we are very grateful to you. You have been very helpful to us. I have my own views about this, and think we all do and I thought when you were testifying that, if this did nothing else, it would put an end to the apology that has been made for so many years that we did not know about the Communists. It would be worthwhile for that reason if for no other. There are many other, better reasons, of course.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, actually, Mr. Chairman, not to butter you up, but you made a fine speech last year on political warfare with respect to Eastern European satellite countries. Now, if there had been, if this Academy had been in existence for 5 years, I do not think you would have had to make that speech, because that would have been in operation.

Senator DODD. That would have been a misfortune for me.

Well, we are very grateful to you, and thank you again.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator DODD. Our next witness is Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer.

TESTIMONY OF DR. GERHART NIEMEYER, SOUTH BEND, IND.

Senator DODD. Good morning, Dr. Niemeyer. We are grateful to you for coming here. I know that you are a member of the faculty at Notre Dame University. You are also on the faculty of the War College?

Mr. NIEMEYER. Right.

Senator DODD. We are grateful to you for being here this morning.

Would you give your name and address for the record, please?

Mr. NIEMEYER. My address is 1126 Helmen Drive, South Bend, Ind.

I am very grateful to you for this opportunity, Mr. Chairman. I submitted to you a statement the day before yesterday, and I would like to ask your permission to insert that statement into the record and to summarize its contents.

Senator DODD. That will be fine. I have read your statement, and I must say that it is an excellent one.

Mr. NIEMEYER. Thank you.

Senator DODD. It will be printed in the record at this point, and I think it would be helpful to us if you did summarize it.

(The complete statement of Dr. Niemeyer follows:)

STATEMENT BY DR. GERHART NIEMEYER

In the forces of Soviet communism, we are facing an enemy who has for half a century perfected his capabilities in political warfare. The Communists ultimately rely on the ruthless and destructive use of force. But in order to get into a position where they can use force with impunity and without restraint, they prefer political methods when seizing power. In coming to power,

the Communists have used force sparingly and have, where possible, manipulated their enemies into political submission. They did this in Russia in 1917.

More recent examples are East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, and Iraq. For East Germany, Wolfgang Leonhard in his "Child of the Revolution" has told how German cadres were trained in special schools in the Urals, thrown into Berlin in the first days of the occupation, and used to maneuver all potential political groups into a Communist controlled single party. Czechoslovakia was taken over by gradual steps, from one small position of power to another. Gradual infiltration into the Guatemalan Government put that country under Communist control before any one really knew what was going on, and it took a revolution to dislodge the Reds there. Regarding Iraq, we have the recent report of a Soviet writer who boasts that the Communists, in Iraq, are controlling a youth union, a women's league, an organization of "peace supporters," and a peasants' union, the latter with 200,000 members, in addition to 34 trade unions. The same writer noted that Iraq now has "units of the people's home guards" which were recently armed. Here we see political warfare at work.

What are the Communist capabilities in political warfare? There is no mystery about this: The Soviets in numerous schools train thousands in the skills of political action in specific countries. Basically, the Communists have capabilities in political warfare because they have long been aware that political warfare can be planned, taught, and learned. They have put to work as teachers veterans of political warfare or others who have studied the veterans' experience. The experts have developed courses through which they teach their knowledge to dedicated students. The students emerging from the numerous Communist schools swarm all over the world. They are deeply motivated to fight and win. They have full and detailed knowledge of their victims as well as of their own party and its goals. They are skilled in the tricks of their trade, including writing, speaking, organization, and subversion. They can turn a passing mood into a lasting organizational gain. They can develop allegiance out of an ideal. They can maneuver their opponents from the places of control. They can skin their enemy with his own consent. Such people need force only at the margin of their operations. They are trained to conquer totally, but, if possible, bloodlessly.

Communist capabilities of political warfare are becoming more important, as the atomic stalemate inhibits both sides from the risk of a military showdown. Under the umbrella of the universal atomic deterrent, any territory the Communists conquer by political warfare drops behind the Iron Curtain for keeps, unless we succeed in winning it back by similar methods.

Moreover, in a number of countries we are now witnessing a process called polarization in which the Communist Party becomes the sole available alternative to the governing party. This is already the case in Greece, India, and Indonesia, and a similar situation may well develop in other countries, for instance South Africa and even France. Once the political forces of a country split into two camps, one of which is Communist, that country's fate will be decided not by foreign policies but by internal political warfare. Czechoslovakia may well be repeated.

How well are we equipped for political warfare? There can be no doubt that our present capabilities in this field are utterly inadequate. USIA, which is certainly one of our main instruments of political warfare, may serve as an illustration. As of a year ago, the personnel in USIA posts abroad numbered less than 1,000, who were distributed over more than 80 posts. This number includes those serving in administrative functions. The rest handicapped by the fact that they are Americans, officially employed by the U.S. Government, and moreover rotated from post to post in 2-year intervals so that they are never able to develop firm contacts in any country. Apart from all that, however, the capability of USIA is confined to the spreading of information. It does not give us any capability to organize, lead, maneuver, counteract.

How about our capability to learn about the enemy, and to train great numbers of people in this vital knowledge? Our universities have a number of centers of area studies. A number of students are educated there in foreign languages, the history and the institutions of foreign countries. But these students are not equipped for political warfare. In the first place, their training does not motivate them to engage in that kind of warfare. Secondly, they are not taught how to put their knowledge to use in the world conflict, to engage in intellectual contest, to argue with conviction for our cause, to find the enemy's weakness.

Among the citizens of other countries, we have even less capability. Nowhere is there anything that could be called an "American Party," or even a "Freedom Party," in the sense in which the Soviets dispose of a worldwide Communist party. Those citizens of other countries who stand ready to argue, debate, organize, and fight on our side find that they have no place to turn to. There is no unit, no organization, no set of leaders whom they could readily identify as their proper rallying points. What is worse, these people often find that we have not even provided them with telling intellectual arguments with which they could enter the fray on our behalf. Paraphrasing a word from the Bible, one could say: In many free countries the laborers are ready, but no one hires them to gather the harvest.

The proposed Freedom Academy will cost very little, compared with the costs of even a single missile. Yet this one lonely Freedom Academy, mobilizing and gathering people, facts, and thoughts at the expense of a few million dollars, can without exaggeration be called a potential major weapon of the free world. Its effect will be a multiple of the effort that needs to be put into it. For a few people, well trained, organized, and disciplined, are a truly powerful force. In South Africa at present, a fast advancing tide of Communist influence is threatening. This influence actually comes from no more than 30 to 40 Communists, nearly all of them foreigners trained in Soviet schools, who are engaged in systematic and disciplined political warfare. The seeds of a future Communist control of South Africa does not cost the Soviets more than a few hundred thousand dollars.

There is no reason why, for a proportionally equally small sum, we could not do as much for freedom as the Communists do for their goal of world rule. The very existence of a place where competent and dedicated people gather and disseminate knowledge of the enemy and are prepared to teach it to those who have resolved to counteract Communist infiltration, the very existence of such a place will be an inspiration to the entire free world. A member of a friendly embassy, commenting on the present bill, said to me: "This bill, if adopted, would be a major breakthrough."

It has frequently been said we are ill suited to the business of political warfare. Those who say this must really mean: we are ill suited to use lies, subterfuge, distortions, blackmail, and fraud to gain our ends. This is the way of the Communists. But political warfare can be waged in different ways, and we can and will wage it with methods worthy of freemen. Others say: Our good cause will prevail by its merit. To have a good cause does not mean that one should not fight for it. If political warfare threatens the cause of human freedom, the defenders of freedom then must become past masters at the art of political warfare, and do it without in the process of losing the values we protect.

What is more, it is a mistake to believe that our culture dooms us to a secondary performance in this field. In the first place, we have working for us what might be called the natural preference of men: religion, morality, love of native country and of national independence, and, at least in the West, political tradition. Those are mighty allies, and they have so powerfully wrought on our side that even without developing special capabilities for political warfare, we have by and large held our own against a massive Soviet onslaught.

In the second place, there are several examples of highly successful political warfare in the West. The unions, once alarmed and alerted, have recaptured from the Communists the bulk of the positions they had lost to them not only in this country, but, to some extent, also in Europe. In Germany, the Government is running a college at which groups of leading citizens are educated in the knowledge of communism. This Ostkolleg in Cologne, together with other measures of political warfare against German Communists, are conducted in the spirit and the methods of democracy, even though inspired by a hard-hitting determination to crush, politically, the totalitarian threat to freedom.

Political warfare is not a field that we need to concede to the enemy. Once we begin to develop its methods and skills, once we give deliberate thought to its strategy, it will enable us not only to hold our own but to go on the offensive against communism. The Freedom Academy is an institution that will immeasurably help to accomplish this.

Dr. NIEMEYER. Let me give you a few details about my past experience, which may or may not be germane to this testimony.

I am a native of Germany, and I have lived through the Nazi dictatorship there, as well as through the beginnings of the civil war

in Spain. I came to this country in 1937 and have, since then, taught at various universities—Princeton, Yale, Columbia, Oglethorpe.

I have been in the State Department for 3 years as a planning adviser, and with the Council on Foreign Relations for 2 years. I am now professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, where it is one of my responsibilities to teach a full year graduate course on Communist ideology from the original source materials.

The main impression, of course, which has been created by Mr. C. D. Jackson's very able testimony, which I would like to underscore, is the very strong capabilities of the Soviet Union in political warfare, capabilities which have existed because the Soviets have been aware that one can teach political warfare in courses, and they have developed the courses, they have developed the teachers, they have selected the students, they have sent them out, motivated, informed, skilled, and organized.

These students swarm all over the world, and instances of which all of us are aware bear testimony to the effectiveness of this situation. For example, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, at present, of course, Iraq, which is still in the balance. Compared with this, our own capability is woefully inadequate.

We have, of course, organizations which do dedicate themselves to political warfare, but to some extent these organizations are handicapped by the fact that their members are official Government employees of the United States. What we need, in other words, are people who are private persons, particularly in other countries, but also in this country.

In that respect, our universities, which could teach private persons, simply are not set up to teach about political warfare. Those who do teach about Soviet affairs teach about the geography and history of the Soviet Union, but they do not dedicate their teaching and orient their teaching toward the purposes and needs of political warfare.

In our exchange program, where also we get foreign students who are trained in this country, there is certainly no attempt to indoctrinate these students for this particular purpose, or even to indoctrinate them for the West. We all know of the painful experience of these exchange students going back to their countries and going back, not as advocates of the Western cause, the cause of freedom, but as advocates of, or as cannon fodder for the Communist machine.

I would like to say that, in my contacts with military people, which I have maintained during this past year, of the National War College, I have found no one who did not feel that special training for political warfare was needed. I found it particularly true in the military missions which I visited during the field trip of the National War College, that the very important people who are there as part of our military mission are selected for their military competence, because they are good commanders, good leaders of troops, and so on, but not because they are adequately qualified for the role of political warfare which they are playing, whether they want to or not.

So I would say, together with Mr. C. D. Jackson, that the very existence of an Academy of this kind would be a very important step, and I should like to mention what a diplomat, a high ranking diplomat of a friendly embassy, said to me when I discussed this bill with him.

He said, "If this bill were passed, this would indeed be a major breakthrough."

Senator DODD. Mr. Sourwine, do you have any questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean that the mere act of passing the bill, being, as Mr. Jackson said, a sort of congressional declaration of the cold war, would accomplish something for our side?

Mr. NIEMEYER. Indeed it would. This, I think, was also the meaning of the statement which I just quoted by the diplomat. It would be a recognition that political warfare is a problem, that one needs to train and equip oneself to deal with political warfare, and it would be an indication to the world that we mean business.

I would also say that this is particularly important, now that we are moving more and more under the shadow of the atomic stalemate, so that political methods become more and more decisive.

Mr. SOURWINE. Instead of leaving this declaration that we are in the cold war merely implicit in the enactment of the bill, would you favor putting in the bill a policy declaration which would place upon all departments and agencies of the Government the obligation to fight this cold war for all they are worth?

Mr. NIEMEYER. My own feeling would be that the setting up of the Academy would be an action, and that actions speak louder than words.

Senator DODD. Would you also agree that this Academy might serve effectively, what I would describe, for want of a better phrase, as a massive intellectual conversion?

Mr. NIEMEYER. In the sense of disseminating information about communism?

Senator DODD. No. I have thought for some time that what we must do in order to be most effective with respect to the Communists is convert the many intellectuals who seem not able to comprehend the nature of the difficulty. This has occurred to me as an ideal means of doing so.

Mr. NIEMEYER. Yes, in the sense that all the facts about communism would be brought together into one pattern there, which is very seldom done. I think this is quite true.

Senator DODD. I do not want to seem to be knocking all intellectuals as being ignorant on this, but there are enough of them who seem to have trouble understanding, to make me feel that there is need for what I have described as a massive conversion in that field.

Mr. NIEMEYER. I fully agree. I fully agree, and I would like to say that, certain instances of cold warfare—concrete instances which are known to me—a considerable degree of ignorance about communism and, of course, misguided thought vis-a-vis the whole problem of communism, was a crucially decisive weakness on the West's side.

I am referring particularly to the situation in South Africa at the present time, where a friend of mine has been consultant to the Government. He reports that, to the extent to which the Government is losing the fight to the Communists, it is doing so because of a really indescribable ignorance about communism and failure to appreciate the true nature of communism. Precisely what you are saying, sir.

Senator DODD. That says it much better than I could. That is what I wanted to say.

Excuse me for interrupting.

Mr. SOURWINE. Sir, do you have views on the question of whether the Freedom Academy, or Freedom Commission, or either, should be an action agency in any sense?

Mr. NIEMEYER. I would be inclined to give the same answer as Mr. C. D. Jackson. In the sense that you place time bombs, no. In the sense that you motivate students, yes. I would say that the Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission would both miss the main point of the whole enterprise if they did not motivate their students to go out and do something about it.

To the extent that they support their students with continual information, centralize all information about communism, gather all this information and make it available to them—to this extent I think they would be the center of a network of active people.

Whether you would call this an operation agency or not I do not know. But I would say that the students of this Academy, after they leave, whether or not they are active in this field, would write back there, they would get their data there, possibly submit their pamphlets to this organization for approval or improvement, and so on.

Mr. SOURWINE. You speak of time bombs, of course, in the literal sense, but in another sense, when the Communists place a trained, skilled, and motivated man in our midst, it is a kind of time bomb, and it might not do any harm if we planted a few time bombs like that around this country and perhaps the world?

Mr. NIEMEYER. In this sense, I agree with you, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That brings us to another point we have discussed in connection with this bill, and that is the training of aliens, that is, nationals of another country than our own, and sending them back to their own countries.

There has been expressed some fear that this might be taken as the training of spies and might have a kickback, a reverse propaganda effect.

Do you have any thoughts on this point?

Mr. NIEMEYER. First of all, I would say that to the extent to which spies are trained, this is the function of the government, a time-honored function of any government, and there should be no interference by the Academy in this. Again, I fully agree with Mr. C. D. Jackson on this point.

To the extent to which people go back from the Academy to their own countries, having been trained in the United States, there is, of course, an element in their background that might strike their own fellow citizens as alien, and this might be one of the difficulties to overcome.

In some countries it would not be a difficulty. I think we are quite mistaken to assume that we do not have people in other countries who welcome our alliance, our help, in this cold war, and who cry out for it. To these people, who are to be found in all countries, all free countries all over the world, someone trained in the United States in what is really a common cause, would be very welcome.

But, of course, there would be others who would consider this man as an alien intruder. I think this is one of the difficulties we have to take and put up with. It is at that, I think, a far lesser difficulty than the alternative which is offered to us in the war in the cold war and

the political war, namely, that we have to move in with our troops whenever a cold war situation has turned against us, which is a far greater diplomatic and national difficulty than to send these, after all, native citizens, back to their own countries trained in the United States.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it a fair summary of what you have said that you feel that, on balance, the advantages of training nationals of other countries greatly outweigh the disadvantages?

Mr. NIEMEYER. Yes, I would say that.

Senator DODD. Well, we are very grateful to you, also, for taking the time to come here. This is a very important matter, we think—we of this subcommittee—and it helps us a lot to get opinions such as you have given us this morning. I thank you on behalf of the subcommittee and for myself, personally.

Mr. NIEMEYER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator DODD. Our next witness is Mr. McDowell. Is Mr. McDowell here?

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR G. McDOWELL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator DODD. Mr. McDowell, we have a little time problem this morning. The Senate is convening at 11 o'clock, rather than at 12. I must be on the floor today. Would it be possible to be through with your testimony in 10 or 15 minutes?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I can conclude within 10 minutes.

Senator DODD. I do not want to hurry you. I shall be happy to go a little overtime, but I am sure that there will be a quorum call, maybe more. Why not go ahead and give your statement, and if we have to suspend, you will understand why.

Mr. McDOWELL. Very well.

Senator DODD. I thank you for appearing here; we are glad to see you. Your name is Arthur McDowell. You are executive secretary of the Council Against Communist Aggression, and I believe your home is in Philadelphia?

Mr. McDOWELL. Philadelphia.

Senator DODD. Would you give your full address for the record, please?

Mr. McDOWELL. My name is Arthur G. McDowell, I reside at 574 West Clapier Street, Germantown, Pa. I am employed as the director of the Department of Civic, Education and Governmental Affairs, and also as director of International Labor Relations by the Upholsterers International Union of North America, with principal headquarters at 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, and auxiliary offices at 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

I am authorized and empowered by the organization that employs me to devote such time as is available and is required for the administration of the Council Against Communist Aggression, which is a voluntary organization of citizens selected from the ranks of trade union leaders, business people, with some accent on scholars in International Labor Relations who enter the field, and, in some cases, because of their special interests, representatives of the clergy.

I have prepared a statement which is in the nature of a qualification of a witness to give testimony on the essential matter, and I would like to file that for the record and merely concentrate on one summary aspect of that statement.

Senator DODD. Do we have a copy of your statement?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, we have copies, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DODD. It will be printed in the record at this point.

(The complete statement of Mr. McDowell is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman and Senators, members of the subcommittee, my name is Arthur Gladstone McDowell and I reside at 574 W. Clapier Street in Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. I am employed as the director of the Department of Civic, Education, and Governmental Affairs, and also as director of International Labor Relations by the Upholsterers' International Union of North America, with principal headquarters at 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, and auxiliary offices at 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Since February 1951, by authorization of the General Executive Board of the Upholsterers' International Union and its president, Sal B. Hoffmann, ratified by all the successive conventions of that union, as its supreme governing body, including the 32d Triennium Convention of that organization in the city of San Francisco, just adjourned on June 11, 1959, I am authorized to serve, without pay, as the executive secretary-treasurer of the Council Against Communist Aggression, with offices, administrative and clerical services furnished by the union. This is a correspondence organization formulating or furnishing reprints of study documents on methods of combating Communist aggression and furthering world freedom through information and advocacy of policy by American citizens and to the extent that they can influence its decisions by information and discussion, through the Government of these United States. We encourage and maintain fraternal correspondence with similar groups and individuals in other free countries. Our governing committee is made up of a national committee, composed of labor union officials, businessmen and industrialists, churchmen, specialized scholars in international affairs, etc.

I appear before your committee to advocate your favorable action in approving and recommending to the full Judiciary Committee for favorable report and recommendation for final passage of Senate bill 1689, which has the endorsement of the National Committee of the Council Against Communist Aggression as of last November 1958 and of the June 11, 1959, action of Convention of the Upholsterers' International Union, for both of whom I speak in this matter.

It is my considered opinion that the Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission responsible to the Congress for the governance of the academy, among other matters, is an indispensable course of action for defeat of the worldwide Communist conspiracy of aggression and survival of the free world, of which the United States is the core. It is my further observation that the function sought to be served is not presently being filled by any existing governmental agency, nor is there any existing agency prepared or qualified to discharge the imperatively necessary function proposed for this Freedom Academy.

This conviction is based on 30 years' experience almost to the day in a variety of posts in student organizations, trade unions, political party activity, including campaigning for office, religious groups, cultural societies, and almost any collective type of activity you can mention; in only one of which, to my recollection, did I function throughout my term without encountering and finding it essential to resist Communist infiltration attempts to influence by mobilizing opposition to and, in certain cases, organizing withdrawal from, or exposure of the group in order to prevent the subsequent use of such for advancing Communist purposes, power or propagandawise. It is my observation that in all these years of experience never was there present at the beginning the informed, organized, and trained personnel equal to those disposed of by the Communist Party or equal to them in preparation and training and, of course, in nature of our free society there was never any equivalent in direction, central place for information or consultation. However successful was the eventual resistance, it was always by a pickup team against professionals, and in the majority of cases the battle once won was never final and had to be fought over again in a few years by another pickup team, unless the particular organization happened to be one whose passing nature or dependence on events led to its total disappearance. It was

always a case of an essentially civilian force fighting an essentially military formation. The Communist enemy always understood this essential difference and their advantage and the democratic opposing forces seldom or never realized this or acted upon that realization. We have now come to the point where we must either provide the purposeful teaching of freemen at all these levels of voluntary community organizations and institutions, sometimes even more important than governmental organization in our American society, the nature and tactics and advantage of our enemy or reconcile ourselves to rear guard actions and ultimate defeat even on own grounds at hands of the adherents of a new slave society.

If the committee's time can possibly afford it, permit me to cite year by year experience of an individual. In 1928 I was a beginning student at University of Pittsburgh, committed to the Methodist ministry as a goal, with a public school background of leadership in Boy Scouts, YMCA, church young people's society, and a lively sense of injustice and social conscience. A loved idealistic minister had signed me up in Methodist Federation for Social Service. I visited their headquarters in New York and was regaled by the dainty white-haired woman secretary with stories of her experience attending Communist Party meetings. I was definitely propagandized and when it was discovered that through friendship with Norman Thomas I had Socialist leanings only, I was scolded and almost scorned. At my university I became active in the Student Liberal Club, but when faculty advisers and past officers assumed it a sound idea to place me in presidency, it was quickly clear that a Communist caucus was secretly at work and the lad who emerged as victor was the son of a Communist textile boss in Leningrad, who was planted in Pittsburgh. When we became embroiled with university authorities in the spring of 1929 over student labor agitation, Fred Woltman, graduate assistant, who subsequently became Pulitzer prize winner for the Scripps-Howard articles exposing Communist infiltration of unions some years later, and myself, found ourselves expelled along with the professional Communist student, but with evidence that a secret strategy board, including faculty members, had made many of our decisions before we had a chance to.

While the student battle raged, I was asked to do a research job to help a group of striking dairy unionists in Pittsburgh. In the midst of this work I found my Communist fellow student and expellee organizing a cabal and trying to take over the strike or break it up. I began to get interested in this Communist type of element and competing with it. I joined and became an officer of the Socialist Party for some 10 years, holding virtually every post except those reserved for Norman Thomas.

I found Communist infiltrators every step of the way, with no one to fight them at outset except a few oldtimers who had had a special training in 1919 when they fought off Lenin's attempt to take over the mantle of labor respect accorded in the United States of America to the remnant of the party of Eugene Debs. These men and women were already aging and alienated from younger people coming in.

The battle expanded. I became a correspondent in Pennsylvania Legislature and saw mass unemployment being exploited, with phony costume party demonstrations at capital. After 1933 partial recovery. Every effort of trade unions in educational field, such as I participated in through the Chicago Labor College, the newly organized local of Adult Education Teachers in the Chicago Federation of Labor, and the new education department of the rising young United Auto Workers in Midwest were beset with organized attempts at infiltration and take over by a tireless bunch of operators.

In 1940 I left the Socialist movement and went to work for CIO Textile Workers' Union and found in St. Louis, Mo., that I had a constant battle with Communist active elements seeking domination of CIO there. The battle became so fierce that I and my local unions actually were compelled to withdraw from CIO Council of the city.

Seeing no evidence of will to combat Communist influence as yet evident in top of CIO ranks in 1945, I resigned from Textile Workers and took director of organization post with Upholsterers' International Union, which had fought the Communist drive into unions openly and consciously since it came into open from underground in 1922. In a few months I found myself getting appeals for aid from friends abroad over the manipulation in Europe of the service committee of Unitarian Church, with which I was now affiliated, by Communist agent Noel Field and his fellow traveler and aid, the very editor of the then Christian Register. I was in midst of aiding an anti-Communist uprising in the rival to Upholsterers, the United Furniture Workers, by 1946, and saw

again, firsthand, the effectiveness of Communists when aided by even just weak and egotistical men at top merely consenting and evading unpleasant conflict.

I became president of the Men's Society, the Laymen's League of my church, after finding secret Communist speakers on program without critical wit or informed opinion present to nail them, where even though the good sound membership felt there was something wrong, they couldn't put their finger on what it was, a common American plight.

I became a candidate for office and an active party Democrat and ran across a capable Communist operative once eliminated from a group like the Philadelphia ADA while I was a member there, well pointed to get places in ward committee and even a pending appointment to judicial bench.

Gentlemen, 30 years are now behind me. Many a warrior trained as I was, not in theory but in practice, has grown much older. The big main labor fight is over. No more battlers are being trained there. But the Communist machine grinds on. There is no answer in even domestic affairs in pickup teams. In uncommitted nations and untried peoples abroad the trained Communist will cut like a hot knife through butter. If we are serious about survival, the only serious approach is this professional one of the Freedom Academy and Commission to train the cadres freedom needs, as does West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Academy in military affairs. Washington won with a pickup army like my great-great-grandfather, a Major McDowell, who came from and went back to the plow. Not today anymore. We train professionally or perish.

Senator DODD. I think it would be helpful if you would give us a summary of it.

Mr. McDOWELL. My principal point is that it is my considered opinion that the Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission responsible to the Congress for the governance of the Academy, among other matters, is an indispensable course of action for defeat of the worldwide Communist conspiracy of aggression, and for survival of the free world, of which the United States is the core. It is my further observation that the function sought to be served is not presently being filled by any existing governmental agency, nor is there any existing agency prepared or qualified to discharge the imperatively necessary function proposed for this Freedom Academy.

May I give a specific instance? I might say that I am at the very opposite end of the spectrum, as far as activity goes, from the witnesses who presented themselves this morning, who have functioned, it might be said, in official governmental capacities, and at the top of the operations that have been concerned with basic security. I have never functioned as a representative or as an employee of a Government agency. Thirty years of experience in dealing with the problem have been entirely in the area of participation in voluntary organizations in the generalized sense of that term. My largest experience, of course, is within the trade-union movement, but it also included the area of familiarity with and direct operation against Communist propaganda and manipulative operations in religious groups, in cultural groups, and in almost any of those activities in which an active citizen concerned with public affairs might find himself involved.

I would like particularly, Mr. Chairman, to call your attention to the fact that our press, particularly our sports pages, have been concerned since the end of May with the description of certain events involving the International Olympics Committee. This has been marked by statements from our official State Department spokesman, Lincoln White, as press officer, expressing obvious elements of surprise over the fact that political elements have been interjected into the International Olympics Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this is very, very late intelligence as to what goes on in an area as important for its indirect impact on opinion formulation as this. In the summer of 1932, a Communist agent, operating in the Chicago area, organized a counter-Olympics committee. This would have been analogous, in my experience, to the policy of that time pursued by the international Communist movement which we would call dual unionism. It involved the operation of a separate trade union center which was established and pushed in America from 1929 to approximately 1935, when the Communist Party line was changed. At that time, within the American labor movement, the purpose of Communist tactics was to set up a separate trade-union organization. This was done. Communist organizations were operating similarly in the organized athletics area in the summer of 1932, which I believe is approximately some 27 years ago, a long time indeed before our official agency expressed surprise that political elements should be found connected with such an activity as international Olympic events.

Now, I would like also to point out in view of the lateness of the hour, that I can remember, as a correspondent in the Pennsylvania Legislature in the year 1931, we had one of the earlier massive demonstrations seeking to exploit the large-scale unemployment situation. As a correspondent, I covered the carefully arranged and dramatized demonstration under Communist auspices that wound into the Pennsylvania Capitol in 1931, in the course of the legislative session. At the head of the procession, seeming quite ludicrous to the newspapermen and to the citizens involved, I suppose, who were there as spectators, was a very large and the very first leading banner, entitled "Hands Off the Chinese People." The fact is, of course, that this is ludicrous only with a superficial observation, because this was an index to the fact that, within the body of American public opinion, there was, however ill-conceived or adapted at the moment, a program for affecting and directing the course of some section of American opinion as to the events in China, and it was not considered ridiculous by the sponsors to put at the head of an unemployed demonstration a reference to something that was going on 10,000 miles away. As a matter of fact, I was aware at the time that a certain amount of funds were being made available through American sympathizers to editors of labor papers, who would give space in their papers to special material on events connected with the clash between the Soviet and Japanese armies in Manchuria. I know some of these editors were approached. I know the majority of them had nothing to do with it. These were not the editors of Communist papers, they were trade union papers' editors, like the organ of Progressive Miners in Illinois, in 1932, for example, the editor of which was approached on this basis.

Now, this is simply what I seek to emphasize by pointing out that this is a late approach to meeting an enemy on a field where it is not a question of excellence of the enemy's tactics or his preparation, but the fact that he has been operating in this area without any operation in response. It is not that we have not been effective, we have not even been there in any coordinated, directed sense, in any informed sense.

Those of us who have gone through this experience over these years, and my own experience, in finding Communists in operation within

a religious organization, goes back to 1928, which I believe you will note is only 9 years after the foundation of the Communist International, discovered it had found a foothold and was already carrying on an operation within an outright religious operation.

I referred, of course, in my statement, to the Methodist Federation for Social Service, of which I was a member in the spring of 1928, when I visited their office.

Now, this is the substance of what I wish to say, and while I could give in detail, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of experience over 30 years' time, specifically in the trade union movement where my experience has been most definite, I think that this point is sufficiently made. It is in the area of the private organization, where people flounder hopelessly and learn the hardest possible way, as I have, in the case of my personal experience, but in the case of scores of young people I knew, drawn into various activities on the most idealistic motives, and finding themselves, if they did not have their lives wrecked, or their loyalties compromised, finding at best that they had a long period of years of the most miserable and trying experience in finding out even the fundamentals of the nature of the enemy they faced, and the nature of his operation.

Senator DODD. If you will excuse me, I have a phone call.

Mr. Sourwine, the counsel of this committee, will preside.

(Senator Dodd left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. McDowell, you spoke of the need for coordination and direction in this effort to fight the cold war on the psychological warfare front.

Is it your thought that the Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission would provide any measure of coordination and direction?

Mr. McDOWELL. In many respects, what I meant in terms of coordination is summarized by a little old gentleman who, for years, functioned as the secretary for foreign students under the Rhodes Scholarship Plan at Oxford University.

So far as I know, there was no staff. I don't think he even used a stenographer. But those who had been Rhodes scholars were kept in contact through handwritten letters. It was an amazing performance for an individual without any staff. But it served an obvious functional purpose in binding together those who had had the advantage of that scholarship in that period into a sort of international community.

Now, of course, this had no direct or obvious political overtones, but this was the sort of thing that I meant. The purpose to be served by the Academy is obviously the systematic teaching and preparation of people to discover the things which a few other individuals have been able, on the basis of pragmatic experience, to discover, but at a very painful and costly sort of a pace and fashion.

Many times, they discovered it too late to save themselves from individual shipwreck after involving themselves in what was, at the start, a very normal organizational relationship.

Coordination, yes, but when I think of an institution such as the Freedom Academy, I am thinking of that little old chap at Oxford University, who bound together students across a good portion of the world by correspondence.

Mr. SOURWINE. You spoke of coordination and direction. Is it your thought that the direction part of it would be supplied in any sense by the Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission, or would that perhaps be supplied indirectly by creating a corps of individuals who could, in various capacities in government and business and industry, themselves direct?

Mr. McDOWELL. I am speaking essentially of the Freedom Academy itself. It does not seem to me that the Freedom Commission's task or authority should be in terms of the direction of the student body. That should be a function of people who have taught and been taught and who have been bound into the process of the teaching of the Academy itself.

That is why I cited the experiment of that amazing individual at Oxford University. I have heard many and many a Rhodes scholar describe his own surprise that one individual was able to keep in touch with them across the years in that personal fashion.

Senator DODD (now presiding). We are very grateful to you, Mr. McDowell, for coming here. We have valued your testimony.

We must recess now, because the Senate has been called into session. We shall reconvene at 1:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon a recess was taken to reconvene at 1:30 p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The subcommittee resumed, pursuant to order, at 1:35 p.m.

Senator HRUSKA (presiding). The subcommittee will come to order.

We shall continue the hearings on S. 1689.

The first witness for this afternoon will be Dr. Stefan Possony, a professor at Georgetown University.

Will you be seated, professor, and proceed in your own way with your statement?

TESTIMONY OF DR. STEFAN POSSONY, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. POSSONY. My name is Stefan T. Possony. I was born in Vienna, Austria. I hold a Ph. D. degree from the University of Vienna. I was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J.

In 1946, I joined the Graduate School of Georgetown University. In 1952, I was a member of the faculty of the National War College. Since 1955 I have been an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

I have written books and articles on matters concerned with military economics, airpower, military history, international relations, communism.

My books were translated in a number of languages, and I have also had ample opportunity to study political warfare from original documents which so far have not been released, most of them in the files of the German Foreign Office, which were captured during the last war.

Senator HRUSKA. Where are those documents?

Mr. POSSONY. Many of those documents are on microfilm in the National Archives, here in Washington, D.C. The originals are mostly stored in London.

As to my experience: Before coming to this country, I have, of course, tried several times, rather extensively, to study American democracy from abroad, and I think I know something of the difficulties which are encountered in such an attempt.

I have, during the war, had experience in psychological warfare in France, with the Columbia Broadcasting System, and between 1943 and 1946 with the U.S. Navy. I have frequently traveled abroad and have interviewed persons as to their knowledge of the United States and of communism.

I have frequently interrogated visitors coming to this country. I also have had foreign students, and I follow regularly the foreign literature, at least the foreign European literature, which has a bearing on matters which are of concern to this committee.

I shall argue that there is an urgent need for the United States to set up an Academy or Institute of Political Science, or, as the language of S. 1689 calls it, a Freedom Academy. This need arises from the following five reasons, in my opinion:

First, it is necessary to make American democracy better understood;

Second, to improve our own understanding of the multiple threats facing free government all over the world;

Third, to acquire badly needed theoretical and operational capabilities in the struggle against communism;

Fourth, to enhance the mutual understanding of political leadership groups throughout the free world; and

Fifth, and perhaps not of least importance, it is necessary to increase and strengthen the capacity of the free world for reform and mutual help.

I shall argue further that these purposes can be achieved only through a genuine educational effort, not through indoctrination. However, this education must not be restricted to theory, but must have practical significance and realistic applicability.

Senator, my statement will cover six points, of which three are fairly long.

The first point will deal with the Communist system of political education, so far as I could decipher it; second, the state of knowledge on democracy and communism in the United States and the free world; third, the limitations of the present educational setup and the need for a central institution; fourth, the structure of the academy; five, principles under which the academy should operate; and sixth, I will attempt to give a general outline for a suitable curriculum.

Point No. 1 on deals with Communist political education. The Communists have recognized the problem and the need of thorough political education. They have a whole network of schools which teach both political theory and practice. By practice, which is a Communist word in this context, they mean operational and organizational know-how.

The Communist system of political education is just as much a key to the secret of their expansion as scientific-technological education has been and is increasingly becoming a key to the mysteries of their military strength and the incessant growth of their physical power.

In 1902, approximately, Lenin hit on the idea that revolution can only be carried out by professional revolutionaries. This idea was not original with him. It had many predecessors, but Lenin was the man who put this idea into the Marxist school of thought.

Professional revolutionaries, in his mind, were people who not only devote their whole life to the revolutionary cause, but who also, throughout the entire duration of their commitment to the revolutionary movement, must undergo training and education.

At the time of World War I, when communism—bolshevism—still was a small group, sect, or coterie of men, there were small schools run by them. One school was in Bologna, Italy. One was at Longjumeau, Paris, and the other on Capri, the little island outside of Naples. This school was financed by Gorki's income as a writer. The men who lectured at these schools included the leading lights of the revolutionary movement, among them Lenin himself. Some of the cadres trained by Lenin at Longjumeau played a great role during the revolution of 1917.

After the revolution, the Communists immediately set up a number of schools dealing with revolutionary expertise. One of the most famous schools of this sort was the Sun Yat-sen University, sometimes called the Far Eastern University. This was one of the main instruments which allowed the Communists, 27 years later, to take over China.

Furthermore, there was established the Lenin Institute. I shall talk about that a little later in a different context.

In the late twenties there was established what is known as the Institute or Academy of Red Professors. This was essentially designed to teach the teachers and to train the upper crust of generalists. This school has not survived to this day. The course lasted 3 to 4 years.

In addition to this upper echelon of schools, of course, there are lower party schools all over the Communist Party organizations: schools for training organizers, for training people they call agitational and propaganda experts, and specialists in military questions, and penetration of military forces, specialists in labor unions, race specialists, and now, presumably, experts in nuclear disarmament. They even have church specialists, as we know from recent testimony, not to preach the Gospel but to control ecclesiastic organizations and dominate the church by secret atheists.

Many of these schools, I understand, teach, as a matter of course, political warfare and related topics. The standard procedure for all Communist organizations is to have such schools at all levels and places also in the free world. In the United States a number of such schools have been identified.

Now, in the last 20 to 30 years, the Communist educational system has been going in the direction of ever greater diversification. For example, the Frunze Military Academy, for a while, was the highest institution of military learning. It was established in 1918. This school was and still is the equivalent of the Command and Staff School in the United States, something like the Ecole de Guerre in Paris. For about 16 years that was all the Communists wanted.

In 1936 a new institution was created, the Voroshilov Higher Military Academy, which is the equivalent, on a somewhat higher

level, of the National War College. It embraces all three military services, but, unlike the National War College, which is teaching essentially on the level of colonels, a great deal of the teaching at the Voroshilov Academy is at the flag rank level. In addition, it has extension courses, a research institute on doctrine, and also offers refresher courses for earlier graduates.

On the other hand, unlike the National War College, it seems to be strictly devoted to military problems, while the National War College covers strategy in the broad sense. The present status of the two Soviet academies is not exactly known. There seems to be some political in-fighting going on, and according to recent information I have seen, it is possible that the Voroshilov Academy was put down a few notches, but I would consider this to be a temporary mishap, rather than a significant change.

In addition to these two higher academies, there is the Lenin Military Political Academy. It is a specialized academy dealing with combined political-military problems. It has no equivalent in the United States. It is interesting to note that, even though there is extensive testimony on the curriculum of the Lenin Military Political Academy, to this day, some people ignore or deny its existence. This is done not just by people who are not knowledgeable on Soviet affairs, but a first-class expert like Mr. Boris Souvarine, who has written a biography of Stalin, and who is generally recognized as an expert on communism, has recently denied that there is such a thing as a Lenin Academy of Political Warfare. It is, of course, the Lenin Military-Political Academy and Mr. Souvarine should know about it. This academy is recognized as an existing institution, it officially exists. The present boss of the place is a general-colonel—a four-star general—by the name of F. F. Kusnetsov. This academy, from what is known of it, is officially at the university level. Major is the minimum rank of the students and usually the rank is higher. The concept is that the commissar types in the Russian military forces, the men in charge of political indoctrination, political activities, military government control, those men are getting, in this academy, military training while military officers—that is, combat soldiers—are getting political education.

There is also offered—and this is of great importance, at least it has been offered in the past—joint training in the Lenin Academy, with foreign Communists, and again there is sworn testimony to this effect.

In addition to these three military academies, there are six other military academies dealing with more technical aspects, such as artillery, armor, airpower, and navy, which I think don't concern us here.

It should be stressed that the courses in these schools seem to be generally for 2 years and sometimes for 3-year periods.

Now, all these academies place enormous emphasis on doctrine, the Communist term for what may be called the art of operating. These academies are in close contact, and possibly are directed by a special department within the Armed Forces General Staff. Teaching is supervised by the Historical Branch of the General Staff which is an integral part of the staff, not like in the United States, where the historical branch is more or less an unused appendage. In the Soviet

Union, the Historical Branch of the General Staff is an integral element of the planning function within the staff.

In addition to this school system, there is a political administration in the General Staff and in all the services, and this political administration is in close contact with the Armed Forces Department in the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The significance of this will come out in a later part of my statement.

The central committee of the Communist Party, which is—maybe I can define it as the highest body of the Communist Party—of course, this is a matter of dispute, since obviously, the central committee is run by the presidium which, in turn, is run by Khrushchev, but I think you can say the central committee is the highest staff within the Communist Party, the main organ and the recruiting ground of the leadership. The central committee has two foreign departments, one dealing with the Socialist countries, the other dealing with capitalist countries. These two departments are where political intelligence is received, and where political penetration and warfare plans are elaborated.

The central committee furthermore has an agitation and propaganda department, which is divided into the Russian branch and the Union Republic branch. In other words, these are dealing with internal propaganda and the breakdown between the great Russian and nongreat Russian branches indicates the continuance of the national question within the Soviet Union.

There are, furthermore, between 5 and 8 central committee departments whose functions have not been disclosed. To judge by the biographies of some of the department heads, I would guess that quite a number of the secret departments are engaged in one or the other political warfare activity.

The significance of the general staff-central committee tie, I think, can be discerned by a short look back to 1941 and the management of the Partisan movement during World War II. The Partisan movement, that is, the guerrillas, originally was planned for, but when the Germans overran Russia, these plans became worthless. Guerrillas sprang up more or less spontaneously, but soon thereafter there was established in the central staff to command the Partisan movement, not in the armed forces, but an independent central staff performing, in essence, as a command over a fourth military service. This fourth service was directly under the central committee. Within the central committee, there was set up a state committee of defense, which—this is a quote from an unclassified Army pamphlet—had the function “to direct all the defenses of the nation: military, political and civilian.” The commander of this central staff of Partisans, P. K. Ponomarenko, was formerly Prime Minister of White Russia. He later became a member of the presidium. He was both a member of the central committee and a member of the defense committee. In other words, you had a bundling of all these responsibilities in one man, who had access to the highest levels of the government and the party, and authority to act down to the lowest level of operations. The double purpose of the Partisan movement which, as we see, was a military service run by the party, was to aid the Soviet armed forces in combat, but also to establish political control in the territories behind the German lines, to set up Communist

political organizations, to revitalize the Communist Party where it had been destroyed; in brief, to wage political warfare.

In addition to this function and to sabotage, this Partisan movement had to collect intelligence. It is significant that special manuals were issued to the Partisans. We have the titles of two of these manuals. One is called, the Guidebook for the Partisan Intelligence Agent, and the other one, and this is very pertinent to this hearing, is called the Guide for Political Espionage.

I believe this structure of World War II is still more or less the model for the Communist political warfare effort, that is, political warfare in the broad sense of the word, which includes military operations if necessary. In other words, you essentially have a setup where the central committee directs the conflict. Inside the central committee, there is a group which is directing political warfare on a global scale. Thus Communist political warfare is a centrally directed effort, under a single command, which probably has worldwide responsibilities. This command is served, intelligencewise and capabilitywise, by the party, the worldwide party organizations and, of course, the resources of all Communist states.

Senator HRUSKA. At that point, Doctor, you speak repeatedly of one man being in command, and so on. That sort of implies that these people under him are not students, necessarily, they are not in school, they are not being trained; they are already trained, they are doing certain work. Is that what you had in mind? Is that what the fact is?

Mr. POSSONY. Well, the people under this man—this man is in command, as you have a general in command of an army. Of course, the men under him, depending on their rank, are supposed to have had the training necessary to accomplish their functions. The point is that you have a major political warfare effort which is organized and fully integrated. It is not a hit or miss effort, it is not an improvised effort, but a centrally directed effort extending to all fields pertinent to political warfare. Unfortunately, we do not have the exact data as to how political warfare is run at present by the Communists. Consequently, we have to go back to historical data.

Senator HRUSKA. Now, the people under this one commander, are they students, are they trainees, are they accomplished workers, have they the instruments ready to do what they must, and are they applying those instruments?

Mr. POSSONY. Accomplished workers. However, they also are getting on-the-job training. Part of them presumably are products of special schools.

Now, to come back to the central committee, and I think this will answer your question a different way, Senator. Under the central committee, there has been set up a whole system of schools. It is confusing to the outsider to determine exactly which is which school, but an effort can be made.

For instance, there is an Institute for Marxism-Leninism at Moscow. Please, this is not the Lenin Institute. This is under G. D. Obichkin, about whom I know nothing. Then there is another institute for Marxism-Leninism at Leningrad under S. P. Knyazen. Whether there are similar institutes in the Ukraine or in the Union Republics, I do not know. I believe that these institutes probably

deal with the basic ideology, that is, on the one hand are concerned with publishing theoretical works by Marx, Lenin, and other Communists, and on the other hand, presumably deliberately fabricate ideological variants and even systems. Those are the producers of ideology.

It would be a bad mistake for us to assume that the Communist ideology has emerged spontaneously or that it still is the same ideology which was laid down by the classics. Current Communist ideology has been the result of a great deal of planning and staff work and discussions around the table and reflects what the Communist leaders estimate constitutes the best ideology at a particular moment at a given place.

Senator HRUSKA. They are really the rewrite artists?

Mr. POSSONY. That is right. This is a very artistic effort, and nothing is left to chance.

Furthermore, there is a higher party school under the central committee. This has been, for many years, the highest party school of the party school system, as distinguished from the military system. I have not been able to find its curriculum, but, from what I gather, it gives operational training to leading party and Soviet workers, that is, to members of the party and to state bureaucrats, and also to newspaper editors. That much has been disclosed. It has an extension course. One member of the presidium, Madame Furtseva, is a graduate of the extension course of the higher party school.

In 1956—but I am not sure of this date, it could have been earlier—there was created an Academy of Social Sciences under the central committee. The director of that Academy of Social Sciences is a man by the name of I. A. Dorashev. He also doubles as the editor of the Communist magazine, "Kommunist." In other words, the social sciences there are not just for the sake of scientific effort, but they have a very practical purpose.

A part of the curriculum has been disclosed. It reads as follows: Political economy, economics, theory of state, international law, international relations, history of the U.S.S.R., history of the Communist Party—I presume this covers all the Communist Parties. There is a major effort right now, this is the major ideological effort at this point in time, to write party histories. Many directives have been issued on the point of how a proper Communist Party history is to be written.

To continue with the curriculum: dialectic and economic materialism, history of Russian and European philosophy, logic, psychology, the theory and history of literature, and of art. Art, in other words, is not what the artist conceives by inspiration and which is accomplished for its own sake, but it is something which has to be impressed into the service of political warfare.

There are a large number of additional institutes. For example, there is an Institute of World Economics. This institute has the function, so far as I can gather, to analyze economic situations in foreign countries, with the view in mind of how economic difficulties may be exploited for the benefit of the Communist movement.

There is an Institute on International Relations which has a similar function.

Now, the Academy of Sciences, which is a highly important body in the Soviet Union, and, in fact, operates directly under the Council of Ministers, also is engaged in this political warfare. It publishes, for example, a magazine dealing with party history. There are, in the Department of Historical Sciences, for example, an Institute of Orientalistics and an Institute of Sinology. These institutes publish a number of magazines. These magazines are essentially on the nature of what we would call geopolitics or political magazines. In other words, they are not devoted to the study of the Han or Ming Dynasty, or to the study of Cleopatra's nose or other historical problems, but are largely devoted to a study of current affairs and power relations.

Under the Academy of Sciences, there is also a museum for religion and atheism. Of course, I do not have to point out to you that atheism has traditionally served as one of the main instruments of the Communist movement.

The chief of the historical department of the Academy, is a man by the name of E. M. Zhukov. He is also a member of the Presidium of the Soviet Solidarity Committee for the Asian and African countries, which is a political instrumentality. A leader of this political instrumentality happens to be the president of a department of the Academy of Sciences.

There is also the Academy of Pedagogy. Of course, pedagogical sciences deal with education, the development of the mind, and not with propaganda, the disorientation of the mind. To what extent they are involved here, I am not sure, but I would be willing to take a bet that this particular academy delivers many into political warfare capability.

We have heard a great deal about a School for Political Warfare in Prague, Czechoslovakia. This school has been commented on in the newspapers. Unfortunately, I did not clip the information. But it seems that in this school the students—mostly from nonbloc countries—are trained for utilization in Latin America. There could be other target countries, too, but as far as I remember the articles I read, Latin America is the main target area.

By contrast, a frequently commented upon school at Tashkent is a training center for people who would go into the Islamic areas. Of course, Tashkent is in an area where Islam has always had an important impact. Some of the holy places of Islam are in the Russian part of Central Asia. The penetration of Islamic countries today is one of the high priority targets of the Soviet Union.

I would add this other point, that all of these schools are backed up by a very strong publication effort. Every one of these institutes publishes one magazine, if not more, and a whole stream of books is published, dealing with all the conceivable problems that have to be handled in political warfare. The system is training experts in basic doctrine, in dialectic methodology of planning, in party history, in organizational political activities, and in conflict operations. It thrives, on the one hand, on motivation, and on the other hand, on what Mr. Hunter has called brainwashing.

The system enhances the exchange of practical political knowledge. That is, the Russian instructors receive a lot of knowledge from the foreign students, and the foreign students, in addition to learning from the Russians, exchange knowledge among themselves and find

out about local and regional problems all over the world. Thus, this system strengthens the intelligence at the disposal of the Soviet Government, and undoubtedly improves their ability to make estimates as to future events. Furthermore, it creates a worldwide network of operators who know each other and who can depend on each other in an emergency.

These experts, after they have gone through this technical training, receive on-the-job training. I should add that, before they get into these schools, they usually have had a good deal of on-the-job training, and also some training in lower party schools.

The graduates from those schools are staffing, so far as we can tell, most or all of the agencies which the Communists are using for the planning of their strategy and for the management of their conflict operations.

As I pointed out, this system is like an ameba, it multiplies, becomes larger, and continuously changes shape. But the substance remains: history's most elaborate system for creating political warfare capabilities.

In 1958, a network of so-called friendship societies was established; for example, a society, USSR-France, of which the president is Ilya Ehrenburg, the writer. There are, or were at last count, 24 such associations, and they were all founded "spontaneously," within a few months' time during 1958. The overall or roof organization of these 24 associations, is under the chairmanship of Madame N. V. Popova, who used to be the vice president of the International Democratic Federation of Women, and also was a key member of the World Peace Council, both important political warfare instruments of the Soviet Union. The friendship societies indicate that political warfare is conducted not only functionally, as heretofore, for example, through women, veterans, scientists, youth, or peace and labor slogans, but also nation by nation. I do not know whether there is a USSR-United States Friendship Society.

Furthermore, the following organizations seem to be noteworthy. There is a Soviet Peace Committee. There is a Society for the Propagation of Political and Scientific Knowledge. This would sound like a very good idea, to have such a propagation society, until you find out that it is run by a man named M. B. Mitin, who is a graduate of the Academy of Red Professors, who formerly was editor-in-chief, of the Cominform journal "For Lasting Peace, For A People's Domestic Democracy," and who also happens to be the editor of "Questions of Philosophy." I am sure his is the type of philosophy which is not very customary among philosophers in this country.

There is, furthermore, a Slavic committee run by a lieutenant general by the name of A. S. Gundorov. This is the agency which centralizes the Pan-Slav propaganda efforts. It has always been denied that there is a Pan-Slav movement, but we find that there is an agency in Moscow which controls this nonavowed movement.

Furthermore, there is the aforementioned Soviet Solidarity Committee for the countries of Asia and Africa. This outfit is unique, inasmuch as it has an outlet in Cairo—at least, that is what the information says—and it has commissions for cultural and economic collaboration, a commission for information, or propaganda, and a special commission for Africa, which, again, is indicative of the priority assigned to this target for penetration.

I am sure, Senator, that further research would unearth additional political warfare capabilities in the Soviet Union, particularly in the Union Republics, and, of course, in China and the satellites. Mirabeau once said of Prussia that war was its only industry. I think that political conflict and political warfare is the most important industry of communism, although it is not the only one.

The free world's problem is to undo or neutralize the work done by the graduates of this Communist school system. As I mentioned before, this system does include many schools within the free world itself, some party operated, some under some cover, in what you might call fellow-traveling outfits. The objective of undoing the work done by the graduates of the Communist school system cannot be reached by defense methods; that is, merely by counteraction against the Communist threat. Counteraction is important, but a positive approach also is needed in order to enable ourselves and our friends to improve security and living conditions in the world.

Our poorly trained people are no match for the thoroughly trained agents of the Communist world movement, nor are they in a position to handle the challenge of democratic construction—the positive approach—on a worldwide basis. Tasks of that magnitude cannot be accomplished by improvisation.

I would like to make a brief comment about political schools in general. I have made a cursory survey of this, and I remember that in Vienna, Austria, there used to be, for many years, a so-called Konsularakademie, which was used to train diplomatic and consular personnel of many countries. It was not quite as restricted to actual consular duties as the title would indicate. It certainly imparted a great deal of political and practical knowledge, especially about central European and Balkan problems.

In Berlin, there was created in the interwar period a Hochschule fuer Politik, which I do not think was too successful, but it was another attempt on the educational side of political science.

In France, there was created in 1871—very significantly, immediately after the Germans won their war with France—the Institut d'Etudes Politiques, or Institute of Political Studies. This institute is still alive. It had, in 1938, 1,800 students, including 350 foreign students. In 1945, it was reorganized, and now consists of an institute of political studies, a national foundation of political sciences, and a national school of administration. It covers all of the political and social sciences.

In addition, after the war, the French Army, very much impressed by the defeat they suffered during World War II, went in strongly for political and psychological warfare. The French have made very thorough studies, particularly in Indo-China, of the methods used by the leader of the Chinese Communists, Mao Tse-tung.

One of the instigators of this effort is a Col. Gabriel Bonnet, who wrote an excellent book on revolutionary warfare. I shall mention some points he made about the war in Algeria. He said, like Clausewitz, that the impact on the souls of men is the principal objective in war and that all officers, who, after the war, were educated in military schools such as the General Staff school and the Ecole de Guerre, have become much more sophisticated and much more knowledgeable in human and sociological questions.

The French Army has set up a fifth bureau, in addition to the normal four bureaus they always had. This bureau is in charge of psychological warfare, or what they call psychological action. In addition, they handle press and more mundane matters like releases and communiques. The troops—this is very important—this fifth bureau is not just a staff agency, but controls actual forces. These troops are organized in what they call light companies, and these light companies are given a great deal of special equipment.

Now, in addition to that, they also have set up 630 so-called specialized administrative sections, abbreviated, SAS. Their function is to accomplish positive, constructive tasks. These are the problems: Defensive action, psychopolitical warfare and creative action. Some of the missions which these SAS units have are to build and run schools, to restore electricity, look after sanitation, carry out rescue and relief operations—in other words, to be of actual help to the civilian population, whether friendly or hostile. Thus the awareness of psychological warfare is becoming generalized throughout the world. If France, as a democracy, can handle it, I am sure that other democracies can, too.

Senator HRUSKA. You have mentioned France. Are there any other countries which you might want to mention?

Mr. POSSONY. Not off hand. I happened to have this information.

Senatro HRUSKA. Do you feel there have been similar developments in other countries besides France, in Europe, along the same line?

Mr. POSSONY. I do not know. I do not know what the status is presently in the Italian Forces. I am afraid that the British, in some instances, are falling down on this job. You may remember the memoirs by Glubb Pasha, the man who used to be the leading Britisher in Jordan. He said that the British are losing in the Middle East because they have had no counter to the activities of Radio Cairo and similar outlets.

This covers my first point. It was a long point.

Point No. 2, a great deal of knowledge about democracy and communism is available. Some of it is taught, more or less indirectly, in connection with other courses in the political and social sciences, international relations, governments and parties and things like that. A great deal of it is accessible in literature, providing you have the money to pay for hard-to-get books and provided you have the patience to dig through very large library holdings, which are very poorly cataloged and indexed.

There are many shortcomings in the teachings of these subjects, particularly communism. There are gaps in completeness. Many subsidiary problems are not covered at all, or are poorly covered. I think you will find it impossible to discover a discussion on conspiracy in modern political science textbooks. There are many books on propaganda and psychological warfare, most of them discussing the maps and only few even evincing awareness of communism. I do not think you will find anything, or not very much, at any rate, on matters such as political warfare. This is an undeveloped subject if I ever saw one.

Solutions which are applicable in the United States and Western Europe are not applicable in other countries. There is a great deal of misleading information all over the world, both on the Soviet bloc and

on the United States. There are no textbooks on communism; Dr. Niemeyer, who testified this morning, is one of the few men who ought to be congratulated on his effort, together with Father Bochenski in Fribourg, Switzerland. These men, against incredible odds, put out an encyclopedia on communism. This unique book is about this large [illustrating]. It has come out in German, and I hope it will come out in English. This text is available, but there is a great deal of trouble keeping it up to date. You get it into print months after the manuscripts were completed and, but by the time you get it translated and get it into print the second time, there has been a great deal of change.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Possony, when you say a book "this large" will you say it in such a way that we can get it in the record? I assume you mean that it is very voluminous.

Mr. POSSONY. Yes, it is very voluminous; it is a very large and fat volume.

Many curriculums in the universities presently do not handle communism. There are no systematic and complete courses on the overall problem. It is extremely difficult for writers on communism to get their books published, not because their manuscripts are bad or not useful. There usually is not too much argument about this point, but the crux of the matter is that the publisher must sell 3,000 or 4,000 copies before he breaks even. He customarily sells perhaps 1,500 to 2,000 of a scholarly book on communism, so he has to pay the rest out of his pocket. He can afford this once or twice, but he is not going to print the third book. It is difficult to obtain financial support to get books of this sort published. I had an experience with a student of mine, who wrote a dissertation on the penetration of communism into military forces. This technique is called revolutionary defeatism or revolutionary antimilitarism and it has been an integral part of Communist operations and warfare dating back to 1904. There is no English book on the subject, the security importance of which is self-evident. The book cannot be published, because no publisher has as yet been found who has the money to pay for it.

Senator HRUSKA. How big a work is it?

Mr. POSSONY. Four hundred typewritten pages, covering events up to 1941 only.

Senator HRUSKA. And he is working on later material?

Mr. POSSONY. He is working on later material, and, Senator, you may remember that, in 1945, this particular Communist effort hit the United States very badly in the Philippines and Germany and other places. It was one of the reasons for the rapid and premature demobilization of the U.S. military forces.⁴

Point three, individual universities cannot handle the job. They can do a great deal, of course, and some are doing a fair amount. There is lack of funds and personnel. Special chairs would have to be set up for this, and they simply do not have the money for specialized subjects of this type, or at least this a frequent argument, which

⁴ After hearings in 1954, the Internal Security Subcommittee reported that: "A group of Communists or pro-Communists infiltrated into controlling positions in the Information and Education program (of the U.S. Armed Forces) and brought it about that 8 million American soldiers were taught the wrong things about communism, the wrong things about the U.S.S.R., the wrong things about Communist China, and the wrong things about Americans who oppose communism."

often is actually valid. In addition there is the problem of documentation, of which I have spoken and which cannot be solved except through heavy expense.

Nor could an individual university, however large, handle the job on a sufficiently broad and sustained basis. There also in the objective problem: If you go to one university, you have two or three professors who may be suitable. Actually, this is an optimistic assumption. These men have their own opinions, specialties and hobby horses and cannot be expected to provide the wide, broad, all-directional approach that would be necessary in order to cover all pertinent problems. Subjects like communism, democracy and political warfare are universal encyclopedic subjects. Communism has penetrated all spheres of life, covers almost a half century of history, since the Communists seized state control, and over 110 years of Communist history since the Communist manifesto was written, not counting the earlier phases.

The piecemeal approach that presently takes place, in which each international relations course, or each course on foreign governments, handles some part of this problem requires a great deal of duplication in basic information. The basic introductory information is repeated time and time again but the payoff phase of the instruction, the specifics, the details, the ramifications and implications, the final arguments and the final deductions never are reached. Hence I think a central instrumentality would be the only effective solution, provided, of course, it were based on sound principles, and provided it will be adequately funded.

I think I should make one point on this funding. I have had a great deal of experience with the cost of research programs. For example, I ran a research operation for Life magazine, in connection with Mr. Alan Moorehead's articles and book on the Russian Revolution. It is amazing how much money you can spend if you need documentation which is not readily available on the shelves. You have to pay for reproduction, you need reproduction facilities, for which you also need personnel and you have to maintain a staff to correspond with the various libraries in many countries. There is a problem of the "erosion" of library holdings. Many of the important books are being stolen out of the libraries, and many times, key books are available only in single copies in the United States. If you have to find it, this may be very difficult and costly. If you are in a hurry, only the telephone and telegraph will help you.

So, funding, if you really want to establish a real research and up-to-date inspirational institution, is going to be a crucial factor, and that on a continuing basis. You need money to set up proper libraries and proper original documentation, you must keep your collection up to date and I should think that a Freedom Academy, sponsored by the United States, should end up with the most significant specialized library. I may say that there already is such a library; the Hoover Library on Revolution, World Peace, at Stanford, Calif.

Point No. 4: I now want to talk about what I conceive to be the more or less ideal form of the Academy. I think we have in this country a pattern or model for this type of school. Those are the war colleges—the Army War College, the Navy and Air Force War Colleges, the Industrial College, and the National War College. These

institutions should not be imitated in every detail but their general pattern is admirable and should be adopted for the Freedom Academy.

You need a resident faculty, with both permanent and rotating members. In addition to the resident faculty, you need outside lecturers. You should get the best lecturers available in the country. The war colleges generally have succeeded in getting the best experts to lecture on their platform on their specific area of knowledge. Certainly it is possible to get lecturers from among the upper 5 or 10 specialists in the country. Private universities do not have such a selection of lecturers.

I think the courses should be divided into graduate and undergraduate courses.

The course work should consist of lectures, which should be followed by discussions and seminars. For example, in the War College, you have a lecture in the morning, which takes about an hour. Then the whole class and the lecturer have a discussion which takes about 45 minutes. Finally, the class breaks up into seminars, where the problem is discussed in detail by the students, with a faculty adviser present.

Furthermore, there should be visits. I would say, for example, some visits would be useful, particularly when you have foreign students, to American corporations, to American labor unions, to Congress, to legislatures, overseas, and so on. There are many places you can profitably visit, and, of course, war colleges do take trips at the end of their school year.

You have to provide the students with a great deal of research data—books, chapters of books, articles and research papers, and documentary films. One difficulty is that there is a great mass of material which must be condensed to make it manageable. This is just one of the jobs that requires a good and strong staff.

I think the courses should be divided into graduate and undergraduate courses.

You must see to it that the students do a lot of work in the library, and perform actual, genuine research. Workshops would be used to work out joint solutions, and act as simulated staffs, or even governments to practice in problem solving. If you have foreign students from different countries, working together, Asians and Africans joining Europeans and Americans, in such workshops this could lead to excellent intellectual contacts and mutual understanding. This would be a more effective method to reach this goal of our foreign policy, about which we do a lot of preaching.

Of course, each student should write an original thesis.

You need a research department to work up all kinds of basic data, including new information, new documentation, new analyses, presentations of the historical background, and also preliminary analyses of newly emergent problems.

You need a translation department, for two reasons. If you have foreign students, for sure you need it. I think one of our great difficulties at present is that many troubles arise in areas where we do not have linguistic ability. We can handle very readily European languages, Russian to a lesser extent, some Chinese, but where the African and Asiatic languages are concerned, we are in bad shape.

In addition to helping students who have language difficulties, all

the students need translations from all the significant areas in the world.

A production department would be needed where textbooks, handbooks, or treatises can be written.

And lastly—perhaps this requires a bit of imagination—you may want a setup which could take outside contracts, for example, from a foreign government or a department or corporation in a foreign country which wants a program worked out for some reform. Maybe this department of the Freedom Academy could be of some help in the application of the principles it teaches.

Senator HRUSKA. You mean if Dr. Castro wanted to get some ideas on land reform, he could get it there?

Mr. POSSONY. We might be able to help him to accomplish something of value. Maybe we could tell him how he really could do it if he has the interests of the Cuban people at heart, rather than carry out a doctrinaire program.

Who should participate? I think, in the United States, you want to address yourself to two main groups outside the undergraduates. First of all, you should have students from the Government and the military services; in other words, people who, in their professions, whether they want it or not, are concerned with political warfare. And you should have professors who are teaching these subjects or related subjects throughout the educational system of the United States, so that you have some kind of a snowball effect. In addition, obviously people from public life, newspapermen, authors, political persons and traders, and members of industrial corporations—this is very difficult to organize because these people must have time to attend these schools possibly some kind of a compromise could be worked out—for example, short courses for this purpose, or public lectures, or extension and correspondence courses. These are details I do not think I should go into except to indicate that solutions should not be inflexible.

Furthermore, you should have students from the free world, including the neutral countries. Additionally you should have a goodly number of political refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Point No. 5; the principles of the Academy.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Possony, before you get to point No. 5, the principles, in regard to these students, you said some of the undergraduates would be in universities or colleges?

Mr. POSSONY. No, this would be a university in its own right.

Senator HRUSKA. In its own right?

Mr. POSSONY. Right. This would be a political science school, perhaps the one political science school in the United States where all—literally all—of the political and social sciences are brought together. Students would go to that school for reasons of genuine personal interest. The Freedom Academy should be of the highest attainable academic standing.

Senator HRUSKA. As far as undergraduates are concerned, how much preschool education or training would they conceivably have?

Mr. POSSONY. Well, a B.A., no, before the B.A. I would say this is a complicated problem, because foreign students have one level of education and American students have another level at a given age. You might have to compromise on this. But I have in mind an undergraduate department in the sense of an American college.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, you see, we run there into a matter of duplication of facilities and so on. There are certain things which can be furnished in other universities, if they are nearby, or colleges. Maybe, after all, funds or the availability thereof may be a factor in this thing.

Mr. POSSONY. That is right.

Senator HRUSKA. I do not know that we are just going to dip into the Treasury indiscriminately and say, boys, help yourself. So, when you talk in terms of university, I have an idea that you are going to be restricted pretty much to the idea that there should not be a duplication of existing facilities.

Mr. POSSONY. This is probably true.

Senator HRUSKA. So I say, would it be that this school that you speak of, where would it be located? Would it be located in the proximity of other colleges or universities where some of these courses, some of this training might be gotten in other institutions? Not in the specialized area, but in the general area of education?

Mr. POSSONY. This is true, Senator. However, this splitting up into various universities, in order to take courses at several institutions, might not be too ideal or practical, I would say, even when facilities are very close by, because after all you have traffic and scheduling problems, and you might get the very duplication you want to avoid. But, perhaps the undergraduates should be on the B.A. to M.A. level, and the graduates on the M.A. to Ph. D. level.

Senator HRUSKA. That would answer my question, because then they would come in with certain academic equipment on which they can build.

Mr. POSSONY. That is right. This may be preferable than to study more or less advanced political sciences immediately after the high school level. I think a little more mature background would be better.

Senator HRUSKA. What threw me off was the use of the word "undergraduates." Usually, we consider those who have just completed their secondary education as undergraduates.

Mr. POSSONY. That is right.

Now, the principles of the Academy, in my opinion, should be as follows:

There should be no uniformity and no dogmatism in teaching. You should not put down a party line. This would defeat the purpose. You should make sure that the various points of view are covered, really covered, not just simply a theoretical commitment which, in fact, means that one line is being presented, while the other lines are being cut out.

The teaching should be factual, objective, and complete as to documentation. If the proper facts are brought out—if a major effort is made that all of the facts are brought out—this teaching should be very effective and we should make precisely the impact we are trying to make.

There should be ample discussion, completely free. Each student should be in a position to make his views known, but, of course, the discussion must be run in an orderly fashion, and if it were used to make some kind of soapbox oratory, that will have to be cut out, as it would be in any university.

There should be complete adherence to the scientific method in fact-finding and analysis. I should say there should be a full exposition of the political philosophies involved, those of communism, those of democracy, and of other political creeds as may be relevant.

There should be a complete exposition, analysis, and discussion of ethical problems, political ethics, and also an analysis of motivation. In other words, we should not simply take motivation for granted. Obviously, we would like to have students, and should be able to get students who have a certain strength of motivation, but we should not rely on this motivation as a sort of spontaneous commitment. The man should know why he is motivated, and his motivation should be discussed with him. If it is discussed with him thoroughly in a good factually scientific and moral manner, I think his motivation will be strengthened.

We should not assume that democracy is a static solution to various political problems, a solution which was found in the 18th century and which needs no improvement. Democracy is a continuing challenge. This is a point of particular relevance to oversea students, who obviously are not helped by understanding that things work pretty well in this country, especially when they know also that things do not work so well over there. Their question is: How are they going to contribute to make their own system function better? I think we should address ourselves to this problem in a much more meaningful way than we have done so far.

The Academy should aim at finding creative solutions which can be adopted through evolution and reform. We should make sure that they understand the commitment to revolution is a bad way of improving the political system.

We should insist on completeness of coverage. We should also adopt the principle of mutual instruction, which is being used effectively in our war colleges.

The student is a man who happens to be a student; that is, he is not necessarily a man of inferior knowledge. Similarly, the instructor is a man who happens to be on the faculty. But he is not necessarily a man with knowledge superior to that of the students. Obviously all students and instructors in a national war college have a great deal of practical experience and knowledge. Everybody there is some sort of expert in one or another field. As they sit down around the table and discuss large problems, they are instructing each other. This, I think, is a perfectly good method. Obviously, some man has to go up and give a speech; he is, in essence, a keynoter. He sets the pace, defines the problem and initiates the discussion, but he does not impose solutions. If he preaches panaceas, he is bound to be shot down. Through this method of mutual instruction, you render the students sensitive to the one-sided view of "experts" and you teach them to handle both the details and the generalities of broad problems.

This also bears on the relations between American students and foreign students. The Americans learn from the foreigners, even as they are teaching them, and of course, what you really get is a mutual exchange of information on an international basis.

I think another point, perhaps minor, must be mentioned. The foreign student should be well qualified in English.

I think that two-thirds of the course should be mandatory. The electives should be tied to the subject the student chooses for his dissertation.

I believe there should be academic degrees, because in my concept, the Academy would be providing a bona fide educational effort. If a man gets a degree in the end, he will be happy, and if not, he would feel unjustly penalized. I sometimes get a little irritated when I find out that the National War College does not enjoy the academic recognition it deserves. Any small college seems to be rated by the academic community higher than the National War College. This is simply unfair and academically utterly unjustified. If a man is a good student in the National War College, he can hold his own in any college in the country. And all universities should be happy to give him credit for his term in the National War College.

My last point concerns the curriculum. I believe the Academy should offer a 2-year course. I realize this is long. On the other hand, we are dealing with a very broad subject, and even if we made the greatest effort at streamlining data and teaching—and certainly this should be done—still a lot of subjects would have to be covered.

During the first year, I would teach general background subjects, such as scientific method and problem solving, ethics and morality, concepts of political philosophy, history of democracy, history of communism, including their ideological and organizational histories; also, the current status of world democracy, the status of world communism, and the status of emergent nations; other ideologies as may be necessary; sociology; national psychology; key topical problems, such as international trade, investment, agriculture, economic and industrial problems in general, oil, specific questions such as oil, water problems, problems of space, nucleonics, problems of military security and internal security, and so on.

In addition to that—this is still background—methods: How do you legislate, what are the methods of legislation, how do you obtain international cooperation? How do you use the instrumentalities of the United Nations? What is international law giving or denying? How do you organize politically, what is political organization, how can it be set up, how should it be run? What are conflict operations, what are peaceful operations, what are the broad strategies of political warfare, economic warfare, technological warfare and of limited and total war? What is meant by these terms. What is being done, what is the history of the problem, what is the threat to you, to the other country, to the world, to democracy, to the Communist? What are the techniques of revolution, how do revolutions come about; do they emerge spontaneously, or are they organized? How do you run propaganda and how do you recognize propaganda? I would give considerable attention to propaganda analysis. How do you vaccinate, so to speak, your people against mendacious propaganda, designed to hurt you? How do you carry out a program of evolution and reform?

The second year would be devoted to special problems. I would think you should have, within this second year, two or three team studies on individual but broadly conceived problems. Here is country X, what are its problems, for example, in agriculture or defense? Here is a team. They should work out specific or overall plans for this

country. Here is a problem such as water shortages in the world, or copper shortages. Does it have a bearing on the political struggle? What are practical solutions?

Furthermore, I would present analyses of the various regions of the world. This idea is again taken from War College experience. When I was there, we started out with an analysis of the United States, went into the British Empire, then into Western Europe, Soviet Union, satellites, Far East, Africa, Latin America. In brief we made an intellectual tour of global problems.

All this should lead, in the end, to student presentations of individual theses and dissertations, both on the platform and in writing.

Now, there may be a third year, for postgraduate instruction of first-rate students. The student could become a team leader for the teams which handle the individual problems, or he could write a full length doctor's dissertation. He needs a little time for that. He also could become a member of one of the research departments I discussed. Or he could become a member of the faculty on a rotation basis, or he could go into writing, perhaps with other members of the group, and see to it that the things he learned in the school will be committed to print, to be available to whoever could make use of his data and his thinking.

This concludes my six points, Senator. The conclusions generally, are that, in my opinion, an all-around Academy for the sociopolitical sciences, a Freedom Academy, is needed, that such an Academy is practical, that it can be operated effectively, and that it must be operated by means of the scientific method and within the spirit of a free society. This must be an educational undertaking; that is, it must be designed to broaden and sharpen the mind, and the power of judgment, not just to impart information, let alone an indoctrination with any particular party line, be it one to our own liking.

On the other hand, this education should be practical, and should allow a man to be proficient in a pertinent and practical job. The Academy should not limit itself to just theoretical knowledge. This would not do the trick at all, since constructive action must be the goal of the entire undertaking. The result of such an effort, in my opinion, would be a great strengthening, not only of the chances of survival of our free society, but an improvement of the chances of a better free society, worldwide.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Possony.

Mr. Sourwine, do you have any questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. I have just one question. This has been so well organized that most of the questions have been recognized in advance and answered without having been voiced.

I was much impressed by what Dr. Possony had to say about the cost, and I wonder if we could put him on the spot and ask him for his own judgment, which necessarily does not bind anyone, about what the minimum cost of establishing—put it this way—of setting up and operating the Freedom Academy for the first 3 years might be? Not the most that could be spent, not what you would like to spend, but what you would consider the minimum, a sum of which you might wish to say, "If you are not willing to go this far, do not go."

Mr. POSSONY. That is a difficult question. I would approach it this way. Disregarding the pay for the students and construction cost for the building, I think you would need about 20 men on the faculty, at a minimum, if you have 200 and not more than 300 students. I would say you should have a research department of equal strength, if not larger, and, of course, the library would require 10 or 15 people. Let me refer to my structure here and see that I do not forget a major problem here.

A translation department. This probably could be farmed out in some way, because I do not think you necessarily need a man who reads Burmese when you have two Burmese translations a year. Nevertheless, you have to budget for this type of thing. You should have a budget for the acquisition of books.

Now, we have, at this point, I am sure, at least 70 people. At \$10,000 each, that is \$700,000 in salaries alone. For 30 secretaries you would need about \$150,000; reproduction and library, \$100,000, plus 20 percent overhead—a total of about \$1 million at a rough estimate or \$1,500,000 for 500 students as yearly expense for the staff. In addition, the cost of plant and equipment, which is nonrecurring. If you want to do a good job, these are cautious estimates.

In addition, the lecturers would cost between \$50,000 and \$100,000.

As to textbook production, suppose you want to produce two or three books per year. This costs you for the printing alone something like \$6,000 or \$7,000 per book. That is \$20,000, \$30,000. You must have the books written which is another 2-year project and would cost about \$20,000 to \$25,000 or about \$100,000 for a minimal obligation program.

So I think, in order to operate this thing right, discounting travel expenses and students' salaries and voyages and the like, the annual costs of a 500-student school should run to \$2 million or a little more. Closer inspection may show this to be an underestimation. On the other hand, if research were contracted out, some of this expense may be recovered.

Mr. SOURWINE. To which would have to be added, as you pointed out, the cost of setting up your original library of what is determined to be needed research material.

Mr. POSSONY. I myself, at this moment, as an individual, spend about \$800 a year on books. The reason for that is that these books on communism are usually second-hand, and the secondhand book sellers charge an outlandish price for them. Of course, I do not cover everything—I just cover books of interest to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Besides which, it is your understanding, is it not, that this would not be a tuition-free institution, but there would be some subsidization of those who came to study?

Mr. POSSONY. The officers, of course, of the National War College, for example, are on military pay. They are of colonel's rank and usually with between 15 and 20 years' service, so that is a high cost right there.

Now, if you have a large school, you will want an auditorium and ample space. But perhaps 500 students should be the maximum.

Senator HRUSKA. On the basis of the 20 faculty you mentioned, how many students would that take care of?

Mr. POSSONY. 200, at the most 300, but this may be very optimistic.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you want 500, multiply the cost by two?

Mr. POSSONY. You have to organize the faculty from two points of view, management of students and of expert knowledge. One man might be an outstanding expert on some special facet though he may not be able to handle any students. Nevertheless, you may need him. This is a borderline case. I do not necessarily advocate you should do that but you should have creative men on the faculty in addition to teachers and discussion leaders.

Let us say 10 to 15 students for a faculty advisor is not too bad a ratio, if all students are Americans. If you have a lot of foreign students, who have many questions and who cannot quite find their way through, and if you do not want to lose the foreign students, you had better have a very comfortable ratio between professors and students. Incidentally, the students' salaries or stipends would run to \$4 million or \$5 million, discounting expenses.

In brief, the total cost, minus nonrecurring expenditures for plant, will be in the neighborhood of \$8 million. This is off the top of my head—I have not studied college budgets.

Senator HRUSKA. Doctor, what becomes of these people? You have taken us through 2 years of academic work, a year of postgraduate work. What becomes of them when they get through 3 years of schooling?

Mr. POSSONY. The American student would go back to his service or his department, or to his school, or whatever his affiliation is. I would say that you probably will do best to recruit foreign students from foreign institutions. In other words, I do not think you should pick them off the streets. You should not take a teacher, for instance, who has no pupils, hence he has nothing better to do than to come to school. You don't want doctors without patients, lawyers without clients, and you don't want students of ping pong or bowling to paraphrase Karl Marx.

I think you should make an effort to take people out of local administrations, out of local military services, out of local universities, people who have a very good chance of making a significant public career—it is not a problem of free education. Those men can go back and can be expected to have an impact. It is conceivable, of course, that people go back and do not find their country quite as attractive as it had looked before. This may be an added motivation to them to improve their system. But that is the chance you take, namely, that they become disgruntled. If the Freedom Academy were to live up to my hopes, I would consider this risk small.

Senator HRUSKA. Are there any further questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Mandel, do you have any?

Mr. MANDEL. No.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much, Doctor. You have certainly made a big contribution to our hearings.

Our next witness is Mr. Edward Hunter.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD HUNTER, PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.

Senator HRUSKA. You may proceed, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER. My name is Edward Hunter, and I live at 64 Webster Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y.

I have been witnessing, reporting, analyzing, and participating in psychological warfare for practically all of my adult life, the first years as a passive observer, as a reporter, foreign correspondent, and analyst, and latterly, as a participant, during World War II and for a short while afterwards.

Many of my years have been spent abroad. That background enabled me to disclose brainwashing, the techniques used in pressures against the mind, for war against the mind, and also the Pavlovian aspect to it. I did two books on this subject, and have continued in that specialty all along. I am concentrating now in analysis, writing, and consultations on matters connected with psychological warfare.

Senator HRUSKA. You mentioned two books, Mr. Hunter. Would you mind giving us the titles and the year of publication?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, the first book, "Brainwashing in Red China," was published in December of 1951.

Senator HRUSKA. By whom?

Mr. HUNTER. By the Vanguard Press. That book was about the destruction of the mind.

The next book, which I had not anticipated writing, was entitled "Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defy It," published by Farrar, Straus. This was on methods by which a mind can be preserved, a much more important matter. Both books were based, not on penthouse thinking, but on first-hand observations and first-hand experience alone.

I did a number of other books along the periphery of this subject.

The mere fact that there are hearings being held on such a bill as the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy measure is itself very revealing and significant. One would certainly assume that in mid-1959, after the rape of Hungary and Tibet, on top of the long past, our Government, through its various agencies, the public, and private enterprise through its organizations, industrial, trade, and labor, would certainly be tackling this biggest menace of all time. The necessity for a bill of this nature can only mean—and we have to face this fact—that there is a deficiency, a critical and dangerous lag, on both sides, official and unofficial, the feeling that they are not doing the job.

My personal belief, based on well over a quarter of a century of observation and experience, is that this distrust is well founded. The place for such apprehensions to be expressed is certainly in the Halls of Congress. After all, Congress is a repository of power and policy. It declares war, it determines budgets. This is the business of Congress, the responsibility of Congress. And it is the public's business too, when such a feeling exists, to prod Congress into seeing that the Government takes action. The public and the Government, each by itself, cannot accept responsibility alone. Each has to coordinate with the other. Otherwise there will be catastrophe. The plain fact is that, as a defensive and offensive tactic, the Reds have infiltrated all spheres of our society—political, economic, legal, medical, certainly religious, taking advantage of the unlimited trust of others traditionally characteristic of the American way of life.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Hunter, in that list, you did not list education. Was that by design?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, education, most certainly.

Senator HRUSKA. Was that by design that you omitted it?

Mr. HUNTER. Oh, no; it was merely that I am reading from my own sketchy, handwritten notes.

This trust, this wonderful trust of the American people, this way of life, was regarded by Red psychological warfare as simply a vulnerability, a weakness to be exploited. As I have personally observed during the past couple of decades, they have been exploiting it to the fullest, callously bringing us to the plight in which we are today.

Nothing is so vitally needed as recognition of the fact that communism, in the full sense of the phrase, is "psychological warfare." We shall go down to defeat, to liquidation, as the Reds term it, if we do not face up to the fact that we are in this fight, that we are fighting communism. This would take our psychological warfare away from the theoretical, and put it on the offensive, in recognition of the existence of this form of combat.

The importance of our failure to recognize this is one of our basic vulnerabilities of which the Reds take full advantage. The fact that, by a bill of this sort, by action of this kind, we shall be entering, frontally, anti-Communist activities and teaching, would give tremendous hope once again to people all around the world, would itself be a most important factor in psychological warfare, helping to restore the fast-dwindling hope and faith in us among people all around the world. The whole essence of the Communist psychological war today, in which they are succeeding, is to convince the rest of the world that it can have no hope, no faith in us, that people have no alternative but to be extinguished or to join the Communist side.

This bill brands communism as the enemy. It is also intended, by this bill, to set up a watchdog system to see that its purposes are fulfilled. It seeks to put an end at long last to the negative policy we have been following, negative by being simply inactive, by ignoring the existence of communism as the frontal enemy.

A bill of this sort is also a matter of financing, of money. There is, in the United States, strangely enough, very little money available for aid to anticommunism. That is why a situation such as this exists, where the Government is, at this late date, having to consider setting up a psychological warfare academy.

Private enterprise has been checkmated, bluffed into not supporting anti-Communist activities, because of smear campaigns. At the same time, fantastic fortunes are available for anti-anticommunism and even for pro-Communist activity.

Here I might point out where Congress could certainly take action, a big reason why we have not had more money given by the public for anticommunism, why there has been comparatively none. It is the question of tax exemption. I myself have learned something of it in the past few months. I have done some research on it. In effect, without anyone realizing it, the Government is actually, through the way tax exemption is being regulated, squeezing out anti-Communist activity in favor of anti-anti-Communists. For tax exemption purposes, we do not recognize officially that teaching about the menace of communism is educational, and, therefore, it is not allowed to be the basis for tax exemption.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, educational projects are considered, are they not?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, but they have to teach both sides of the question, otherwise they lose tax exemption.

Senator HRUSKA. How do you get over to the other side, the anti-communism?

Mr. HUNTER. We have to face certain basic facts. I think this Freedom Academy measure is a first step toward that, not merely the first step, but recognition that communism is a menace, and that it can be spelled out, and that education has a proper role in this. Tax exemption should include anticommunism. As of today, practically all efforts by people who have money with which to fight communism have been abandoned. Even big fortunes are involved. They have tried to set up publications that would tell both sides, so as to meet tax requirements, but that defeats their purpose, because at this time, under the coexistence line of the Communist world network, it exactly fits into the Red psychological warfare program. The line is "let's see both sides" permanently and artificially, never coming to a conclusion ourselves.

The bill would be incomplete if this tax exemption gimmick were not remedied simultaneously, to permit such money to be contributed specifically for anticommunism. Still as of today, when a man provides money under tax exemption for anti-anticommunism, each of his dollars goes three or four times as far as a similar expenditure by someone else who wants to fight communism. This is because the man wants to fight communism is deprived of tax exemption. The importance to the bill we are discussing is basic. If anticommunism were included in tax exemption, there is no doubt at all in my mind but what part of the financing, I believe a very large part, would be gladly provided by private sources.

Senator HRUSKA. Even if the bulk of the Academy or school were taken care of by Government appropriation, do you think there would be that incentive to do it?

Mr. HUNTER. Frankly I do not believe, in our present climate, as it will exist for quite a while, enough of a budget would be voted by Congress and become law to meet the real need. We would again be doing too little, too late.

If we open the door to private enterprise, to people who are willing to spend money this way, I believe the solution will be easily met. Only yesterday and today, when I picked up the newspapers, I saw stories pointing out what a tremendous amount of money is available. On the first page of the Baltimore Sun yesterday was an article entitled, "Program Provides Millions for Training United States Leaders." When I saw the headline I said to myself, "Ah, here is a story that has to do with this new Freedom Academy." Oh no! Despite the tremendous importance of this project, I have not seen any reference to it in the newspapers. This article was about a program for adult education that it said "might work out as high as \$15 to \$20 million a year," one of the incidental contributions of the Ford Foundation. But nothing for a Freedom Academy that would fight communism.

There was an editorial in the New York Times today entitled "Studying Freedom," and I thought this surely had to do with what

is taking place here today. But no, it was about tremendous foundation funds being provided for just a continuous study of so-called basic issues. Well, certainly, the Communist war on us is the most basic issue of all.

The decisive flaw in our Communist approach, in the past and today, in and out of Government circles, has been lack of coordination and lack of followthrough. It has not been a matter of lack of people, of dedicated knowledgeable anti-Communists. They are not lacking and also, the Reds carry the ball for each other and have a whole strategy for coordination and followthrough, and we have nothing of the sort, or do the opposite.

As of now, the unhappy fact is that anti-Communists are being squeezed out all along the line here in America while they are being squeezed out, we are shaking our heads and saying, look, there are no anti-Communists available who are able and experienced for this job. There are plenty of them. Plenty of them, to compose the faculty for this Freedom Academy, plenty to do this job.

The rare exception in and out of Government is anyone who is permitted to call a spade a spade in this anti-Communist fight.

What do I mean by saying these people are being squeezed out? I mean just that. I mean in Government agencies—the people who are anti-Communists, who have the know-how of anticommunism and are anxious to fight it frontally. And in public agencies, too, on newspapers, in publishing, in public organizations generally. The dislike of communism as a theory is permissible, or to generalize about it, but when one pinpoints the evil, when one goes down to earth by giving names and dates, disclosing specific things, actually hurting the Communists, then the roof falls in on you.

Senator HRUSKA. Who causes it to fall in? You mentioned, a little earlier, smear campaigns as figuring in the lack of desire for participation by private enterprise in this anti-Communist combat. Now, who generates it? Where does it come from? What is the nature of the smear campaign to which you refer?

Mr. HUNTER. This is part of the Communist psychological warfare that is being waged on all fronts, exploiting a state of mind which is not Communist.

Senator HRUSKA. For example?

Mr. HUNTER. This state of mind is based on the way we have brought up a generation, that the customer is always right, that you must not be what is called antisocial, that if you are in a group of people and one person picks up a glass of water and calls it what it is—a glass of water—and the others say, "Why, that is a flower vase," it is considered impolite to disagree. If the person insists it is a glass of water, he is advised to go to a psychiatrist. All that our young people who were captured in Korea did—those who did as the Communists asked—was to follow these teachings given to them in home, school and church back here in America, to "get along." When they were among Communists, and everyone was talking communism, why, they were just "getting along."

Communist psychological warfare has taken a free ride on top of this really un-American approach. The methods being used to squeeze out numerous anti-Communists who have experience and capability—you are having a number who are perfectly capable appear

at these hearings—ranges through all the techniques that go into psychological warfare, the teaching of which would be the purpose of this Academy. Lack of knowledge in it is the reason why you are having these hearings.

We have been maneuvered into a state of mind, into a political propaganda climate under which, while the Reds howl murder, purge and arrest wholesale, and stamp out nests of freedom-lovers wherever they can, bloodily, for all the world to see, we follow the policy of not being rude. We do not use, as an important official expressed it to me only a few days ago, the "sledge hammer approach" of calling communism communism, because that might upset people. Honey can attract a bear, is the saying, but I don't believe honey will trap the Communist bear.

We have psychological warriors, but they are being squeezed out of the field. We have plenty of activists. Anti-Communist warriors, people with know-how, are excluded. A major problem for such an Academy as this bill proposes is that of placement, after students learn their subjects, so they obtain the opportunity, in and out of Government, to perform their work. I mean specifically in Government, in agencies that range everywhere from USIS and CIA to some other departments, as well as in private life, in business organizations and even in labor, and in other institutions. It is very rare that you find anticommunism being mentioned specifically, the way it is pinpointed in this bill, because the leadership has been lacking. We have not taken this kind of a stand.

What this bill would achieve, what it must be seeking, is a change in approach, a change in policy, plainly and openly, to becoming plainly anti-Communist, to going on the offensive against communism. We have never been on the offensive. We are like a football team, as described to me in a conversation only a few days ago, in which the manager of our side instructs his team not to make any goals, or to kick any goals, oh no, but to make sure that the other team makes no goals, either. That is containment. Well, we may be a tremendously powerful football team, but the time will come when our guard will be down, and the other team will kick a goal. It is just a matter of time when we agree to such rules.

This strategy of merely being on the defensive results in just what has been happening all around the world. One cannot pick up a newspaper any day without seeing somewhere where we have been given a new setback. Under our strategy, the dice are loaded by ourselves against ourselves. A psychological warfare training institution that recognizes that the foe, the basic foe, is communism, would contribute tremendously toward changing this defeatist outlook.

We are lacking a psychological warfare strategy, a strategy for fighting communism. We have no real philosophy for it; we do not even dare mention it by its true name. We are muffing daily opportunities for lack of the know-how to utilize the opportunities that present themselves to us. I have sat time and time again, since I came back to America a couple of years ago, with groups of people who only required some sort of coordination of action to be developed to prevent a Communist victory, and they have been unable to obtain it. We lack operational facilities.

The papers only a few days ago were full of a recent psychological warfare setback given us—given us by fellow Americans, too—in the Olympics arrangements. Red China is being enabled, in effect, to replace the Republic of China. Well, at this very time, I've learned of still another step that the Communist psychological war machine is taking to keep us off balance, and ultimately lead to our recognition of Red China, and what this would mean in the loss of all Asia.

Only a few days ago, in the lobbies of the United Nations, I heard that the Communist Chinese were recruiting a planeload of correspondents accredited to the United Nations to go to Red China. No, the Red Chinese were not themselves doing the recruiting; they had friends doing it. They had the Indonesian delegates doing it for them. The propaganda intent is that, when this is announced, the reaction created in America would be, well, we've been caught with our pants down again; why didn't we do something like that, and this is exactly the Communist line. A number of other persons have found out about this latest conspiracy, too, but nobody knows what to do about it.

Senator HRUSKA. That is the point I was trying to reach, that I was trying to think of. You say why did we not think of something like that? Then your next words are, we do not know what to do about it. What would you suggest? You have made a great study of this, you have thought about it a great deal. Where would you send some correspondents?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, the very obvious thing should be not to fall into the Red-set trap, but to expose the plot, not to become—

Senator HRUSKA. To expose what, Mr. Hunter?

Mr. HUNTER. To expose the fact that an enclave on American soil was being utilized by delegations favorable to a regime—a conspiracy—which is not recognized by the United Nations, conducting what is obviously a plot to push the United States into recognizing Red China, to blackmail the United States into agreeing to the Red Chinese forcing their way into the United Nations.

Senator HRUSKA. How would you suggest going about that?

Mr. HUNTER. I believe, and it certainly is what the Communists would do if it were the other way around, we should come right out, as soon as we find out these facts, explaining and exposing this conspiracy. It certainly is not the intent of the Red Chinese to bring a group of United Nations correspondents to really see what is happening in China, on the tortured mainland of China, and to permit the views to be truthfully portrayed. That is not their intent at all. Their intent is to keep the United States off balance, the way it was put off balance in this Olympics scandal, the way it has been kept off balance by incident after incident, so that we finally give up the way the boys gave up in the brainwashing camps in northern Korea and say, all right, we give in, let us recognize Red China, waking up only after we have trapped ourselves in a situation where we are cornered into recognizing Red China.

Senator HRUSKA. I do not believe you have answered my question. How do you go about it?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, very simply, Members of Congress, the many private organizations that are anti-Communist, the Committee of One Million, all should act on this at once. But they need a channel for coordination. As the situation is now, there is no such channel for

an anti-Communist approach, no know-how on how to go about setting it up, for instance, between the members of the United States Senate and organizations in private life. Psychological warfare is an uncharted field and under present conditions, those who mention it, some lonely Senator or the Committee of One Million in a leaflet, are woefully insufficient. This is a matter of coordination and follow-through, the way the Red put on pressure, a snowball effect. One does not require guns for that, one requires a tongue and printer's ink, and the capacity which psychological warfare provides, the same way it is done in business, to alert all in the field who are interested. This very simple first step, alerting each other, is as of this moment wholly lacking. We have no facilities for it, and it is the basis of psychological warfare, something which any academy on psychological warfare would have to teach and to develop. The first thing to do in such an incident as we are referring to is to make it public knowledge and another measure, of course, would be to put pressure on correspondents who accept such tricky invitations. The ones being used in this maneuver inside the United States are mostly from foreign countries. But if there is utter silence about it, this is encouragement to them to go right ahead and do what the Reds want. This is just one example, a simple example.

Senator HRUSKA. Are you proposing, Mr. Hunter, that the press should be discouraged from going on a tour of that kind?

Mr. HUNTER. Into Red China?

Senator HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Of course.

Senator HRUSKA. You would rather not have them go, is that it?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, for correspondents to go to Formosa, where they are able to go about without a stage being set, would be one thing. But correspondents going into mainland China would simply be falling for a Potemkin setup, a development of Potemkin villages. We have already had the horrible experience, have we not, of what helped bring about the fall of China, when the Communists used our press, important segments of it, successfully blinding us to the fact that Mao Tse-tung was a real Communist, and the Chinese Communists were only "agrarian reformers."

Senator HRUSKA. You are discounting the press very heavily when you say they are going into a Potemkin-like setting and not realizing it, are you not?

Mr. HUNTER. I am talking about reality. I remember the tour of Red China a couple of years ago by a group of correspondents and Labor Party leaders from England, which received tremendous publicity and gave tremendous impetus to the campaign in America by my colleagues in the press and by publishers—not all of them, by any means—to be allowed to go into Red China. I was in Asia then. I read letters from people in Red China who participated, who saw the way parties were set up, rehearsed ahead, rehearsed for days ahead as if for a show, for the reception to these British correspondents and politicians; how every move was plotted ahead, how individuals were rehearsed. A Chinese who spoke English would be instructed: you take such and such a Britisher aside and say this and that to him, and say, I am talking to you all alone, so you can believe me. Why, this was all a setup. For us to go into a trap of this sort, without our know-

ing the ABC's in psychological warfare, would be tragic and a betrayal. The mere fact that you are holding these hearings for the beginning of an Academy to teach psychological warfare shows how completely we are lacking in this knowledge.

We are utterly lacking in it all along the line. We are even lacking a simple college of this sort. An Academy that a bill of this kind would make possible would teach such basic matters as Communist language. We do not even understand what the Communists mean by their own words, by their own dialectical materialist words. In an Academy such as proposed by this bill, chief among the foreign languages that might be taught would have to be the Communists' own language. An editorial I wrote about this was published in the *Saturday Evening Post* only last June 13. The Reds have a code language, possibly the main psychological warfare channel they have into our minds. We have to learn about this. When the Reds use words that have one meaning to us but a wholly different meaning to themselves, our intelligence people, newspaper correspondents and legislators are fooled. Unless they translate these words from the Communist language, the public is fooled, too.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Hunter, would not one instance of that be some of the interpretations of the Russian Constitution, for example, by American students and scholars and sometimes lecturers?

Mr. HUNTER. Of course. The Communists, in the Russian so-called Constitution, in speeches and documents, are saying what they mean. They are not foolish enough not to know what they mean. They say it, in the Communist jargon, except when they use English as English according to Webster, as a confusion tactic. Otherwise, they say what they mean in the Communist code language. When they say peace, they mean their interpretation of peace, and the academy would have to teach the meaning of that word: that peace to them is the condition that arrives when everybody accepts communism. We constantly repeat in our headlines and in Congress what Communist delegates say about peace, not explaining that the word "peace," is as much a foreign word when pronounced by the Communist as any word in Chinese or Greek.

An Academy such as this would have to go into fields of teaching that face up to the fact that communism is waging a war, that this is war, and that this psychological warfare includes not only the overt, not only simple publicity, but techniques that are used on the battlefield, techniques of deception, techniques that are called clandestine or black. All this is part of the psychological warfare being waged against the United States here on American soil and all around the world. At least we should know the details. There is nowhere now where they are being taught.

The Freedom Commission Act, of course, is only part of the answer in this situation. The basic success of the Communists in their psychological war has been the creation of a propaganda climate. The propaganda climate of America today is unfavorable to plainly worded anticommunism. The Communists work at creating a psychological climate. They build up an atmosphere favorable to their strategy and then the events that take place, the reactions, even of people who are anti-Communist, is as the Communist psychological warfare network has planned. The reaction to such a matter, for

example, as American newspapermen going into an enemy area, such as Red China, arouses in our minds only a naive, Red Ridinghood reaction.

An academy of this sort requires some kind of watchdog arrangement. A great deal of study must be given this. A tremendous danger exists that, unless we go about this in a very knowledgeable way, we shall merely be setting up another bureaucracy, an additional bureaucracy, which would be linked to existing bureaucracies, and whose policy inevitably would be modified gradually to that of the previously anti-anticommunism. The watchdog, Freedom Commission, would have to guard against this. It should consist of only the few individuals the bill provides, but they would have to be selected with certain points in mind.

First of all, their motivation must be unquestioned, and among their motives must be the desire to fight communism. The bill is worded in a way that makes this objective plain, that mentions anticommunism in an unprecedentedly frank manner. The watchdog group, first of all, would have to be composed of individuals who, in their own minds, know that to destroy communism we have to call a spade a spade. We can't do it with just soft words.

Secondly, no matter how well motivated these individuals would be, they also would have to have actual experience in psychological warfare. Psychological warfare is as much of a profession, with its own techniques, as medicine, as electronics. Unless a man is trained and experienced in it, what he believes he is doing against communism often works out in an anti-anti-Communist or pro-Communist manner.

A third point that should be required in the selection of a watchdog group is that they would not operate the Academy, but watch to make sure that the policy setup, as announced for the American public and the world, and which is sure to thrill people everywhere, that we finally are going to have a school where people will learn the Communist techniques and how to combat them, is not being quietly sabotaged.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Hunter, just one question at that point. This bill provides that the watchdog committee will be composed of Members of Congress. You are obviously talking about some other watchdog group.

Mr. HUNTER. No, I believe there are Members of Congress who fulfill these needs. What I am thinking of is a watchdog group that would not be composed only of Members of Congress. Members of Congress change, often frequently, and represent all political complexions, having their own, diverse ideas on how communism can be combated, how America can be defended. Sometimes, these ideas are very close to what the Communists themselves desire. They are not anti-Communist, in effect, at all.

If an institution of this sort were set up by the will of Congress, those in control of it would first of all have to sincerely favor its approach, because far more important in psychological warfare than know-how is motivation.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Hunter, are you not kind of begging the question just a little bit? After all, it must be assumed that laymen outside of Congress are also of all political shades of mind.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Senator HRUSKA. Maybe some of them are a little bit——

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, but——

Senator HRUSKA. Let me finish my observation, please, will you, Mr. Hunter?

After all, the cure is not to get them from Congress or outside of Congress, the cure is to find some method of selecting them to get the proper material. Is not that the real problem?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. The manner of selection, once these requirements are laid down, can be flexible. It can be as provided in the bill, the President doing it with Congress agreeing. Or Congress could do it itself. So long as these requirements for the job are specified.

Senator HRUSKA. And followed?

Mr. HUNTER. I did not hear you.

Senator HRUSKA. And followed? Not only must the requirements be specified, but they must be truly and accurately followed.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, yes.

Senator HRUSKA. Now, as to whether the choice comes from Members of Congress or from the American Medical Association, or the Kiwanis, or the Rotary Club, does not make too much difference.

Mr. HUNTER. That is not so important. If it is an alert, representative segment of American society, from the Executive to private enterprise, it really is not so important. It is the individual selected who is important, and there are many available. There is Herbert Hoover, who has been President of the United States, and out of Government for a long time, who knows psychological warfare.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Hunter, the chairman must leave to attend another committee. The Chair would like to announce that tomorrow's witnesses will be Congressman Walter H. Judd, of Minnesota, Mr. Herbert Philbrick, of Rye, N.H., Dr. Leo Cherne, Research Institute of America, and Lt. Col. MacArthur H. Manchester, Reserve Officers' Association, of Washington, D.C.

Now, will you continue with your statement, Mr. Hunter; and, Mr. Sourwine, will you please close the hearing if I do not get back here in time?

Mr. SOURWINE. Perhaps the Chair will leave the order that if Mr. Hunter should finish before the chairman returns the subcommittee will automatically recess until tomorrow morning.

Senator HRUSKA. It is so ordered.

(Senator Hruska left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. HUNTER. A watchdog group of this sort must be an expert advisory group. Obviously its reports, for it certainly would make reports, would have to go to the appropriate committee of Congress, to existing Senate and House committees such as Government and Foreign Relations. This is not to be rivalry or to duplicate the work of other committees, but to fill a gap where no committee has existed, a gap responsible for our consistent setbacks in psychological warfare.

An academy set up by the Government, with a commission also set up by the Government, even if composed partly of individuals in private life, must not become just another bureaucratic enterprise, susceptible to all the twists and turns of demagogues. Perfection is impossible. If we wait for perfection, we would never accomplish anything. But we can make sure, within reasonable limits, that

bureaucracy is prevented from taking over, from obtaining a control that would paralyze or change the work of a Psychological Warfare Academy.

The measure, fortunately, spells out the anti-Communist objective. This must remain paramount. It should also spell out, and to a great extent it does, its function to teach and encourage existing anti-Communist elements, and those coming into existence in private life here and abroad, so that we can create a psychological climate favorable to the free world, to replace the poisonous climate we now have on this matter of fighting communism in the United States. What I have seen of psychological warfare convinces me that such a change of climate can be achieved much quicker and far more completely than people suspect.

The Academy, too, should be composed of, and welcome, volunteers. Indeed, General Chennault's Flying Tigers can be a symbol of what is meant by volunteers. For our side, the word "volunteer" is actually the dictionary word as found in Webster. It is not doubletalk, as among the Communists. As we all know, the "volunteers" that the Red Chinese army sent into Korea were not volunteers at all. For our side, we have plenty of dedicated anti-Communists everywhere on earth, who only want the opportunity to volunteer in this great crusade. Instead of a foreign legion—the idea of a foreign legion belongs to old-fashioned warfare—volunteers can be encouraged and developed all around the world. They are eager, and volunteers would inevitably turn up inside the Iron Curtain countries, too. Once the ball starts rolling, this project would be a great factor for peace. The Communist world is off balance; and if the Red hierarchy realized that the populations of the satellite countries and the peoples of Soviet Russia and Communist China whom they know hate communism would find ways of attacking, they would not dare to take such military action as they would otherwise take if they were able to deceive their populations into believing that we were not fighting communism, but that we were fighting Russia; that we were not fighting communism, but were fighting China. The Academy we are discussing would teach editors and legislators not to talk and write, as they are constantly doing, of the Russian enemy, of Russia doing this and that, when it is not Russia, but the Communist hierarchy in Russia. The Russian people are as much against communism as anybody in the world. The people of China are certainly as much against communism, more so than the people in America, because they know bitterly from experience what communism is.

There are a number of vulnerabilities—traps—that the Freedom Academy would have to knowingly avoid. For instance, the simple matter of student selection. One might say, we have so many hundreds upon hundreds of foreign students coming into America, let us open wide the doors of the Academy to them, so they will learn how to fight communism and go back to their countries and be volunteers in this work of combat. But a proportion of the students are themselves, in effect, being infiltrated into America. In some parts of the world, police informers and others linked to the secret police are maneuvered into scholarships, and those dedicated to free world principles eliminated, sometimes even after being selected for scholarship in America. I came across a number of such instances abroad.

The comparison of such an Academy to West Point should not be unthinkingly accepted. Our military schools teach basic military techniques, knowing that from year to year, from generation to generation, the nations involved change. But this Academy would have as its fundamental premise the fact that communism is the main enemy; it would specifically teach about this enemy, the psychological warfare that this enemy engages in, and the psychological warfare that we must wage to defend ourselves against that enemy, and to help liquidate that enemy.

Actually, the situation in America is far more favorable to anti-Communist activities, to a project of this nature, than it superficially appears. The mere fact that this project is being considered is evidence of it. Never before have I come across so many persons, groups, and organizations who are alert to the menace of communism and are trying to do something to fight it. Never before; but never before, either, have I found so many persons, groups, and organizations who want to fight communism, or are trying to do so, with the feeling of being isolated, being boxed off, of being in a hopeless situation and being squeezed out. They are spending their energies just barely surviving.

This obviously is a contradiction, and it does not make sense. It reflects the success the Communists have had in their psychological warfare in the United States. Coordination and followthrough, which can be easily taught by the Academy and rapidly put into practice would automatically eliminate the contradiction, because then the vast number of people and groups in America who are alert to communism will no longer feel boxed in, will know that they belong, and have the overwhelming support of the population. This contradiction, too, reflects our lack of leadership. The top must take the lead; no matter how important and anxious people are, private citizens and organizations are pretty much stymied on such matters, unless there is leadership by official sources, on top. A bill of this nature would be a decisive element in showing that the top is assuming the responsibilities of leadership.

The Freedom Commission Act, too, would tackle the decisive factor of character and convictions. It is basically a matter of character. Our consistent setbacks by the Communist international network exploited the softening up in our character. Our experience in Korea is a vivid example. The bill, too, helps implement U.S. policy on this very point. A code dealing with character has been set up by the U.S. Government for Americans who happen to be captured in the future. In the accompanying documents that the President signed in connection with this prisoner of war code, and in the documentary report on prisoners of war made for the Department of Defense, it has been spelled out that this is the responsibility primarily of home, school, and church. Unless convictions, unless character, is retored to the American people, there can be no more success against enemy psychological warfare than our men had in the Red POW brainwashing camps in Korea.

An academy of this sort, teaching U.S. objectives as part of its responsibility, implies this reform in character to what it was not too many years ago, and in that way would be implementing U.S. policy. Actually, the American people are way ahead of their Government as

regards the peril of communism, and the need to face it frankly and courageously.

I have been constantly told that our people are apathetic regarding communism. I have found this to be a libel on the American people. They are not apathetic, but they are frustrated. They are constantly being given only doubletalk on communism. Under a distortion of the correct theory that we should see all sides of every issue, we are only being given conflicting viewpoints, without any conclusion ever being reached. The right and the wrong are artificially kept equal. Each time we describe something unfavorable to communism, under a twisted version of tolerance, we have to point out something favorable to it, or at least be anti-anti-Communist. This is supposed to be what is meant by being "fair." And that is so much hogwash.

Of course, any normal human being who comes up against a situation of this kind is frustrated. Of course he then goes to the television to see Western and other escapist shows. He wants specific answers to be given to him. This measure which sets up for the first time—it is almost inconceivable that it would be the first time—a psychological warfare school frankly recognizing communism as the enemy, would help remove the frustration and the confusion in so many minds, and the apathy would automatically fade away with it. Because what this bill actually does, and this is what it has to do, is provide the genuine spirit for what we constantly observe in communism, its quack religion. The bill provides for a new type of missionary, a missionary of the free world, who will crusade for freedom. Very significantly, one of the two legislators who initiate this bill is a missionary himself, a missionary doctor. As part of his inherent missionary qualities, he sees the need today to extend the crusading spirit to psychological warfare for the defense and security of the free world.

This Academy would be a seminary for a new crusade of the spirit.

We must face up to the fact, too, that this bill is a declaration of war by Congress against the international Communist movement. Congress is the repository of this right, and the bill would be a declaration that the United States no longer will sit back and continue taking a licking, sitting down, unprepared for psychological warfare, just as unprepared as that reconnaissance plane which, a few days ago, was shot up and only miraculously spared from total destruction, because its guns had been spiked. This is very symbolic of our situation in psychological warfare today. It was not the Reds who spiked those guns, it was ourselves. It is not the Reds who are preventing us from defending ourselves against communism in a frontal manner; it is ourselves.

The impact abroad of the establishment of such a Freedom Academy would be overwhelming. Faith in America is declining fast, especially since Hungary and Tibet. The whole communistic technique is to point out to the peoples abroad that the United States has no policy, actually, against communism, that we go with the wind, that we talk piously, but that when somebody climbs out on a limb on our mutual behalf as the people in Hungary did, as they are doing today in Tibet, we become silent, we turn our faces elsewhere.

This actually, and I shall conclude with this point, is a measure not for war but for peace, because the Communist world is off balance, and by keeping it off balance, instead of enabling it to artificially put

us off balance, it will be prevented from engaging in a total shooting war, because its own peoples would be the very first to take the opportunity to obtain freedom. The only danger, and this is the desperate move we would have to guard against, would be of a Pearl Harbor sneak attack, a Pearl Harbor sputnik, in which automatically, before the peoples of the anti-Communist world could rise up and do anything about it, the victory would be won by the Communist hierarchy. That is what we have to circumvent and prevent. The policy change that the creation of a Freedom Academy of this character would constitute, would guarantee true peace and a gradual crumbling of the Communist edifice.

I thank you.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sure that if the Senator were here, he would express the thanks of the committee, Mr. Hunter. I want to thank you for him and for the committee. It was a very fine presentation, and I know the committee appreciates your appearance here.

I should like to announce that Mr. Joseph Z. Kornfeder, of Detroit, Mich., is ill and will not be here. He did furnish the committee with a statement. That statement, at the chairman's request, will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement of Mr. Kornfeder is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman, it seems that I am the only one amongst the witnesses to appear in favor of S. 1689 who has actually gone through a type college that this bill aims to create. As many of you probably know, I have spent 3 years at the Lenin School in Moscow, and I was for about 2 years attached to various committees at International Communist Headquarters. The Comintern and the training colleges were, of course, closely interlinked. If I understand the purposes of S. 1689 clearly, you aim to create with that measure the type of college for political counterwarfare similar to the Lenin School but only in reverse. S. 1689 would, of course, not be needed except as a countereffort to the type of warfare with which the Kremlin aims to conquer the earth.

We may perhaps see the scope of this thing in clearer perspective if we look back into recent history. Only about 50 years ago a group of ragged Russian intellectuals embarked upon certain methods of fighting existing society from within, now known as political warfare. It is a method of infighting and of conspiratory organization so effective that within a period of 40 years they were able to create an empire of 900 million plus an organized subversive movement of millions inside the areas of the West.

The Lenin College was Lenin's idea, but he did not live to see it realized. Lenin through this type of training aimed to do on a much larger scale what he and his group had done in Russia. Lenin aimed to train other intellectuals in the methods he had devised so that this thing could be done far more wisely and with much more system to it. As you probably know, Russia itself was conquered by these types of method, but when I was in Moscow the same thing was being prepared to be done in China. For that purpose there was what was known as the University of the East in which Chinese Communists were being trained on a large scale. Much of the leadership of the present Chinese Communist Party acquired its know-how in the Far Eastern University of Moscow and that includes Ho Chi Minh and many others of the Asiatic leaders outside of China.

At the same time many of the leaders of the present East European satellites were being trained at another college also located in Moscow known as the Western University. Do not be misled by the name "university." These are not institutions like our universities. All the training colleges I mentioned are entirely preoccupied with the art of creating discontent and organizing and manipulating discontent in the areas in which those trained there operate. There are also other colleges all aimed at the same purpose. I would estimate the total turnout of trained personnel thus turned out since 1923, when the first batch graduated, at about 120,000 men and women, or an average of about 4,000 a year. This then is the officer corps which carries out the Kremlin's type of warfare

on the five continents and in it is contained the real secret of the successful penetration of the West.

You may also be able to get the scope of this if you had a chance to inspect the library in Moscow which feeds the colleges with the necessary textbooks. The library, about the size of our Congressional Library, full of books, all of which are concentrated on the problem how to organize, how to agitate, how to infiltrate, and to undermine our type of society. Never before has such a huge collection of material been assembled to teach this type of warfare.

In addition to the training system above enumerated in which at least 600 American Communist leaders were trained, including Steve Nelson, and an even larger number from the Communist Parties in South America, an area on which Moscow is now concentrating, there are spread all over the five continents minor Communist training schools, but all of them are patterned on the training system in Moscow and the same text material is used. In this connection it may interest you to know that the cost of all this type of training and all of the text material and much of the operational expense resulting from it is all defrayed by the Soviet Government, although officially they will deny and have denied the very existence of the whole thing.

A word now as to who teaches in these colleges in Moscow which will give you an idea of the importance attached to this type of training by the leaders of the Soviet Government. In addition to the routine staff which carries on the day-to-day work, Joseph Stalin himself taught there; so did Trotsky while he was still in Moscow; Nicolai Bukarin, a member of the Russian Politburo and Lenin's second as theoretician; Otto Kuusinen, erstwhile secretary of the Comintern and now back in prominence again; Dimitri Manuelsky; and others.

May I say a few words also on the question whether we can successfully create a college to fight their type of warfare. Well in my opinion it is not a matter of whether we can, we simply must because if we continue to ignore the enemy on this front, we and our successors may not be here to talk about it in 40 years from now as Khrushchev said.

For if they could do what they did starting from scratch in the last 40 years, they can with the present means at their disposal do much more in the next 40 years.

I am also one among those who believe that we can successfully engage the enemy on this front and create an effective training college for that purpose. I think the potential staff for such a college is now available and they can also create the necessary textbooks.

It is, however, not a mere matter of learning from them. On the contrary, much of their methods based on the penetration of an open society like ours cannot be used in reverse. In other words, we must devise methods of penetrating a closed society like theirs, a problem which has not yet been solved, and much of it will be solved only when we begin to seriously wrestle with it. And then there is also the problem of countermethods against them in the West, problems of specialization according to area, population stratification, etc.

In the main, ideas must be fought with other ideas, organization with counterorganization, tactics with countertactics, etc.

S. 1689 in my opinion creates the prerequisite for such a countereffort and it is not a duplication of efforts by other agencies. On the contrary, it can make these other and scattered efforts at least indirectly more effective. Much of course depends on how this thing will be staffed after it is created. It took Moscow, even with the guidance of leaders experienced in political warfare, several years to get this type of colleges going effectively. Patience is needed.

If the whole thing is however staffed by milk-and-toasters it will be but a toothless affair, if not worse, for even a tiger cannot bite without teeth. The Voice of America and Radio Free Europe is also a very good idea, but if some real teeth were added, it would be much better.

Some say that it is late in the day of history and that there is no time left for a countereffort along these lines. They say that the military showdown will settle the whole thing. I doubt it very much because Moscow is doing quite well as is. Their huge military buildup is not to substitute political warfare but to back up the aggressiveness thereof. We must, of course, have a corresponding military buildup as a safeguard, but even with it all we will finally lose everything if we do not meet the Kremlin on this long neglected front—political warfare.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the record will be clear, Mr. Kornfeder not only has a three and a half page statement, but he also has an exhibit, being the curriculum of the Lenin University, which he attended, which it seems is pertinent to this subject matter. At the chairman's request, that also will go in.

(The exhibit referred to is as follows:)

JOSEPH Z. KORNFEDER EXHIBIT

CURRICULUM, LENIN UNIVERSITY, MOSCOW, U.S.S.R., (AS OF 1944)

TEXTBOOKS ON MILITARY SUBJECTS

(NOTE.—The instructors on military subjects were all Red Army staff officers of the high command. They perform under party names and often are not at all introduced to the students; they just take charge. Occasionally a known member of the high command like Marshal Simeon Budenny lectured in Russian on this subject. The staff officers instructing are men who specialize on foreign military problems and participated in the events they are instructing about.)

Textbooks

On War, by Clausewitz, the Karl Marx of German military theory. (Translated from German.)

Construction of the Red Army During the Revolution, by Antonov Ovseyenko. (Translated from Russian.)

The Civil War, Military Problems and Civilian, by Bubnov. (Translated from Russian.)

Strategy of Civil War, composite book by Bubnov, Kamenev, and Eydeman. (Translated from Russian.)

Red Army and Civil War Politics, by S. T. Gussev, former representative of the Comintern to the United States, under name of "Green."

Fighting During the Revolution, by Bukharin.

The Class War, by Tuchachevsky. (Translated from Russian.)

Civil War Politics and Insurrection. Excerpts from Lenin's writings.

Political and ideological preparation for armed insurrection.—Key theme: (1) Everyday politics have no sense unless it is consciously preparatory to the armed struggle for power; or (2) insurrection is a continuation of everyday politics by means of arms.

Precondition for successful armed insurrection.—(1) Economic collapse and chaos in the country; (2) demoralization and dissention among the governing circles; (3) defeat of the government in a foreign war or its inability to keep things moving as a result of exhaustion following the war; (4) ability of the party to take advantage of the situation.

The "peaceful" phase of preparation

Ideological and organizational penetration of Armed Forces (Army, Navy, police, etc.).—Main theme: To foster antimilitarism and hatred of officers, alleged objective rank and file; democratization of Army, Navy, etc. Main objective: Demoralization and decomposition. Subsidiary objectives: Training of young Communists in the use of arms and information on status and disposition of forces and armament.

Instruments to be created and used for that purpose: (1) Young Communist League; (2) student unions, clubs, or leagues; (3) front organizations like the Youth Congress, auxiliary instruments, teachers' unions, parents' associations, etc.

Peaceful organization and penetration of strategic services.—Organization of trade and industrial unions; in maritime and land transports, such as the National Maritime Union, transport-workers union, longshore and warehousemen, etc.

Auxiliary—unions in the communications systems—radio, telegraph, and telephone, like the American Communications Association.

Organization of strategic production services—like unions among oil and refinery workers; die and tool, instrument workers; automobile, aircraft, and vehicle workers; chemical workers; electrical, machine, and radio workers, etc.

Technical intelligence organizations—like the association of technicians, engineers, chemists, etc.

Organizations for penetration of government.—Unions of county, municipal, and government employees; office and professional workers; Labor Party and Progressive Party clubs and leagues; infiltration of Democratic or Republican Parties.

Demoralization and disinformation instruments.—American Newspaper Guild, Teachers' Unions, American Association of Writers and Artists, American Peace Mobilization, committees of liberals, and clergymen for various purposes, International Juridical Association, Lawyers Guild, etc.

(NOTE.—This gives only a rough idea of the theme behind the mosaic of innocents and "front" organizations basic and auxiliary fostered by the Communist Party under Comintern direction.)

Tremendous attention is paid by the Comintern to the creation in popular form of labor confederations like the CIO even if not fully controlled, it gives their unions within it a big backdrop and reach. This mosaic of organizations once created can then be utilized to profit from any crisis, confusion, or misfortune that may befall the country in which they operate or else be stimulated or driven in one direction or other according to the needs of Moscow's foreign policy.

They can be utilized on a vast scale for political sabotage, that is, stimulated strikes where it hurts most.

Demonstrations disconcerting to the morale of the public, and continued crescendo of demoralization propaganda. The inner intent of which is in strategic parlance, "defeat"—of what Moscow considers as its enemies. Democracies are of course considered favored playground and easy marks for this sort of machinations.

Actual physical sabotage becomes possible on an effective scale once the masses are sufficiently charged and wired by such ideological preparations. Physical sabotage is, however, considered secondary to political sabotage and is carried out only by specially instructed select groups in places and moments where it may count most.

In order to get the masses involved into these machinations, the mosaic of organizations sponsor what the masses consider good for them. This "progressive" front shingle has the liberals entangled. In essence, the movement aims at a reactionary overturn of our constitutions carried out by revolutionary means.

The technique and methods for this were, of course, developed gradually as the Russian revolution settled down to stark reaction.

During a revolutionary situation, the creation of which is stimulated by these types of machinations, the activity of this mosaic of organizations can be stepped up as indicated further on.

The average party member himself scarcely knows the pattern or intent of the top strategists, but, being mentally conditioned, welcomes and accepts it as it unrolls.

Intensified preparation for armed insurrection

Intensification of antimilitarist activity among armed forces. (Objective: Demoralize, neutralize, recruit.) France is example. Advantage of conscript army. (Hatred of officer corps.)

Organization on a large scale of a semimilitary, sports organizations, youth clubs, of many varieties. Intensified emphasis on penetration of non-Communist and semimilitary youth and other organizations.

Organization and preparation of assault groups: Training and hardening of the groups in "peacetime" warfare; organized heckling and breakup of enemy meetings and demonstrations; terrorization of opponents by assaults; punishment of "bad" cops; organized street brawls; protecting a demonstration; peacetime demonstrations in quasi-military form; practicing on scabs.

Procurement of armament: Procurement of arms from arsenals, depots, barracks and armament factories, etc. Assaults on arms stores and isolated police or constabulary stations and cops to obtain arms. Smuggling across border and by seas. Machine shops as arsenals. (Buying of arms, Molotov cocktails, homemade bombs, etc.)

Preparation and organization of sabotage (state of tension and panic).—Political sabotage: Stimulation of strikes, demonstrations, street fights, with emphasis on strategic industry. Temporary capture and operation of radio stations. Sabotage of government from the inside. (Direct sabotage.) Rail and transport sabotage, organized incendiarism, equipment sabotage.

The planning of the uprising.—Assignment of objectives to the assault groups and commandos. Thorough investigation of objectives and planning of each individual assault. The theory of engaging and destroying the enemies' vital

forces and occupying vital central points. The method of arming "left" elements, mopping up, and forming the Red guard. The strategy of absolute surprise. The strategy of relative surprise: Hamburg, Canton. The national aspect—interior lines: Marching to support government demoralization, Russian revolution. Periphery to center. German revolution.

Techniques of agrarian insurrection.—Advantage of terrain, distance, and camouflage. Guerrilla raids. The technique of diversion. Expropriation raids. Raids on outposts, night activity.

Political and philosophical preparation for seizure of power. Leninism

Strategy of singling out the working class and setting it apart or against all other classes.

Strategy of organizing a party out of the disaffected and pauperized intelligentsia to lead the working class, which particularly in agrarian countries is considered unfit to lead itself.

The concept of party as a political army engaged in constant maneuvering and warfare and capable of rapid transformation into an armed military force. The use of other classes, peasants, middle classes, etc., as strategical allies in the capture of power.

The transition from a party of revolutionary opposition to a party in power. Stalin completed that transition by destroying the old party and its principal components and creating gradually a new one.

History of the labor movement

The concept that the history of society is the history of continuous class struggles.

The concept that authority of government is based on a body of armed men in the service of a particular class and that the problem is to create or possess oneself of that instrument.

The history of labor is the history of rebellion against the master class from the time of Roman Empire (Spartacus rebellion) to our time.

The Bolshevik (Leninist) concept of conquering power combines all the best out of the experience of the past brought to date. Other movements like the Socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, etc., are ailments and deviations surviving out of the infantile past.

Marxian economics

The theory according to which the workers produce all wealth, receive enough only for their minimum sustenance, while all others live off their backs.

The theory of the inevitable economic exhaustion and decay of capitalism through its own greed, and dog-eat-dog conflicts creating a condition for its early destruction by the party of the revolution.

The theory of the abolition of private ownership in the means of production and distribution and its replacement by government ownership (state capitalism) as a transitory economy on the way to socialism.

The theory that a one-party monopoly over the government is essential in order to guide the masses through this difficult economic process on the way to socialism.

Marxism as modified by Lenin's strategical formulas and the needs of Stalin's policies:

1. Imperialism is interpreted to suit the strategical purpose of organizing rebellion in the colonies against England, France, Japan, and to subvert (sic) Latin America against the United States.

2. Theory of independence of small nations is strategically utilized to create as much division as possible in non-Russian Europe and elsewhere.

3. Theory of inevitable decay and collapse of empires to create faith in the sure victories of national independence movements under Russian inspiration and attract them within the orbit of Russian power politics.

Anything ever written or said by Bolshevik, Socialist, anarchist, liberal, or reactionary leaders that could be quoted, interpreted, etc., to substantiate said strategical theories and create a fanatical conviction about them is made available to the students.

Case in point: The famous black-belt theory, to sublimate the southern Negro with the mirage of "national liberation" and independence.

Dismemberment and exhaustion of empires aimed at without regard to consequences to populations involved.

SUBJECT: *Mental Conditionings of Party Members and Workers.*—In order that civil war can be led into a direction desired by Moscow, a thorough preparation is needed; this presupposes the creation of an insurrectionary mentality; only those thus mentally enmeshed can mentally charge the masses with the opiates necessary. Mental civil war precedes the physical civil war; to be able to shoot mental, and thence physical, bullets is the aim of the philosophical training received.

Textbooks and teachers are conditioned by that purpose.

Textbooks on curriculum subjects

Economics—Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, N. Lenin, Malstus, Ricardo, Smith, Hiefferding etc.

Politics—Lenin, Stalin, Marx, Bebel, Bernstein, Kautzky, LaSalle, Bismark, Bukharin, Backunin, etc.

Organization—Lenin, Stalin, Piatnitzky, Gussev, Derchinsky, Sverdlov, Piatakov, etc.

(NOTE.—Outside of Marx' Capital which most students find difficult to digest mentally, the other authors are given in excerpts and parts or heavily criticized. Many of the above-mentioned authors, Russian and foreign, have since been purged and their books disappeared. If their ideas in part are essential to the teaching of the system, other authors have been given the privilege to present it as their own.)

TEACHERS STAFF

Vyacheslav Molotov, head of the university, chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars and present (1953) foreign commissar. Also head of Comintern (Dimitrov being titular head only). Subject: Soviet Politics and Tasks of the Comintern.

Ossip Piatnitzky, organization (former) secretary of the Comintern. Subject: Organization Politics of the Comintern.

Otto Kuusinen, active politico of the presidium of the Comintern. Recently head of the provisional government set up by Stalin during the Finnish invasion. Subject: Politics and Strategy of the Comintern.

S. Losovsky, head of the trade-union department of the Comintern and assistant foreign commissar. Subject: Trade Union Politics of the Comintern.

(NOTE.—These are only the most prominent of the teachers at the Lenin University, the routine staff used to consist of Rudasz, Mingulin, Kirsienova, etc. All the heads of Comintern departments teach there, like Vasiliev, Ercoli, Petrovsky, etc.)

P.S.—This outline as to what is taught at the Lenin School, a political-warfare college, was prepared in 1944 from notes taken at the Lenin School. To make it intelligible to Americans, suitable names and illustrations were used. The CIO has since cleaned out its Communist-controlled unions and there have been other changes.

/s/ JOSEPH Z. KORNFEDER.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the chairman's order, the hearing is automatically recessed until tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Friday, June 19, 1959.)

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND FREEDOM ACADEMY

FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL
SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:45 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, Senator Roman L. Hruska presiding.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Frank W. Schroeder, chief investigator.

Senator HRUSKA. The committee will come to order. We will continue hearings on S. 1689.

We are fortunate today to have with us one of the leading Members of the other body, Dr. Walter H. Judd, Congressman from Minnesota.

Congressman Judd has a deep interest in this subject and in the bill.

Dr. Judd, I think you are a coauthor and sponsor thereof.

Would you take the witness chair here and favor us with such testimony and such statement as you care to make?

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER H. JUDD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. JUDD. Thank you very much, Senator. I am one of the co-authors in the House. Congressman Herlong and I introduced the original bills, H.R. 3880 and H.R. 3881 on the same day last January.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for not being able to be here when you opened the hearings the first of the week as I should like to have been, but we in the House were working on the mutual security program which is the most important bill that comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the whole session. So I had to be on duty over there.

Senator HRUSKA. We know of your leading role in that legislative place. We are busy on both sides of the Capitol. No apologies are necessary, but a note of explanation is always welcome.

Mr. JUDD. I might say for the record, although it is just a personal comment, that I am interested in appearing before you because I once appeared before your father when he was county superintendent of schools in Butler County, Nebr., and he signed my eighth grade diploma.

Senator HRUSKA. And thereby giving you evidence that you are an educated man.

Mr. JUDD. Superior training, I can assure you.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of things going on in this world. You find comments, editorials, and discussions over the television, radio about this, that, or the other new thing that is happening. There is a shift, allegedly, in the Soviet position at Berlin one day, and then a shift in the other direction the next day. People react like a thermometer, going up with the slightest hint of a so-called thaw and being chilled at the closely following evidence of a so-called freeze.

If there is one conclusion we can draw from this whole cold war situation after being in it for these many years, it is this—that the more things seem to change, the more they remain the same. Behind every one of the apparent changes, there is no fundamental change.

The first thing that remains the same is the Communist conspiracy. Its objective is fixed; it is world conquest. That does not change, and it cannot change unless or until the Communist movement gives up communism; that is, until these world revolutionists renounce themselves. Nobody renounces himself or his philosophy of life or his whole lifework, at least not as long as he is winning.

You could no more have communism without this program of world conquest than you could have Judaism without the Ten Commandments, or Christianity without the Sermon on the Mount.

World dominance is the heart of it, and this is one thing our people have not been able to realize or believe.

All these years since 1930 when I was in an area in China under the control of the Communists for 8 months, I find myself trying in vain to get across one simple idea—that Communists act like Communists. But our people out of their very decency, do not grasp that. They insist that Communists are going to act like nationalists, or that they are going to act like capitalists, or like democrats, or even like Christians.

Every day one hears someone say, "Well, I am convinced that the interests the Chinese Communists have as Chinese will lead them into conflict with the Soviet Union." This view is based on the notion that Chinese Communists are first Chinese and secondly Communists, or that Russian Communists are first Russian, and secondly Communists.

It is the basic error on our part. When you become a Communist you give up your nationalism; you are a world revolutionist. The idea that Communists can be first or also, patriots leads us into the further error of assuming that a Communist government will operate primarily in terms of national interests.

Our concessions at previous summit conferences, beginning at Yalta, were made in all sincerity in the belief that if we satisfied the historic national interests of the Soviet Union, that is, a warm water port in the Far East, security on its west, etc., that would achieve their objectives and we could get an agreement and peace.

But they are not Russian patriots. They are not working in the interest of the Russian people. They are using the Russian people to promote the world revolution.

In China, the Communist regime is making war, first of all, upon its own people. It has enslaved 600 million persons. It locks them

up at night and lets them out in the morning to work in the fields, only under armed guards.

Communists also are not capitalists. We are always assuming that if we offer them some trade or raw materials or machinery that would appeal to us as being advantageous, they will of course, be sensible and make concessions to get that trade.

But they are not capitalists, seeking profits. They are Communists dedicated to world revolution.

Also, they are not democrats. They are not interested in sitting down and working out a settlement in a civilized democratic way. Why in the world should they want a settlement and an end to the situation of tension which they have at last managed to achieve and which is made to order for them?

They are also not Christians. I don't say this in a critical sense. I say it in an analytical sense. We are always projecting into their minds our ideas and our values. But they live by their values, not ours. If we could just get it through our heads that Communists act like Communists, then we would be prepared to do what is necessary to get out of our state of apathy.

It sometimes seems to me that it is almost a hypnotic stagnation which can lead to our destruction, not because we are weak, but because we are slumbering and we can't bring ourselves to believe the truth. We are too decent.

We don't believe that any group of people could sit down and coldly, scientifically, calculatingly reject all the decencies that civilized men have worked to develop to govern their intercourse since they emerged from the jungle. We have to oppose Communists not because they are bad, but because they are Communist. They are not bad men; they are good men by their standards. They just have a different set of standards.

This doesn't mean that to deal successfully with them, we have to abandon our values. It means that we have to find honorable but tough ways to defeat their skillful maneuvers and to present honestly and convincingly the things that we believe in, just as effectively as they are able dishonestly to present effectively the things that they believe in.

Now, if it is true that the Communist conspiracy remains the same with respect to its objective, world conquest, it is also true that its tactics remain the same. They are completely fluid. Of course that is part of the reason for their success. They are hard and tough when they have the advantage. They are soft and smiling when we have the advantage. This has happened over and over.

I have sometimes thought that their chief practical weapons are the five T's. The first thing they ask for, when we are ahead, is a truce.

When they were winning at Dien Bien Phu and the French asked for a truce, the Communists wouldn't give them even a 24-hour truce to evacuate the French wounded.

When we had the upper hand in Korea, they asked for a truce and we promptly gave them 2 years during which they were able to escape from their difficult position, regroup and rearm their deteriorating forces and build up tremendous defenses in depth so that by the end of 2 years' discussions it was impossible for us to resume the hostilities without prohibitive costs.

The second is talk. Some say we never lose anything by talking; but we may when dealing with this kind of enemy. It was during the 2 years of talk at Panmunjom that they got the H-bomb. It was during these 2 years of talk, talk, talk at so-called disarmament conferences that they got sputnik. Then they said, no more discussions on disarmament; and there haven't been any serious ones since that time.

The third is trade. Whenever they are in trouble they offer trade. We have grabbed the bait several times beginning in 1933. I don't think we are going to do that this time, but some of our allies are grabbing it, because they are unable to bring themselves to realize that this is a mortal conflict and more dangerous than anything any of us have been in previously—more dangerous just because it is so different.

Another tactical weapon is to ask us to trust them. They play upon our sportsmanship which tends to make us give them the benefit of the doubt. They ask us to trust them even though they have not done one thing that justifies such trust.

Of course, the greatest of all their tactical maneuvers is to play for time. We think time is on our side. I am sure it would be on our side if we would use it to work in dead earnest; but time is not on our side automatically especially if we just wait while they are working day and night.

Truce, talk, trade, and trust—all in order to gain time.

So first of all, the more the Communist world conspiracy seems to change, the more it remains the same. And it must remain the same. It cannot change until Communists renounce communism.

The second fact that remains the same is that we cannot call this cold war off except on their terms—and their terms are surrender. We have tried repeatedly and constantly to call it off through negotiations. Three summit conferences were held under three Presidents. It was in vain. For we cannot call it off except on their terms—and their terms are surrender.

Now, the surrender must not necessarily be all at once. They are quite willing to take it city by city and island by island, position by position, principle by principle. And they don't demand that we surrender under the name of "surrender." They know that would be too difficult, so they are perfectly willing to take our surrender under some other name, such as disengagement, or a realistic readjustment, or a new approach.

I haven't yet seen any new approach suggested that didn't amount to another surrender.

If a football team is doing badly on the 40-yard line, it might say, "Let's have a realistic readjustment on the 30-yard line," but it is still a retreat.

A third thing that remains the same is that we haven't been winning in this cold war because we haven't been trying to win.

We are just like a football team that stands on its 40-yard line and says, "If you try to come through us, we are going to resist you; but we want to have good relations with you, so we tell you in advance that if one of your men should fumble the ball, we'll never grab it and run to your goal line."

This is why the Communists want more and more conferences. There is nothing for them to lose. We have told them in advance that

we aren't going to try to win, so they can go to a conference with complete confidence. They can't lose, and they can win eventually if we don't do anything except defend. One of their plays will one day break through. In contrast, we can't win, because we are not trying to win, and we can lose.

We go to a conference and our maximum is just to maintain the status quo—please just be nice and leave Berlin as it is.

The status quo is their minimum. Their maximum is a touchdown, or at least a first down. If they don't succeed in gaining some ground, well, at least they won't lose any. We are happy if they just leave things as they are until they can devise the next probe.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has ever yet won a struggle, military or otherwise, by being only on the defensive and announcing ahead of time that he is not trying to win.

Why haven't we tried to win?

A basic reason is this: We have assumed in our typical American self-assurance that if we can just avoid a shooting war, we, of course, will win any other kind of war.

We assume we will win any economic war, for example. Well, are we so sure?

We, of course, will always be ahead scientifically. We didn't argue that or try to prove it. We just took it for granted. But the facts won't support the assumption.

We, of course, would always be ahead educationally. I was impressed a year ago, at commencement in one of the large high schools in my city in Minnesota with over 400 seniors graduating, to observe that the top 5 honor students all came to this country from displaced persons camps since the end of the war.

What's the reason? Are they smarter than the native-born youngsters of Minnesota. Of course not. They appreciate America, and they work harder.

We unquestionably can win the educational struggle if we have the will; but if the chief objective of a people is enjoyment rather than hard, stern self-discipline, including the intellectual disciplines of studying our enemy and studying ourselves and working out effective means of winning for the things we believe in, then the other folks will win just because they work harder.

Another thing that we are assuming just now is that if we can arrange a greater exchange of persons, so that their people and ours can "understand" each other better, we, of course, will gain in any such interchange.

Although that could be the result if we have the will to make it so, I don't think that it necessarily follows. First, because there is not a real interchange. Who goes over from our side? If it's a farm group, whatever farmer wants to go. He may be merely curious and like to go see. He is not trained in dialectics. Very few Americans have thought out and can state convincingly just why they believe what they believe.

Put them in a contest with the trained agitator who has learned dictated answers and our American is all but helpless. He is not articulate. He hasn't thought it through in precise phases.

So we allow any farmers to go over who want to go. Who comes over from their side? Only those are allowed to come that are

trained and tested—persons whom they are sure of and who know how to be convincing in presenting their side.

We allow journalists to go over to get information. They send over agents to win victories.

We have our professors and clergymen going over as they wish. They send over agents.

We have Congressmen and Senators going over. The officials that come from their side are agents—from Mikoyan down.

It just does not follow that the better system will overcome the worse, unless the spokesmen for the better are better trained.

We don't say, Never mind about the few rotten apples; bring them in amongst the many good apples. The good apples will prevail over the rotten apples. We know that it is the other way around.

We don't say that it is cruel to quarantine people with TB, small-pox, et cetera. They ought to be brought in among the healthy. How can the diseased become well unless they circulate amongst the healthy? Rather, we know that the diseased will prevail over the healthy unless precautions are taken to protect the healthy from the diseased.

We don't say, "Don't worry about an unsound currency or a bad economic system. Let it associate with ours. Ours is sounder and stronger. Ours will prevail over theirs." But almost the first law of economics is that bad money drives out good. It is the other way around.

We can win these interchanges if we are awake and alert and trained, and have worked out our philosophy so that we can present it, and have an organizational setup which will enable us to mobilize the full strength we really have—intellectual, political, moral, economic—as well as military. Only if we mobilize all of them can we be adequately effective.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we are not winning this cold war as yet because, first, we haven't taken the trouble to understand this adversary. We haven't recognized that his science of winning is exactly by the same methods that we use to win in football—that is, power and deception.

If you have enough power, you go through the line; but if you don't have enough power, then you revert to deception—trick plays, forward passes, reverses, and the rest.

A good quarterback is chosen not because he is a crooked or evil person. He is chosen because, after training, he is skillful at deceiving the other team's players, diverting their attention, confusing them. Likewise, the top man in any Communist organization is there because he is the most skillful deceiver. If they haven't the power to drive through Turkey, they shoot a forward pass over Turkey to Egypt, et cetera.

They do what any good quarterback or good pitcher on a baseball team does—he mixes up his plays. The pitcher throws his fast ball, and then a slow one, and then his curve and then his sinker or whatever he has. We don't get confused by that. We don't assume that when he throws a fast ball, all the rest will also be fast balls. We know he mixes them up in order to win.

This is just what any intelligent Communist leader does. He mixes up his tough threats and his soft smiles. The smile does not mean

any thaw or the slightest change in policy. It means he is a smart quarterback, intent on winning the game—the world. Yet we insist on believing that because our system, our society, is better than theirs, it will win out without any feints or diversions on our part, without any deviousness, if you wish. Rather, we too must master these techniques if we are to deal successfully with this kind of an enemy whose primary tactic is not straightforwardness and winning by merit, but winning by deception.

We are good poker players. We are good football players. But in the biggest contest in which we have ever been engaged, not by choice but by necessity, we are inclined to think that just by being straightforward and open and honest, without much skill, we will prevail.

Unfortunately, much of history is the story of better civilizations being overcome by poorer civilizations, when the better civilizations were not as alert and dedicated and willing to work as hard and as intelligently as the poorer.

I think it was Toynbee who said, "Whenever the frontier between two civilizations stands still, time always works in the barbarians' favor." Why? Because they work harder and to win. They know what they want. They have more drive, and they are on the offensive.

May I impose upon the committee to read a quotation from Demosthenes, supposedly the greatest orator of history. He tried in vain to awaken the people of Athens to a threat they faced. They were at the peak of their power; the whole world beat a path to Athens; it led the world as perhaps no civilization has ever excelled in history. It led in philosophy, science, education, medicine, mathematics, culture, art, literature, whatever you can name.

Let me quote a few sentences from Demosthenes' warnings. You remember his greatest speeches were called the Philippics. Why were they called the Philippics? Because he was warning his people about a man named Philip who was picking up the outposts in neighboring Macedonia—the equivalent of Quemoy or Iraq or Cuba today. Demosthenes was urging that if the Athenians allowed this barbarian to pick up the outposts, one day he would knock at the door of Athens and Athens would go down not because it was weak, but because it had lost the will to resist.

Demosthenes failed. It was not Philip, but his son Alexander did take Athens, its civilization was destroyed and has never been reconstructed 2,300 years later.

Demosthenes said (and one can well substitute Khrushchev for Philip and the United States of America for Athens), "Do not believe that his present power is fixed and unchangeable like that of a god. No, men of Athens, he is a mark for the hatred and fear even of those who now seem devoted to him. One must assume that even his adherents are subject to the same passions of any other men."

Demosthenes was saying there were great forces against Philip in his own area, if the Athenians would hold him in check. He was not strong but, rather, weak because of his tyrannies. If the Athenians would wake up to the situation, they and the peoples conquered by him could defeat him.

In present day terms, the communes in China are not an evidence of Communist strength there, but of incredible Communist weakness. If the people of a country are enthusiastically supporting their government, they don't have to be locked up every night and be denied the opportunity to live as families, or allowed to work in the fields except under armed guards. There are terrible weaknesses in the Communist regime in China.

Demosthenes warned that they had to take advantage of such weakness. He said:

At present, however all these feelings—
compare this with behind the Iron Curtain—

are repressed and have no outlet, thanks to your indolence and apathy which I urge you to throw off at once. For observe, Athenians, the height to which the fellow's insolence has soared. He leaves you no choice of action or inaction. He blusters and talks big according to all accounts. He cannot rest content with what he has conquered. He is always taking in more, everywhere casting his net around us, while we sit idle and do nothing.

You take your marching orders from him. You have never framed any plan of campaign for yourselves. You have never foreseen any event until you learned that something has happened or is happening. All this was once perhaps permissible. Now things have come to a crisis, so it is no longer in your power.

It seems to me, Athenians, as if some god out of very shame for the conduct of our city, had inspired Philip with this activity. For if he did nothing more, but were willing to rest satisfied with what he has already captured and subdued, I believe some of you would be quite content with what must bring the deepest disgrace upon us and brand us as a nation of cowards.

Yet, I find people urging us to follow the same course today as Athens followed then—to its doom.

If we can just get the Communists, they argue, to be content with the 900 million they already have enslaved and leave the rest of us alone, it will be all right with us. We haven't understood our enemy and, perhaps, just as bad, we haven't understood ourselves. We haven't appreciated the power, the liberating force, the dynamism, that are in our philosophy, our life, and our system.

If we will come to understand these and release them, mobilize them, organize them so that they can work in the world, we will win.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to talk so much about the background, but it seemed worth doing because we are in the greatest struggle of all the history of man on this planet, and these are the fundamentals. There have always been conflicts and always will be, but this time every culture, every civilization, every continent, every country, every people is involved. It is total conflict, not only geographically, but in the sense that it involves every aspect of our lives—our economy, our politics, our military strength, our educational system, the psychological reactions of individuals to their environment, the forces for them and the forces against them.

So what do we have to do?

First of all we have to know our enemy; and, second, we have to know ourselves.

What is required if we are to know our enemy? I think we have to develop a more systematic study of his objectives, his tactics, his strategy, and then we have to develop a science for counteracting them. He has a science by which he continues to expand his power. We have to develop a science whereby we can successfully counteract

that. We have to develop first a science of defense against this type of enemy; and second a science of offense for our own system. The purpose of this bill is to try to fill in a void between former types of warfare and this total warfare. It is a gap that somehow we have left empty, not by intention, but by default.

We have strong forces for conducting conventional conflicts. I think our diplomatic corps is as competent today as it has ever been in our history, if not more so. It is skilled in the traditional methods of handling international problems. But the Communists use a whole series of unorthodox, unconventional methods that we haven't studied adequately. We have powerful military forces. But, in a sense, we are like Braddock and his redcoats who came to this country to fight American Indians as if the Indians would fight according to the European codes of chivalry, the codes of the knights of King Arthur's roundtable. The redcoats insisted on fighting the way they had been trained to fight in Europe.

You know, the two sides put on different colored uniforms so each would know which were the proper targets to shoot at. Then they lined up and shot at each other.

Braddock's redcoats were being badly defeated, but fortunately he had with him a man named Washington and a bunch of scouts who didn't know much about traditional warfare in Europe, but they understood the American Indian and did not hesitate to get down behind the fences and trees and fire from ambush. That was disgraceful for a knight in armor from Europe, but that was the way the Indian fought and the scouts saved the day.

To begin this task of knowing our enemy and knowing ourselves, this bill sets up, as you know, a Freedom Commission.

I am not going into the details because I know that has been handled in previous testimony.

It is a Commission of seven outstanding citizens, not under the Pentagon, not under the State Department, not bogged down or smothered in the usual bureaucracy carrying on things as usual in the conventional pattern, but a separate organization in the executive branch, to study this adversary intensively and to develop systematic knowledge regarding its methods and its procedures.

Second, it is to develop a program for meeting the Communist offensives with an adequate defense, and then to develop an appropriate counteroffensive.

In short, we have to develop a science of total warfare. Somebody has to do that and I believe this Freedom Commission will do it. It should work out for this new kind of total warfare a science such as Clausewitz and others developed for conventional warfare, the rules, the principles of war as fought in the past.

The Freedom Commission at that point, I think, will want to establish a freedom academy.

We don't say it has to, but we say it is authorized to do so, if its study leads it to conclude that this is an advantageous thing to do.

We wouldn't try to win a land war without a West Point to train our warriors in the science of land warfare. We wouldn't try to win a naval war without the Naval Academy to train officers in the science of naval warfare. When airplanes were developed and we developed sky warfare, we didn't trust the old Academies, we established a third

Academy at Colorado Springs, to train officers in the science of warfare in the skies.

How do we expect to meet successfully an enemy that is attacking us on all sorts of unexpected fronts, unless we have somewhere a group of topnotch people, the most competent in our country, working to develop the science of meeting today's enemy in his new kind of total warfare and overcoming him?

A science of defense, that is first. A science of successful counter-offensive is second. Third, in order to know ourselves as thoroughly as we know the enemy, I would hope that this Commission and this Academy would have a section concentrating on how to develop, release, and rise to the pull of the dynamic forces that are inherent in freedom. We have to know how to win for our faith as well as to prevent the other side's winning for its faith.

The Communists are in trouble behind the Iron Curtain. The urge of men to be free is moving mightily in the world once more; not so much in the free world where we still enjoy freedom and don't quite realize that it is threatened, but behind the Iron Curtain where people have been deprived of it. The urge of men to be free has not been exterminated there through environmental conditioning. Man is proving wrong the Communist theory that he is just like Pavlov's dogs and if taken early can be conditioned to accept his environment and react according to the conditioning with an automatic "yes" or "no."

We believe that man was born to be free, and that he has the in-born capacity to make moral judgments. This is our faith. If we don't believe this, then we ought to join the Communists. If we do believe it, then we ought to take full advantage of it. This urge of man to be free in his nature, it is inalienable, as our Declaration puts it, and unextractable from his nature.

Because men were born to be free and to stand with dignity, they have always managed to pull down their oppressors; and men now will find a way to weaken from within and pull down the present tyrants who oppress them and threatens us, if only we don't build those tyrants up, and if we will give hope to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain by proving to them that we will not let them down.

I hope very much, Mr. Chairman, that your committee will regard this project as one of the most important things that can possibly be done at this time.

Thirty-nine billion dollars we have appropriated for our conventional defenses. Yesterday in the House, we authorized almost \$3.6 billion to help our allies and all peoples who are free to remain free, because if they are able to maintain their independence, if they are able to keep their countries out of the control of the adversary, no matter how much they may dislike us, that is of great advantage to us and to other free peoples, as well as to themselves.

We are making these tremendous efforts to build our own strength and to build strength among all free peoples in the world, and yet we are making almost no effort at all in the one area where we are losing, the weak spot in the line where the adversary comes through.

We ought to concentrate on finding ways to plug that hole in our lines as the first step, and then to develop a strategy of victory, a science, and to train our people in it. We need to organize systemati-

cally so that we can take advantage of the forces in the universe that are on our side, can release them and move on to defeat of this new kind of adversary, and thus give human beings a chance once more to enjoy the blessings of liberty and the peace that will come only as a result of such freedom and justice and good relations among peoples in the world.

I have talked in overall general terms today because the great thing that we need is the urge, the will, to find the way.

We haven't had it in the past because we didn't quite see that it was necessary. And where there is no will, there is no way. But if we can somehow wake up to the urgency of our peril, I have no slightest doubt about our capacity to find a way. And I know no better way to start than to set up a specialized agency for this purpose as we always do in our Government when a new problem or a new opportunity or a new weapon or what have you comes along.

We discovered radio and TV and we set up the Federal Communications Commission, a specialized agency to deal with it.

We discovered atomic energy and we set up the Atomic Energy Commission, a specialized agency to deal with this new force.

Men find a way to send missiles into outer space and we set up special committees of the Congress and a special space commission to deal with this problem.

How does it happen that when everything we have is threatened by the most dangerous menace of our history, we haven't yet grappled intelligently and in dead earnest with it, or established a specialized agency to meet the threat?

Let's know our enemy, how to check his moves, and mount a successful counteroffensive against them.

Let's know ourselves and how to mobilize the powerful forces that are on our side. Let's establish a specialized agency to train people—both governmental officials and selected civilians—in the science of total warfare, so that we can win and live.

If I have talked too long, I apologize, Mr. Chairman, but I feel very deeply on this subject, I don't want us to go the way of Athens.

It is too bad for such a beautiful and blessed country as this to be in such danger of following the 20 civilizations before us that have gone to their doom. It is too bad if we are so busy with other things and too decent in our dedication to the finest values that our civilization has developed that we allow it to drift into such mortal dangers as we face today.

I shall be glad to answer any questions, if I can.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you, Dr. Judd. You have certainly supplemented and complemented the background remarks of your colleague, Congressman Herlong, who testified day before yesterday on this same subject and pretty much in the same area in which you did, laying the groundwork for the proposals made in the bill.

There is one thing that has been canvassed somewhat here before the committee by other committees. I am sure that it will ring a familiar note in your mind and the committee would be interested, I am sure, in any comment you might have on it.

After all, we have witnessed in America the infiltration of many of our institutions of thinking and of business and of training and education—yes, even our religious institutions—the infiltration of

some of the very thinking that you have been criticizing and condemning so much as having for its purpose, the conquest of the world.

We know that in our educational institutions we have witnessed that thing. We have witnessed those people who say that after all the Communists are just another political party.

Secondly, they resent it when people seek to deal sternly with the Communists.

Also, there are those who point out and say, "Well, they are different now, they are smiling, they are trying to coexist."

How can we assure ourselves, Dr. Judd, that maybe even this Freedom Academy, if it is established, will not sooner or later find termites in it, or maybe even be taken over by the termites who are burrowing so deeply and so destructively in so many of our other institutions?

Mr. Judd. There is no assurance, sir, except through eternal vigilance. We can be sure that if we set up such a commission, this will be its No. 1 target.

Senator HRUSKA. Exactly.

Representative Judd. They would be foolish not to try to take it over.

That isn't a nasty charge against them; that is a compliment. They have sense enough to know where the centers of power are.

You say they have infiltrated even our religious organizations. They are a primary target. Where else is there such an advantageous place to get in and work on the outside without suspicion, as in the churches?

A fellow said to me the other day, "Why would a minister become a Communist?" I said, "Ministers don't become Communists. Communists become ministers." They have been at this for 40 years. Years ago they assigned their smartest boys to go into the seminaries. It was their mission to get in where they could have greatest influence and be least suspect.

Likewise, college professors don't become Communists; Communists become college professors. Congressmen don't become Communists; Communists try to become Congressmen if they can fool enough people into supporting them.

I was in China when they took over China. They didn't talk about communism. They talked about Chinese nationalism. They talked about liberation of people from poverty and disease, and what they called medieval feudalism. They promised whatever they found the people wanted. They appeared to be fighting for the Chinese and their human aspirations, and they took the country over for the Communist Party.

Almost nobody would go with them if they came out openly and said, "Please join our party." One of the errors we often make is to assume that the Communist Party is a bona fide political party like the Republican and Democratic Parties, each trying to get 51 percent of the voters to join it. No, no; the Communists don't want 51 percent of the voters as members. They would have as much trouble as the Democrats or Republicans have when they get that many; they would quarrel among themselves. They don't want more

than 2 or 3 or 4 percent. They are always weeding out any fringe beyond that. It may not be completely reliable.

They have developed into practically an exact science techniques whereby the 2 percent that is disciplined and trained can control the other 98 percent. And they are doing it today in several countries.

In the end, I am sure it will break down, but not perhaps until after we have been overcome. So we must exercise eternal vigilance.

A new organization usually can stay clean for a while. Perhaps I shouldn't say this, but one reason we need this new agency is because some of the older organizations have gotten into inflexible grooves. Their 11th commandment is, "Thou shalt not upset the applecart." That becomes a rule in all the traditional agencies.

In Washington, the way we get ahead is by seniority, or as some people call it, senility. The way to get enough seniority to get ahead under that rule is never to make any enemies. What is the way not to make enemies? Never have an idea.

If you have a good idea, you will offend your superior. It reflects on him. Why didn't he think of it first?

If it is a bad idea, it reflects on him also. He has such an incompetent as an underling.

So in either case, you don't win favor with your superiors in any routinized organization by having ideas.

To get the fresh ideas and methods, we need to deal with our present world situation; we need a new agency. If, after 10 years, it becomes either infiltrated or frozen then we will have to do something else.

This enemy has all the tricks that there are, and I can give no guarantee that the thing might not become infiltrated. The representatives of the people in this Congress would have to watch for that. By and large, we are close to the realities, perhaps closer than any other group. Furthermore, we don't become too bureaucratized here because our tenure is too uncertain. We can all be changed very quickly. There are no civil service laws that protect us. We can't appeal to any bureau to keep us in office. We have to go back to the people and lay it on the line. That keeps us on our toes.

I don't think we can refuse to take a step that is good, just because it has some possible dangers.

Let me use an analogy. I wish sometimes more men in public life had had surgical training. I spent 19 years in the practice of surgery. Every day doctors have to make difficult choices between courses which both have dangers. Every time we operate, we are taking a life into our hands and the patient may die. Some may say we shouldn't operate because of the risk of the operation and, if the patient dies, we are responsible. But not to operate allows the cancer to go ahead, and we know that will kill the patient.

A cancer grows by the lawless process of encroaching on tissues that don't belong to it. That is also the best description I know of communism—it grows lawlessly by encroaching on countries and interests that don't belong to it.

When we see in a microscope even a few cells growing lawlessly, we don't say we should wait and see if it spreads. We know it will spread. It cannot change its character. We have to cut it out or cut off its blood supply so it can't grow. There are risks in that

operation. The husband says, You say my wife must have her breast removed because of that lump, but, Doctor, that is cruel. That is mutilating. It is bloody. Maybe she will get an infection, or have a hemorrhage, and die.

We say, Yes, that is right. There is risk if we operate, but there is also hope. If we don't operate, there is far greater risk and no hope. Therefore we operate.

Some will die, but the largest percentage will not. We save a great many more than we lose and for us to refuse the lesser risk, because of the possible death, is to accept the greater risk of certain death. It seems to me that is not a wise course to follow.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much.

Mr. Sourwine, have you any questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. I have one or two, Mr. Chairman.

Isn't it true, sir, that it is one of the objectives of the Communist conspiracy to seek to create in the minds of not only our people but peoples of all the free countries a concept of communism with the very objective of paralyzing any action that might otherwise be taken?

Mr. JUDD. There is no question about that. That is as true of the Communists as it was true of Philip when Demosthenes was talking about that very point.

It is one of their most effective appeals amongst the so-called less developed peoples. I have spent endless hours talking to Communists. Everyone of them was perfectly certain that they are going to win, as certain as I am that the sun is going to rise tomorrow.

They look at us with astonishment that we don't accept it too. To them this is not a dogma. They think Karl Marx discovered a law. The same as Newton when the apple hit him on the head is supposed in a flash of insight to have discovered the law of gravity, so Karl Marx—they will tell you—pouring over the history books in the library of the British Museum, noticed a consistent pattern in history, and in a flash of insight perceived the law by which societies develop. People went along for centuries without change, and then a new idea came along, an upward thrust—thesis they call it. The status quo resisted—antithesis. The pressures built up until there was an explosion, with violence, revolution, bloodshed, destruction. But out of it came a new pattern—synthesis—and man moved ahead. We believe that societies usually develop by gradual change or evolution—the leaven process. Karl Marx said it isn't so. Why are we so stupid as not to see that history develops by a series of explosions? You sit and talk to them by the hour and they are so sure of it. They can point to so much of history which on superficial examination seems to support their position. They make you wonder.

I tell you it made me proud of my country's basic educational system that there were only 23 of our boys that succumbed to this kind of brainwashing in Korea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Judd, you spoke of the parallel between an operation for cancer and the attack on the Communist conspiracy. This really has nothing to do with the bill, but I would like to take this opportunity to ask you when a surgeon operates for cancer, is he

content to remove the cancer or does he consider it important to remove the surrounding pink tissue?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, he has to take some normal tissue also if he wants to be sure of getting all the disease process. There are times in cancer when you can't operate. It is too late. When some one now suggests a preventive war, we must recognize that such a point has already been passed.

No. 1, we were not logical enough to do it when it could have succeeded. No. 2, we were not savage enough to do it. No. 3, it is now too late. We don't have sufficient superiority to do it. I bowed that course out a long time ago. We aren't that kind of people.

Furthermore, we would probably destroy the patient whom we are trying to save if we started it. We are reduced to the other course that surgeons use. We try to cut off the blood supply to prevent further spread, we cut its channels of communications even though we can't operate to remove the whole cancer.

It doesn't mean we are helpless. We have to do what we can do. We are not without weapons, by any means.

Mr. SOURWINE. Sir, witnesses here have referred to this bill as a conventional declaration of cold war, at least for the first time we have a legislative recognition that we are in a cold war and a legislative directive to fight that cold war.

Do you see it that way?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I agree with that. The Communists have an additional weapon in that they know they are at war with us, but we don't realize we are at war with them; and therefore we aren't willing to do the things necessary to win, the things that we would do if we realized we are at war.

We disarm ourselves psychologically, again because of our decencies, I feel strongly that our people will do whatever is necessary once they see we are in a war. And as I said earlier, this is a much more dangerous war than we have ever been in before, partly because it doesn't look like a war and therefore, we don't mobilize our full strength and discipline ourselves and galvanize ourselves into action to do the job that is necessary.

Mr. SOURWINE. Sir, do you see the freedom commission that would be established under this bill as an operating agency?

Mr. JUDD. Not primarily, at least not at the beginning. I think it might develop into one, but I would begin with the first task of developing a total plan and see how we go along.

I don't think we can win without a blueprint for total warfare; but I don't think anybody is likely to come up with such a blueprint unless somebody is set apart and commissioned to do just that.

Primarily, the first job is to analyze the enemy and systematize our knowledge with respect to him, analyze the forces on our side that can be used against him, systematically develop a science of total warfare, and then enlighten, alert, and train our people so they can and will apply that science successfully.

The amateur will always lose against the professional. I want professionals on our side. We have the better cause, but we are not professional in the presentation and advancement of it.

They have the poorer cause, but they are professionals in making their lies look good.

Mr. SOURWINE. This bill contains no amount on the particular authorization or appropriation.

Have you given any consideration to what might be the minimum cost to set up the freedom academy and operate it for 3 years?

Mr. JUDD. No, but it wouldn't be a substantial cost in comparison with what we are spending to fight the war on the old fronts where we don't even get at this enemy.

I would think that in the first few years its budget couldn't conceivably get beyond \$5 million and that figure is just picked out of my head.

I would expect it to be less.

Mr. SOURWINE. There have been several questions of witnesses about cost. I have been waiting for some witness to say we need this, we must have it, it doesn't make any difference what it cost.

Mr. JUDD. I will say that without hesitation. But you asked me what it would cost in the early stages. The need to spend whatever it takes is implicit in what I said earlier. We are spending \$39 billion for our own Armed Forces and we appropriated \$3.6 billion yesterday to help our allies with the bases and other facilities essential to our military defense. I don't see how we can choke on a figure only a tiny fraction of that, and I think we can afford it.

Mr. SOURWINE. No more questions.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much, Dr. Judd, for coming. You have added a great deal to our record.

Our next witness is Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick.

Mr. Philbrick, will you please come forward and take the witness chair. Have you copies of your statement?

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK, RYE, N.H.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I have copies of my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HRUSKA. You may proceed. We are glad to have you with us.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Thank you, Senator. I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity afforded me to testify before this committee in favor of the Mundt-Douglas bill to create the Freedom Commission.

Senator HRUSKA. In reality, Mr. Philbrick, it is a return engagement for you. You have been before congressional committees before.

Mr. PHILBRICK. It has been my opportunity and privilege to testify before this very committee several times before.

In fact, it is largely that testimony and some of the information which I have given this committee that has led me to support this bill.

That testimony concerned some of the things that I learned inside the Communist Party while serving as a counterspy for the FBI.

I know that, in the course of that testimony, I related that my entire experience with the Communist Party—and the FBI—began when I joined a supposedly legitimate group in Cambridge, Mass., in the spring of 1940, only to learn—after I had joined it—that the group was, in fact, a Communist-front organization.

I further testified that my own lack of information and knowledge concerning communism played a major part in the success of the Communists duping me into joining one of their phony organizations.

I further related, in my testimony before this committee, that between 300 and 400 other young people in Cambridge, Mass.—decent young people—were similarly victimized by the Communist criminal conspiracy, and that they, too, were victimized by ignorance.

Over the years that I worked as an informant for the FBI, I was appalled to observe, over and over again, how easily the Communists were able to dupe, to victimize, to fool innocent individuals. One of the documents prepared by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, entitled "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," provides evidence of the incredible success the Communists have had in an obviously well-planned, well-directed, and well-operated campaign of deception.

If the lack of information on the part of the American people has served to make them tools of Soviet agents, and if this had occurred on a civilian level only, this would have been bad enough. I believe that the record shows, however, that Americans who have gone into Government service have carried with them the same lack of information, and knowledge, concerning the Communist apparatus.

This has been borne out by experts better qualified to speak than I. The recent book by Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer "Wedemeyer Reports," cites a number of appalling errors of judgment on the part of Government leaders.

Ralph De Toledano, noted newswriter, indicated in his book, published in 1952 by Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, "Spies, Dupes, and Diplomats," that these errors of judgment had been taking place over a long period of time.

Robert Morris, former chief counsel of this committee, in his excellent book, "No Wonder We Are Losing," also cites a number of disastrous errors in judgment.

I think that it is high time that we Americans, all of us, frankly and humbly admit that, for a long time, we have made a series of disastrous and far-reaching mistakes. I believe that when the history of this period of time is written, it will be recorded that the Soviet Empire has won major victories, not because of any particular brilliance on the part of Communist action, but largely because of the inaction or wrong actions on the part of the U.S. Government and people.

All of these things, I believe, point to the great need for the proposed Freedom Commission, and the Freedom Academy, for the development of the science of counteraction to the World Communist conspiracy, and for the training and development of leaders in this, a total political war.

I can further testify to the needs for the Freedom Commission on the basis of my many contacts with the American people throughout the United States. For the past few years, I have lectured widely, in every State of the Union. Everywhere I go, I find people anxiously asking for information, what to do.

In Oklahoma City, last fall, I spoke to over 12,000 schoolteachers, members of the Oklahoma Education Association at their annual convention. After the lecture, many of the teachers came to the platform to tell me that in the entire State of Oklahoma, not one single solitary textbook was available for them to use for the instruction of their students concerning the most rudimentary facts about communism.

Many of the teachers told me that they were, on their own time, and using their own money, gathering together whatever material they could find, in order that they might bring some small amount of information to their students. They asked me: "Where can we get information? What can we tell our students to do?"

It has been suggested by some—and I agree wholeheartedly with them—that it would be better if private groups would do the job of the Freedom Commission, rather than the Government. But the fact is, the job is not being done.

Only last week I received a letter from a student at Harvard University. He asked me several questions concerning communism, and then he said, and I quote:

I do not have sufficient information to enable me to form an intelligent opinion.

It seems incredible that, at this time in world history, with not only our Nation but all the remaining nations of the free world facing a ruthless and deadly enemy; at a time when every newspaper in the United States every day carries stories concerning this enemy in its headlines; when not a single major radio program is heard or television newscast is seen without some mention of the Communist gangsters; at a time when not a single major magazine in the country does not carry some mention of the struggle over and over again; at this very time when the entire future of our Nation, our lives, and our fortunes are at stake—at this time, a student at a leading American university can say, "I do not have enough information to form an intelligent opinion."

I do not cite this instance to imply or suggest in any way subversive intent on the part of Harvard University, but only to indicate that apparently the youth of Cambridge today are no better informed than the youth who were victimized, along with myself, 20 years ago.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, the esteemed writers of many best sellers, said recently in their latest book, "What We Must Know About Communism":

The problems that harass our country today in relation to communism can best be summed up as problems of our unreadiness * * * The time has come when each of us is obligated to study the character of this new force which claims the human future as its own, and to convert such knowledge into an awareness of what is at stake and what needs to be done.

In the face of our own unreadiness, what has the enemy been doing?

It has again been a matter of my own testimony before this committee that when I joined the Young Communist League for the FBI, I was astonished by the great skill and knowledge of the Communist instructors who came into our cell meetings. These people were experts.

I quickly revised my previous estimation of Communists as half-witted, unkempt radicals. Over the years I observed that these people

were experts; they knew what they were doing; they knew what they wanted; and they had elaborately and meticulously planned each step in their campaign. Over the years I have constantly tried to warn our people, "Don't underestimate the Communists." It is not that they are any smarter; it is only that they work harder at it.

It is no accident that this was true. The Subversive Activities Control Board, in 1953, came upon information revealing that the conduct of the Communists' political warfare in the United States had been, in fact, outlined a long time ago in Moscow itself. One section of their report reads as follows, and I am quoting:

The evidence establishes that in the early 1930's respondent's students in the Lenin School were taught such subjects as Marxism, Leninism, the history of the labor movement, trade-union and strike strategy, history of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, history and organizational structure of the Communist International, the national and colonial problem, the history of the Communist Party, U.S.A., international propaganda, the theory and practice of Soviet economy, revolutionary tactics and the science of civil warfare. These subjects at the school were adapted to the peculiar conditions in the countries of the students, including the United States. For instance, the course given respondent's members on civil warfare included political and economic conditions in the United States, the culture of the people, the terrain, the histories of the United States and the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the degree of political maturity in the United States. * * * All this was taught with the object of destroying the economic system in the United States, and establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat here.

In the face of this expert training in political warfare on the part of our enemy, we in the United States have done little or nothing. We have tried to rely upon conventional weapons, and the conventional weapons have failed and are failing today, to maintain and secure the freedom and safety of our people.

The simple reason is, we have not been fighting back with the new weapons used by the Communists. The cold war is not just a figure of speech; this is a war, but it is a new and different kind of warfare.

Robert Byfield called it fourth dimensional warfare. So unfamiliar are the American people with this type of warfare that many people in the United States today still do not realize that we are at war.

During my years of observation inside the Communist Party, I learned that the Communists are being trained and taught not only what to do, but how to do it. It is high time that our people were provided with some information with which to fight back.

They need to better understand the nature of the international Communist conspiracy, and they need to be equipped with knowledge of effective methods for combating it. It was for this purpose that the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy were envisioned, and I strongly recommend the enactment of this bill.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Sourwine, do you have any questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. No questions.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Philbrick, why haven't we any textbooks in the schools on communism?

Mr. PHILBRICK. This is one of the strange mysteries that no one can seem to fathom.

It would seem that some of the largest publishing companies in this Nation, producing thousands of textbooks annually would at least produce one that could be used in our schools.

The Little, Brown Publishing Co. in Boston, for example, one of the largest textbook publishers in the country, so far as I know has nothing that can be used in the schools on the subject of communism.

Senator HRUSKA. First you must have the writers to produce the books.

Why haven't we got any writers? Have you ever given any thought to why we don't have them for the grade school, high school, and colleges in this particular field?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir, I indeed have and I must confess that I am unable to provide a reasonable or logical answer. I just don't know.

Senator HRUSKA. Among the public, we have, of course, what Dr. Judd described as the lack of will, the lack of an urge to do something in the area that we are exploring in these hearings.

Could it be that there is a lack of urge on the part of educators and teachers and a lack of will on their part to sit down and wrestle with this, or is there an aversion to it or just what is the answer?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I think, insofar as the teachers themselves are concerned, or the professors let us say, yes, there is not only a lack of urge but I would say there is a lack of desire, apparently, toward bringing into our colleges any information which would very seriously damage the Communists.

For example, a couple of months ago I was invited by some of the students at Harvard University to speak to one of their student groups. I was rather shocked to find that a great deal of resistance appeared, not on the part of the students, but on the part of some of the faculty members at Harvard to prevent me from speaking at Harvard; and yet this is the same campus where Mr. Castro, only shortly before, had received a great reception.

Dr. Oppenheimer had also been invited and had spoken at the campus and yet, when I was invited by the students to speak, they did their best to prevent me from appearing there.

Senator HRUSKA. It is not my recollection that Dr. Oppenheimer was working with the FBI at any time.

That is very interesting and bears again on the question I raised with Dr. Judd. Suppose we get this Commission and Academy rolling. How long will it be before even the students or the faculty have amongst their numbers those who are possessed perhaps of the same desire to sabotage and take control of the Academy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't know. Again, I agree with Dr. Judd. The Communists would be rather stupid if they didn't attempt to infiltrate the Freedom Academy.

I again, however, agree with him that if sufficient vigilance is taken a good job can be done.

For example, I cite Harding College in Searcy, Ark., under the leadership of Dr. George Benson. They have done a remarkably good job.

I know the students who come from that school are not confused about communism. They know the truth. Again, this is only an exception that proves the rule, but at Harding College I would be willing to bet you would not find a Communist or Communist sympathizer on the staff, and if one did manage to infiltrate the campus there, I am sure he wouldn't stay too long.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Following your own question, Mr. Chairman, do you think Congress should write into this bill some specific provisions to protect against possible infiltration of the Freedom Academy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I do, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you given any thought to the structure of the school or academy or center which would be formed under this school as to courses of study, as to organization, as to faculty, and so on?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, indeed. I have been in contact with Alan Grant of Orlando, Fla., for a long time.

As you know, he originally tried to establish such a school, such a Freedom Academy, as a private organization. His attempts, however, have not been successful, and, of course, this is why this has now been proposed as a Government Commission.

I know it is the intent of the plan to bring into the school qualified people and we have them. We have many on this committee, certainly, who are qualified to teach; who have learned through application, through study, by gathering knowledge concerning communism, and who know how to teach the nature of the Communist criminal conspiracy; how it operates and what it intends to do.

I don't think it is going to be quite that easy for the Academy to devise or to develop plans of counteraction. This is something that, as I said before, we Americans must admit, all of us, that we have not done.

This is one of the things that the Academy will attempt to do and I think that, with the people we have available today scattered throughout the United States, brought together to work together, a good program and effective program of counteraction could be developed.

This is something that does not exist today and I don't think any one of us would attempt to claim that we have the answer or that any one of us individually knows the answer to the problem.

This is one of the things the Freedom Academy would seek out and discover.

Senator HRUSKA. Of course, as to the textbooks and the gathering of information for schools, I don't want to suggest that maybe the fault lies exclusively with the faculty or teachers in the school.

We read on occasion, when courses are considered for offering in schools on communism, there are sometimes objections by lay people saying they don't want their children exposed to the philosophy of the Communist.

Have you any comment in that regard, on the resistance and the opposition maybe amongst lay people who are not well enough informed or not possessed of that will and that urge to do those things which Dr. Judd outlined?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I know, sir, that that has happened on a few occasions. I think that it happened largely because of a lack of understanding on the part of the individuals opposed to the program.

Also, I think that some of this opposition came about because it was discovered upon analysis, that occasionally when these courses on communism were proposed for the schools, they unfortunately turned

out to be courses favorable to communism rather than doing any particular harm to the Communists.

I know this happened in Scarsdale, N.Y., a community just outside of New York City, when a number of the parents discovered that some of the students were being taught about communism all right. The only trouble was that the courses were completely favorable to the Communist cause, and, as you know, this became quite a notorious national incident.

Over 100 books were found in the Scarsdale school library about communism, but all were written by Communists and pro-Communists. There was not one single, solitary book in the school library against communism, or exposing communism.

There was not in the Scarsdale library for the use of the students one copy of the excellent reports that this committee has published.

Now I think that is partly the reason. I would say this, that, in contrast to those incidents, I have found in my travels about the United States that most parents I have spoken to are hoping that the schools will teach and will bring the truth about communism to their children.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you, Mr. Philbrick. The chairman personally thinks you are doing a very fine and effective job, nationwide, in your travels and your lectures, and I should like to say that to you and to bid you good luck and a lot more years ahead in this very fine work.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you for coming.

Our next witness will be Dr. Leo Cherne, executive director of the Research Institute of America.

Dr. Cherne, will you come forward and take the witness chair, please.

TESTIMONY OF LEO CHERNE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Mr. CHERNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a great privilege to testify before this committee in support of Senate bill 1689, the Freedom Commission Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted if there is the opportunity, at the close of the testimony, to address myself to two of the questions which you raised with the previous witnesses.

Senator HRUSKA. That would please the chairman and I know it would enlighten him and the whole committee.

Mr. CHERNE. My remarks flow from a conviction which, in turn, has been created by the last 24 years of my own professional preoccupation and involvement as executive director of the Research Institute of America and in a voluntary capacity as chairman of the board of the International Rescue Committee.

As executive director of the Research Institute of America, recently described at West Point as "the central intelligence agency of business," it has been my responsibility to guide a staff of economists, attorneys, psychologists, sociologists, accountants, industrial engineers, foreign affairs specialists, and political scientists who are deeply concerned with all of the major aspects of our economy and with the

increasing impact of events in far distant countries upon the most intimate details of the life of the average American citizen.

In the course of this activity, I have been deeply involved in the preparation of the industrial mobilization plans before World War II, in the internal economic mobilization during the war years, and in the economic warfare waged throughout the world during the war. I was also called upon to play a role in the conduct of political warfare during those years. It has also been as a result of my association with the Research Institute of America that I have, since 1938, participated in the courses of instruction given at the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the U.S. Military Academy.

At the conclusion of the war, at the request of the White House, I undertook a detailed political, economic, and social study of England, France, and Germany; and subsequently, at the request of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the War Department, I directed the staff of the Research Institute in planning the reorganization of a major segment of the Japanese economy.

I have also, for many years, been deeply concerned with the aggressive danger to the free world presented by the totalitarian governments of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Because of this interest, almost 15 years ago I became a director of the International Rescue Committee, which has assisted thousands of the most distinguished scientists, writers, artists, and political leaders who fled Nazi Germany, and in recent years has assisted more than 100,000 of those who have fled the slave empire behind the Iron Curtain.

During the last 7 years I have functioned as Chairman of the Board of the International Rescue Committee and, in that capacity, became deeply involved in the tragedy of Berlin the winter of 1953, when as many as 6,000 escapees daily fled the Soviet Zone of Germany. I also tried to provide some help to the Hungarian people in their heroic struggle to achieve their freedom in October 1956. I was, in fact, the first American to confer with Cardinal Mindszenty in Budapest on the morning of his release from Communist imprisonment. This background also enabled me to play a role in assisting the new Government of Vietnam to meet the crisis which confronted that new country right after the 1954 Geneva armistice. The sum total of these activities does, I believe, enable me to make some assessment of the training which is available in the United States today for various aspects of the struggle against Soviet imperialism.

In the months and years immediately before us, there are several facts that must dominate our planning and actions:

1. The war which the Soviet Union conducts against the free, the independent, the remaining colonial, and even the neutral nations of the world, has been and will continue to be a war waged by the Communists with every available instrument. Not only does this warfare involve the most complete use of military, diplomatic, economic, political, subversive and ambiguous techniques, but it is one which regards as the battlefield all levels of a society under attack. The boundaries of this warfare include every society which is not yet safely imprisoned within the Communist empire.

2. There is, of course, no alternative to totally adequate military preparedness and the deep involvement of the United States in the adequacy of the military strength of our friends and allies.

3. There is urgent need for economic assistance of every character, particularly to the developing nations of the world, in order to assist them to develop a higher standard of living for their people within a climate of freedom and democracy.

4. The diplomatic, the intelligence, the informational and cultural functions of our Government have increasingly important roles to play in the struggle which lies ahead.

5. This testimony is in no sense to be regarded as seeking to diminish in any way the need for programs which are in existence or are before the Congress. I do testify, however, in the belief that those programs can achieve those objectives only if the individuals involved officially in the performance of those activities, and the countless others whose private efforts accompanying these governmental functions, are adequately trained to understand, and counter Communist warfare of the character which has been so well described.

I am frankly less concerned with the need for adequate training for Government personnel, though it is important to recognize that the various institutions for the education of military and civilian personnel which exist today reflect a world which was profoundly different, and warfare of an entirely different character. The National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the institutions which train the foreign service have all taken recognition of the fact and nature of the Soviet Union, yet they fundamentally must concern themselves with the very large and very complex professional guidance required by their particular function. The equally important instruments of political, economic, organizational, and ambiguous warfare remain only footnotes of preoccupation in the existing institutions. I speak with greater certainty that we have hardly tapped that reservoir of talent in the country at large which will be required if we are even to hold our own in the nonmilitary aspects of the struggle. A recent study of educational activities within the executive branch of the Government (Lilly report) shows that while systematic *information about* communism, its objectives, how it operates, and so forth, exists to a limited extent and in a piecemeal fashion, there is nowhere at the present time any training of U.S. Government personnel, or those persons involved in the exchange programs which could lead to an understanding of the *techniques of organization* which are at the heart of any effective counteraction program against the Communist cadres. As a matter of fact, the principles of conventional diplomacy, for example, regard counteraction as a harmful emphasis.

That this should be so is tragic and this gap in our armor stems from a failure to recognize the nature and scope of the cold war. The fact that, between the conventional techniques of government-to-government diplomacy and the normal military defenses, there exist only the rigidly nonpolitical foreign aid program and the apolitical cultural exchange efforts is an anachronism in this revolutionary age.

It seems to me that the heart of the problem is the failure to understand the nature of the implications of the revolutionary character of the age in which we live and the revolutionary character of the enemy who is committed to our destruction. It is not unusual that men of good will, people whose purpose is peace, citizens who live in a community which has religious and moral attributes that are generous and decent, project that image upon others. It is not that they are

gullible; it is that they are unprepared by belief, by study, by contact, to accept the profoundly different commitments which guide the Soviet Union and the agents of its warfare abroad.

When the Reverend Billy Graham, after an exhaustive 5 days' study of the Soviet Union, reported the high morality and religious fervor of the Russians, he reached judgments which were at one and the same time true, if superficial, false, and damaging and altogether irrelevant. A better trained observer would have realized that the danger to the world is the force which has enslaved one-third of the earth's people; the Soviet Government, using the Russian people.

If, by morality, the Reverend Billy Graham means that the Russians wear longer bathing suits than we do, he is quite right. If his evidence has persuaded him that in the Soviet Union all aspects of the culture place a lesser emphasis upon sex than is the case in the United States and the countries of Western Europe, this is also entirely true. These, however, are purposeless manifestations of morality when contrasted with the fact that those who first enslaved and then butchered the Hungarians, who were simply seeking freedom, were also Russians.

It is true that the Russian people, as people, not only wish peace but would themselves prefer freedom. But it is equally true that they have become tools for the actions of a government which has committed genocide repeatedly, which threatens war and destruction constantly, but which uses brutality as a standard operating procedure to enforce its inhuman and immoral objectives.

And, to the extent that the Russian people are the victims, as well as the instruments of the Soviet, it was urgent that the Reverend Graham take notice of that key reality.

Similarly, if the evidence of the Russian religious spirit lies in the fact that St. Basil's Cathedral towers above the walls of the Kremlin and that thousands of Russians attend religious services, then, by that test, Russia is religious. A serious student of Russian church history would, however, recall that some of the hierarchs of Russian Orthodoxy have been as willing to acquiesce in the brutality, nationalism, and intrigue of the Kremlin as they were in the violence, bloodshed, and abuses of the Russian people by the Czars of Russia.

A short sophisticated course in the complex realities of life in the Soviet Union, such as this bill would provide, would have aided the Reverend Billy Graham to discern the sin against humanity which lies astride the Russian people and the Russian nation with something of the same acuteness which enables him to observe and inveigh against sin in the Western World countries, with which he is much more familiar. Such a course would have saved Reverend Graham from confusing his religious and moral following at a moment of acute crisis for the free countries of the West.

When my good friend the hard-hitting Judge Samuel Leibowitz, after having visited one model prison outside Moscow, concluded that Soviet prisons are more modern and humane than ours, the judge not only cavalierly neglected to observe that he was visiting the one show-case prison that is used to impress westerners, including Averell Harriman only recently, but permitted himself to be used to create the impression that the slave labor camps are a thing of the past.

I regret to say so, because I have personal affection for him, but

Judge Leibowitz was as unsophisticated and dangerously superficial in neglecting to look behind the front he was permitted to observe in Moscow as he was when he failed to observe who and what was behind his selection as lawyer to defend the Scottsboro boys more than 20 years ago. The Scottsboro boys were undoubtedly as innocent and as framed as millions of those who still pay their brutal penalty in Vorkuta and the host of other slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and Siberia. It is pertinent to ask whether Judge Leibowitz met any of the thousands of Hungarian students who were hauled off in sealed boxcars from Budapest in November and December of 1956. If they were not in that model prison, where were they—certainly not back in Hungary.

I have no doubt that Judge Leibowitz' immediate and limited observations were entirely accurate. He is, as he has always been, a man of determined honesty. But honesty which does not seek to penetrate the surface can only serve the most dishonest imperial fraud of the 20th century. As lawyer and judge, Sam Leibowitz knows well the mentality and the ruthless practices of the gangster. He might well have brought this experience and these powers of observations to bear on the occupants of the Kremlin, who are not safe even in each other's company.

In our age, as in any revolutionary period, the fabric of societies is weakened, seams come apart more readily; in a revolutionary period the potential of an individual acting on his own or in an organized group increases tremendously.

The Communists know this perfectly well. And that is why for years they have concentrated on training personnel to infiltrate and seek to control every area of life in a given society in order to wring the last measure of political advantage, and these efforts of theirs have been immensely successful.

Let me give you an example from my own experience as to how this Communist effort works. Shortly after World War II, I was asked by General MacArthur, in my capacity as executive director of the Research Institute of America, to undertake a basic revision of the Japanese tax and fiscal structure. The prewar industrialization of Japan, superimposed as it was on the top of a feudal society, never permitted the development of a healthy, viable middle class. And without such a healthy middle class, democracy would be impossible. Therefore, tax measures were introduced which were designed to produce in a short time the strong middle class necessary to the political pluralisms of democracy. Now, the moment that the essence of this plan was announced, and its purposes explained, an unexpected event occurred throughout the nation: The tax collectors went on strike. The Communist leaders of that union were clearly following the instructions of the central political apparatus in the Kremlin. They knew clearly that, if the tax plan was enforced, the power of a wealthy few reduced, the land redistributed, and a healthy middle class developed, the chances of Communist control of Japan would be seriously diminished. This is an example of astute political warfare carried out by well trained persons operating in key positions in captured private organizations.

This is the sort of thing that goes on all the time all over the world. A large youth organization in India passes a resolution about the

stopping of H-bomb tests; copies of American magazines suddenly are unavailable at the newsstands in Jakarta; students riot in Latin America; Kerala, the most literate of India's states, goes Communist; the sects in the new Republic of Vietnam suddenly turn on the central Government; the newspapers of the world accept uncritically and without quotes the adjective "free city" of Berlin when discussing Khrushchev's ultimatum. A boatload of armed Kurdish "refugees" from the U.S.S.R. pass through the Suez Canal on their way to Iraq. These things don't just happen by accident. They are the results of organization and training.

Little in the arsenal of existing U.S. action is geared to counteract this kind of political warfare. No training program exists today in the United States which can adequately prepare our citizens for this struggle. As I have indicated before, I am particularly concerned with the vast multitude of private American citizens who are and will increasingly be involved in activity abroad. The nongovernmental voluntary organizations already employ thousands of private individuals operating in oversea areas. With each month, additional numbers of American business executives, educators, consultants, and community specialists embark to perform vital, separate roles in countries which are in the very heart of the battlefield. Artistic, cultural, scientific, and entertainment groups are an additional increasing body of American representatives contesting, in their own way, the unequal effort upon which the Soviet is engaged.

There is a great interest in and preoccupation with communism in the United States. It is my belief, nevertheless, that hardly more than a handful really understand the precise nature of the Communist, his commitment, his instructions, his methods of operation and the mechanism to which he is linked by absolute loyalty. Is it strange then that these aspects operating in other countries are even less well understood?

And this failure to understand the dimensions of the war we must fight has already cost us a great deal. Yet we have hardly begun the task of harnessing and organizing the vast reservoir of talent and brains for the political warfare we cannot avoid.

This is why I consider the Freedom Commission Act and the Academy to be of such central importance for the development and training which will assist our whole cold war program immeasurably. The Academy is the institution within which we can bring together that talent and experience which can develop an operational science of political counteraction within the framework of our democratic structures. The most important and thrilling thing about this bill 1689 is that it offers the beginnings of a basic solution to the problem. We recognize the urgent and even heroic programs which proceed within the scope of the State Department, the CIA and the USIA. These leave, however, largely uninvolved and untrained other foreign programs of our Government and the infinitely more numerous private sectors representing the United States and the foreign communities which are a part of the battlefield.

There has been an understandable concern in the Congress over the granting of passports to those servants of the Communist conspiracy who in traveling abroad will seek to misrepresent and actively injure our freedom. This danger is real. But it is small in my judg-

ment when contrasted to the loss we suffer because infinitely more numerous patriotic Americans, functioning here and abroad, are unable to bring to their travel or work, their fraternal contacts or the exercise of their professions a disciplined knowledge of the enemy we face, the techniques designed to destroy us and the methods by which we may fortify our safety.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Cherne, that is an excellent statement and I think an excellent one for the committee. I noticed that in following the manuscript which you gave us you skipped around a little. Would you like the privilege or would you permit us to put the entire manuscript in the record which you gave, as though you had read it in its entirety, so we can have it as a part of the record and for the information of the other members of the committee?

Mr. CHERNE. I would be delighted to have you do that. I merely eliminated certain portions of it in the interest of conserving your time but would appreciate having the full statement copied into the record as though I had read it word for word..

Senator HRUSKA I might say that you did it without hurting the substance or the text. In fact, I think you emphasized it beautifully.

(Dr. Cherne's prepared statement reads as follows:)

STATEMENT OF LEO CHERNE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a great privilege to testify before this committee in support of Senate bill 1689, the Freedom Commission Act.

It is usual, I know, to preface testimony before committees of this sort with a few formal gracious words of introduction but in this instance my introductory words are not, in any sense, formal. They flow from a conviction, which, in turn, has been created by the last 24 years of my own professional preoccupation and involvement as executive director of the Research Institute of America and in a voluntary capacity as chairman of the board of the International Rescue Committee.

As executive director of the Research Institute of America, recently described at West Point as "the central intelligence agency of business, it has been my responsibility to guide a staff of economists, attorneys, psychologists, sociologists, accountants, industrial engineers, foreign affairs specialists, and political scientists who are deeply concerned with all the major aspects of our economy and with the increasing impact of events in far distant countries upon the most intimate details of the life of the average American citizen.

In the course of this activity, I have been deeply involved in the preparation of the industrial mobilization plans before World War II, in the internal economic mobilization during the war years, and in the economic warfare waged throughout the world during the war. I was also called upon to play a role in the conduct of political warfare during those years. It has also been as a result of my association with the Research Institute of America that I have, since 1938, participated in the courses of instruction given at the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the U.S. Military Academy.

At the conclusion of the war, at the request of the White House, I undertook a detailed political, economic and social study of England, France, and Germany; and subsequently, at the request of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the War Department, I directed the staff of the Research Institute in planning the reorganization of a major segment of the Japanese economy.

I have also, for many years, been deeply concerned with the aggressive danger to the free world presented by the totalitarian governments of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Because of this interest, almost 15 years ago I became a director of the International Rescue Committee, which has assisted thousands of the most distinguished scientists, writers, artists, and political leaders who fled Nazi Germany, and in recent years has assisted more than 100,000 of those who have fled the slave empire behind the Iron Curtain. During the past 7 years I have functioned as chairman of the board of the Inter-

national Rescue Committee and, in the course of that responsibility, was deeply involved in the acute dilemma of Berlin during the days of the airlift, the tragedy of Berlin in the winter of 1953, when as many as 6,000 escapees daily fled the Soviet Zone of Germany. I also assisted the Hungarian people in their struggle to achieve their freedom in October 1956. I was, in fact, the first American to confer with Cardinal Mindszenty in Budapest on the morning of his release from Communist imprisonment. This background also enabled me to play a role in assisting the new Government of Vietnam to meet the crisis which confronted that new country right after the 1954 Geneva Armistice. The sum total of these activities does, I believe, enable me to make some assessment of the training which is available in the United States today for various aspects of the struggle against Soviet imperialism.

In the months and years immediately before us there are several facts that must dominate our concerns and our acts:

1. The war which the Soviet Union conducts against the free, the independent, the remaining colonial, and even the neutral nations of the world has been and will continue to be a war waged by the Communists with every available instrument. Not only does this warfare involve the most complete use of military, diplomatic, economic, political, subversive, and ambiguous techniques, but it is one which regards as the battlefield all levels of any society and the boundaries of this warfare include every society which is not yet safely imprisoned within the Communist empire.

2. There is, of course, no alternative to totally adequate military preparedness and the deep involvement of the United States in the adequacy of the military strength of our friends and allies.

3. There is urgent need for economic assistance of every character particularly to the developing nations of the world, in order to assist them to develop a higher standard of living for their people within a climate of freedom and democracy.

4. The diplomatic, the intelligence, the informational and cultural functions of our Government have increasingly important roles to play in the struggle which lies ahead.

5. This testimony is in no sense to be regarded as seeking to diminish in any way the need for programs which are in existence or are before the Congress. I do testify, however, in the belief that those programs can achieve those objectives only if the individuals involved officially in the performance of those activities and the countless others whose private efforts accompanying these governmental functions are adequately trained to understand and counter warfare of the character which I have described.

I am frankly less concerned with the need for adequate training for Government personnel though it is important to recognize that the various institutions for the education of military and civilian personnel which exist today reflect a world which was profoundly different and warfare of an entirely different character. To the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy there has recently been added the Air Force Academy and there is an urgent specialized basis for this particular service in the Armed Forces. The National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the institutions which train the Foreign Service have all taken recognition of the fact and nature of the Soviet Union yet they fundamentally must concern themselves with the very large and very complex professional guidance required by their particular function. The equally important instruments of political, economic, organizational, and ambiguous warfare remain only footnotes of preoccupation in the existing institutions. It is my judgment that the United States has as yet inadequately introduced that level of coordination within the functions of government that we must have if we want to survive. I speak with greater certainty that we have hardly tapped that reservoir of talent in the country at large which will be required if we are even to hold our own in the nonmilitary aspects of the struggle. A recent study of educational activities within the executive branch of the Government (Lilly report) shows that while systematic information about communism, its objectives, how it operates, etc., exists to a limited extent and in a piecemeal fashion, there is nowhere at the present time any training of U.S. Government personnel, or those persons involved in the exchange programs which could lead to an understanding of the techniques of organization which are at the heart of any effective counteraction program against the Communist cadres. As a matter of fact the principles of conventional diplomacy, for example, regard counteraction as a harmful emphasis.

That this should be so is tragic and this gap in our armor stems from a failure

to recognize the nature and scope of the cold war. The fact that between the conventional techniques of government to government diplomacy and the normal military defenses there exist only the rigidly nonpolitical foreign aid program and the apolitical cultural exchange efforts is an anachronism in this revolutionary age.

It seems to me that the heart of the problem is the failure to understand the nature and the implications of the revolutionary character of the age in which we live and the revolutionary character of the enemy who is committed to our destruction. It is not unusual that men of good will, people whose purpose is peace, citizens who live in a community which has religious and moral attributes that are generous and decent, project that image upon others. It is not that they are gullible, it is that they are unprepared by belief, by study, by contact, to accept the profoundly different commitments which guide the Soviet Union and the agents of its warfare abroad. In our age, as in any revolutionary period, the fabric of societies is weakened, seams come apart more readily; in a revolutionary period the potential of an individual acting on his own or in an organized group increases tremendously.

The Communists know this perfectly well. And that is why for years they have concentrated on training personnel to infiltrate and seek to control every area of life in a given society in order to wring the last measure of political advantage and these efforts of theirs have been immensely successful.

Let me give you an example from my own experience as to how this Communist effort works. Shortly after World War II, I was asked by General MacArthur, in my capacity as Executive Director of the Research Institute of America, to undertake a basic revision of the Japanese tax and fiscal structure. Such a program seemed particularly central to the introduction of democratic structures into the social fabric of postwar Japan; because the prewar industrialization of Japan, superimposed as it was on the top of a feudal society, never allowed for the development of a healthy, viable middle class. And without such a healthy middle class, democracy would be impossible. Therefore tax measures were introduced which were designed to produce in a short time the strong middle class necessary to the political pluralisms of democracy. Now the moment that the essence of this plan was announced, and its purposes explained, a mysterious event occurred throughout the nation: The tax collectors went on strike. The Communist leaders of that union were clearly following the instructions of the central political apparatus in the Kremlin. They knew clearly that if the tax plan was enforced, the power of a wealthy few reduced, the land redistributed, and a healthy middle class developed, the chances of Communist control of Japan would be seriously diminished. This is an example of astute political warfare carried out by well trained persons operating in key positions in apparently private organizations.

This is the sort of thing that goes on all the time all over the world. A large youth organization in India passes a resolution about the stopping of H-bomb tests; copies of American magazines suddenly are unavailable at the newsstands in Jakarta; an entertainer rockets to fame in New York; students riot in Latin America; Kerala, the most literate of India's states goes Communist; the sects in the new Republic of Vietnam suddenly turn on the Central Government; the newspapers of the world accept uncritically and without quotes the adjective "free city" of Berlin when discussing Khrushchev's ultimatum. A boatload of armed Kurdish "refugees" from the U.S.S.R. pass through the Suez Canal on their way to Iraq. These things don't just happen by accident. They are the result of organization and training.

Little in the arsenal of existing U.S. action is geared to counteract this kind of political warfare. No training program exists today in the United States which can adequately prepare our citizens for this struggle. As I have indicated, I am particularly concerned with the vast multitude of private American citizens who are and will increasingly be involved in activity abroad. The non-governmental voluntary organizations already employ thousands of private individuals operating in oversea areas. With each month additional numbers of American business executives, educators, consultants, community specialists embark to perform vital, separate roles in countries which are in the very heart of the battlefield. Artistic, cultural, scientific, and entertainment groups are an additional increasing body of American representatives contesting in their own way the unequal effort upon which the Soviet is engaged.

There is a great interest in and preoccupation with communism in the United States. It is my belief, nevertheless, that hardly more than a handful really understand the precise nature of the Communist, his commitment, his

instructions, his methods of operation and the mechanism to which he is linked by absolute loyalty. Is it strange then that these aspects operating in other countries are even less well understood?

And this failure to understand the dimensions of the war we must fight has already cost us a great deal. It may not be important in the United States that the most prominent American businessmen roll out the red carpet for the Communist Mikoyan, and no one is suggesting that the resolve of these men was in any way weakened. But you can be sure that for many people around the world the stature of Mikoyan and their respect for Communist economic power rose tremendously.

The failure to understand quickly enough the implications of the Communist attempt to get the escapees to return home, and their kidnaping by the Soviets hurt the cause of the free world greatly. One need only read some of the statements made by the returned refugees and then listen to their impact on the people still in refugee camps in the West to understand the measure of dissatisfaction, and disillusionment this campaign produced.

Examples like this could be multiplied hundreds of times. This is not meant as an indictment of those in whose hands the responsibility for America's cold war struggle lay. Often they understood more than anyone else. But the Nation was not prepared to understand what was required, and so we just haven't been able to be smart enough. We have not yet begun the task of harnessing and organizing the vast reservoir of talent and brains for the political warfare job we must undertake.

This is why I consider the Freedom Commission Act and the Academy to be of such central importance for the development and training which will assist our whole cold war program immeasurably. The Academy is the institution within which we can bring together that talent and experience which can develop an operational science of political warfare within the framework of our democratic structures. The most important and thrilling thing about this bill 1689 is that it offers the beginnings of a basic solution to the problem. Each of the various departments and agencies of the Government and the private organizations who are concerned with the problem of political warfare will have available to them in a single center the possibility for continuity, interrelationships and meshing into the wide spectrum of counteraction.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Cherne, I asked a previous witness today, and I did yesterday also, a question about the structure of this Academy and some of its courses of study and the mechanical makeup.

Have you given that subject any thought so that you could give the committee some suggestions in that direction?

Mr. CHERNE. Yes; I have given that subject some thought. I know it has been a great deal less than Alan Grant and the others who have devoted so many dedicated years to this effort but to the extent that my thought makes a contribution, I will be happy to do so. I would like to return to one aspect of my testimony.

I indicated, as we all know, a number of educational institutions which are presently concerned with the training of certain portions of our governmental personnel. They are the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, the National War Colleges, the Foreign Service Institutes. I also indicated that, while in these institutions there is an occasional reference to the problem of protracted conflicts and the problem consequently of conflicting management, there are two things which do operate.

Those two aspects of the problem are merely footnotes, by necessity, in the existing institutions. Secondly, within at least one of the institutions, the preoccupation with these aspects is, in fact, in conflict with normal purposes.

I am referring here to the Foreign Service Institutes, the normal diplomatic corps which does not regard conflict management and counteraction as a useful normal instrument of the Foreign Service.

I believe, incidentally, they are entirely correct in their view, but in providing this footnote material, these institutions have already assembled the names of those specialists, the lecturers and their lectures which were taken in shorthand.

Consequently, we are not dealing with a matter entirely novel. In fact, the experts are well known to the members of this committee. The experts are, in fact, well known—and you raised another question earlier—to the members of the educational community of the United States. The experts are available. They are, in fact, about to be tapped for, I believe, a 2 weeks' training session this summer of the Officer Reserve here in Washington, in which a certain portion of that officer training will be involved in an examination of some aspects of these questions.

However, on the second part, on the science of counteraction, here a great deal more must be done.

Here, too, we are not completely in the dark. It must be evident to the members of this committee that, after having been burned badly as a result largely of its own blindness, the American labor community, an overwhelmingly large community, began to understand two things—the nature of the enemy and the urgency of counteraction.

The American labor movement, through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, has been involved in the counteraction.

Here, too, we are not dealing with blue sky. We are dealing with the availability in the United States today of the beginnings of exploration on the process of counteraction.

Senator HRUSKA. Now, you referred to the matter of passports and said that, while there is danger of an abuse of the relaxed standards for passports, the greater danger lies in these many other representatives, not of Government, but of businessmen and of others who go abroad.

Now, it would seem, would it not, Dr. Cherne, that some provision should be made, some thought should be given, not only to a formal school which would have a 2-year course and a year of postgraduate work and a doctor's degree and so on, but to some available practical courses not necessarily by way of indoctrination, but certainly by way of having heavy tones in that direction, for men who will be sent by corporations to foreign lands to represent them for 2, 3, or 5 years or as long as they would stay.

Would you like to comment on that and tell us what your ideas are as to the possibilities of perfecting something like that which would not necessarily be required by law of these corporations, but which they in their self-interest should follow and take advantage of?

Mr. CHERNE. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that the observation you have made is essential to the entire prospect of an effective counteraction, that at least half of the process of developing effective counteraction might involve shorter courses of education, of orientation to those who go abroad for more limited periods or more limited purposes.

Consequently, such an Academy must have at its very earliest and as one of its central objectives, the provision of short courses of education in the problem of the Soviet Union and the means of counteracting it.

It is my judgment, incidentally, on the basis of concrete information, that business institutions, among others, will be eager to avail themselves of the opportunity to have members of their staff secure this education.

I am amazed constantly to learn of the many thousands of business executives who, year in and year out, take two weeks' training which is provided annually by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in industrial mobilization.

Now these are men who presently have no knowledge of industrial mobilization. This is merely in the unhappy, terrible event of another war. Nevertheless, they put 2 weeks aside and, as I recall, more than 20 major cities of the United States devote 2 weeks' time to the industrial mobilization plan.

The need for it among businessmen cannot possibly be exaggerated.

If I may be permitted, I would like to read a letter I received yesterday from a very able and successful businessman who retired a year ago and who has spent one solid year traveling around the world and who considers himself, with some small reason, to be a very informed world student as a consequence.

He now writes:

It was nice of you to think of me and forward the reproduction of Eugene Lyons' speech.

I think he has somewhat of a fixational viewpoint on the Russian Communist leaders, as his entire speech harped constantly on the individuals involved and overlooked the Russian people and the nation as a whole.

There is one element of reality to his comments. That is the so-called political leadership such as Khrushchev, Mikoyan, who can cause a lot of trouble and get a nation into war. There is nothing new about that. By past experience Hitler and Mussolini did the same thing. However, several individuals on our side of the fence, such as Dulles and Herter, can force the same thing.

The people don't want war. That is true of the Russian people. They are very friendly. Most of them know two English words—"please" and "friend."

I mingled with them in two different areas of their country geographically which was like New York, Cleveland, and Chicago. There is hardly a Russian family who, during the last war, did not have somebody killed or wounded. They are fed up with the strife.

Right now they are well fed and dressed, happy and contented.

It is the so-called bickering and negotiating by political statesmen that will cause war, and people like Eugene Lyons, who stir up antagonism, don't help much.

I am planning a trip to South America, probably around January or February. I have been to Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama. I would like to feel I have been to every country in South America.

Frankly, I should fear to think of his inadequate information now extending to South America. It is clear that he was wholly unprepared on any level to understand what he saw in the Soviet Union or to understand the relationship between the Soviet people and the government of the Soviet Union.

It is not the people of Russia who now threaten Berlin. It is the government of the Soviet Union which threatens Berlin.

It is not the people of Russia which established the cold war. It is the government of the Soviet Union which established the cold war.

Unfortunately, an untrained individual looks at faces. He sees faces which he suggests resemble those of Cleveland, New York and Chicago. He is wholly honest and I am sure sometimes intensely wishes: "Why can't we live in peace," and he comes back concluding it is just a matter of a resolution on our part.

That, if we just act peaceful, they will want peace. Lost in this mass of misunderstanding is the entire conspiracy of the Soviet imperialism.

Senator HRUSKA. Which, as Dr. Judd and many other witnesses have testified, has not changed and will not prevail until they are subdued.

One other question, would it be practical, in your judgment, in this process of education and training in short courses or long courses, would it be practical for the Commission to contract with some of our Nation's universities to get the job done?

Mr. CHERNE. I have no doubt it would be practical and I would suspect that some of our universities would be the desirable site of some of these short courses or instruction to which you have referred previously. But, I should think that, by and large, it would not be desirable at the early stages to contract to a university, any university, the job of either the assembly of the Academy or the job of the preparation of the curriculum.

Senator HRUSKA. Why not?

Mr. CHERNE. Well, if the universities had demonstrated any capacity to do this job, they would, in fact, have been doing it on their own campus, and I see no evidence. And may I also say I am not singling out the universities in that respect. I just see no evidence that any segment of American life, with the exception of the organized labor movement which itself had been substantially captured—there was the unique element which created its own experience—with the exception of that, I see no segment of American life which is capable at the present time of undertaking a contract on this job.

I think individuals are. I think this committee, for example, is a repository of enormous knowledge and judgment in this area, and this committee knows well who in the community has that knowledge.

Senator HRUSKA. Yes, and we have witnessed those who have said that this committee has served its purpose and should go its way.

Mr. CHERNE. Any activity that is interested in defeating communism today suffers acute troubles. There is the urgent need for it to have, not the individual hit or miss, but isolate those important efforts, and coordinate them.

You asked before, Mr. Chairman, of two other witnesses why aren't the textbooks in the colleges.

My answer would be that it is not because there is anything uniquely sinister in the colleges or anything uniquely sinister in the publishing companies. It is because there is a fact which still prevails and that is that anyone who tackles the job of anticommunism has no market. There is an automatic campaign to injure and destroy him.

Why is it that there are so few anti-Communist plays on Broadway? Why is it that the anti-Communist plays on Broadway fail?

It is because investors need to have their money returned. The anti-Communist plays either receive a yawn or a slap from the critics, because the anti-Communist play will have, surrounding itself, a word of mouth campaign about its unattractiveness, its morbidity, as well as the fact that it is awfully dull.

That would be the word of mouth campaign and consequently, whether it is writing a book or writing a play, it is not unusual that, in a private society, there will, by and large, be a rough correlation

between the market, the possibility of earning a living and the action which is taken by an author, a playwright, a professor. Here I believe is the answer.

Once again, the effort to have a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy will, in my judgment, be the major indication that the Nation does indeed regard this, not only as urgent, but eminently respectable.

Senator HRUSKA. I take it from the earlier part of your answer to the question as to contracting with universities, that what you would like to see happen is the formation of the proper trend, the assembling of properly trained people; the gathering of a proper library, sources of information, and impress upon the institutions which will be contracted to carry the right pitch on this thing, rather than putting this project into perhaps a purely academic atmosphere where it will be kicked around and examined as to whether or not communism is good; whether or not we should take a position. Would you say that approximates it?

Mr. CHERNE. That is entirely correct, Mr. Chairman. You have said it so much better than I. There is no question that that is so.

I am concerned there will be a misconception of the Freedom Academy, not in the direction of an infiltrated organization but that if some academic minds are applied to it, we will find ourselves in still another examination into what it is that Marx really did say and how accurate was he, and did it work out.

Now these are all useful, but this is not the heart of a program of understanding the enemy with which we deal today.

Senator HRUSKA. It is the deadly serious business, isn't it, of assembling a correct, effective weapon?

Mr. CHERNE. Yes.

Senator HRUSKA. Dr. Cherne, we are very grateful to you for your appearance here.

Your vast knowledge and your experience with this subject is plainly indicated by the statement you have filed and the testimony you have given.

Your appearance has added immeasurably to the substance and to the information which is so necessary for proper consideration of the legislation upon which we are having hearings.

Colonel Manchester did not return and there are no further witnesses today.

Mr. SOURWINE. Colonel Manchester did not come back but he has sent word that he would like to have his statement put in the record at this point.

Senator HRUSKA. Without objection, it will be incorporated into the record at this point.

(The statement of Lt. Col. M. H. Manchester reads as follows:)

THE CASE FOR A FREEDOM ACADEMY

Presentation by Lt. Col. M. H. Manchester, deputy director of ROA, to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee

1. To further strengthen national security, the Reserve Officers Association has taken the unusual step of creating a special standing committee to study the whole field of nonmilitary warfare. This group, headed by Brig. Gen. Wendell Westover, bears the title of "Committee on Fourth Dimensional Warfare." Many other distinguished officers, from all parts of the Nation, have

volunteered to serve on this committee; and the group maintains close liaison with a number of outstanding scholars who are preparing the articles on Communist strategy, geopolitics, and psychological warfare for the Officer magazine. Moreover, ROA is the cosponsor of a 2-week strategy seminar at the National War College this coming July, in which some 200 Reserve officers will be trained to understand the Communist techniques of protracted conflict. These points are made to indicate that ROA has knowledge and experience in fields related to the legislation under consideration by this committee of the Senate.

2. The "fourth dimension" refers to the techniques of struggle in the arena of the mind, the will, and the psyche. Hence it embraces propaganda, political warfare, psychosocial combat, economic warfare, brainwashing, subversion, ideological conflict, and the basic beliefs of our own society which motivate men to sacrifice. (The classical dimensions of warfare are, of course, land, sea, air, and, now, space. The fourth dimension is the invisible terrain of courage, character, loyalty, determination, and ideals.)

3. ROA is, of course, comprised of officers who have seen service on what might be called the orthodox battlefields of World War I, World War II, and Korea. ROA has consistently supported an adequate and balanced military posture; for we know that the Communist challenge is backed by formidable land armies, a menacing fleet of submarines, and growing air and missile capabilities.

4. But ROA is concerned also with the nonmilitary threat of the Sino-Soviet Axis. It is here that world communism has a long leadtime over the West in the use of trained, professional cadres, or conflict managers.

5. Americans believe in education for defense as well as for peace. At West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy we train selected youths in the arts of war. Graduates of these military schools continue their education, in adult life, at the Army War College, the Naval War College, the Air War University, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the National War College. In other words, we have postgraduate schools for hot war.

6. The Communists, however, are waging war against the free world on the chessboard of politics, economics, propaganda, and subversion. They have, for more than three decades, trained professional revolutionists in the arts of non-military combat. Communists, in short, have command and staff schools for cold war.

7. ROA submits that, on the record, the free world has been losing the non-military struggle owing in part to the lack of cold war training facilities for American diplomats, soldiers, foreign aid personnel, businessmen who serve overseas, and other effectives.

8. American personnel are being trained today in international law, business management, diplomatic history, and economic theory. Virtually no Americans are being trained in propaganda analysis, psychological warfare, world precinct politics, and ideological combat.

9. In an age of mass media, mass literacy, and intercontinental communications, the battle of world opinion is dominated by professionals. At the present time, Soviet Russia has a monopoly on professionals who are the products of the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare and other Communist training schools.

10. ROA wishes to record the conviction of citizen soldiers, who have served under fire in three wars, that a whole new dimension of conflict has been introduced by the Sino-Soviet Axis: and that, therefore, a whole new type of training is required in order to equip Americans and their allies with techniques evolved from the behavioral sciences. Classical diplomacy and firepower are not always relevant in the age of the hidden persuaders. The Communists have perfected an organizational weapon and propaganda machinery that cannot be contained by the conventional defenses of the past.

11. In the following analysis, ROA sets forth its assumptions about the nature of the world struggle in the decade ahead, and strongly recommends that, in order to compete on reasonably equal terms, the Senate give serious consideration to the case for the Freedom Academy.

I. ASSUMPTIONS

A. By exploiting fear of nuclear missiles, and boasting of sputnik, the Soviets will try to paralyze the U.S. military arm by terrorizing public opinion in America and the rest of the free world. The Communists, like the Nazis before them, know that, in a democracy, confused opinion sometimes inhibits government from taking decisive action in time. By corroding the will of free peoples

(alternating threats with false hopes for peace), the Soviets may be able to use politics, propaganda, and world pressure group activity to—

- (1) "ground" the Strategic Air Force;
- (2) deactivate and dismantle our military and missile bases abroad;
- (3) immobilize our Army and Navy (in the event of brush-fire wars);
- (4) demoralize and disorient large segments of American opinion, and thus increase pressures on Washington for disengagement, peace at any price, unilateral disarmament; peaceful coalition in a world socialist state, etc., etc.

B. Under the "umbrella" of nuclear terror, the Soviets may be able to seize Asia, the Middle East, and Africa piecemeal by coup d'état, civil war, precinct politics, fifth columns, assassination, propaganda, guerrilla activities, economic penetration, and the other instruments of psychosocial conflict. The Soviets can thus keep their atomic powder dry and win the world with fourth dimensional warfare.

C. In the past, we have waited for the enemy's first blow to awaken our people to peril. Then, shielded by our oceans and by time, we have mobilized public opinion for sacrifice and service. But, today, we must arouse the people before the Soviets are ready to consummate an atomic Pearl Harbor on continental United States. Indeed, there must be disciplined understanding that we are already engaged in a new kind of war, with camouflaged weapons and unorthodox rules. If we do not prosecute this fourth dimensional conflict with vigor and sophistication, we may be driven into a corner where our only choice is to surrender or cremate the earth.

II. GOALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

A. To create, inside Government, the machinery needed to enable the free world to compete successfully with Soviet fourth dimensional warfare techniques. (Ultimately this might mean the establishment of a fourth weapon not only in Washington; but at NATO and SEATO Headquarters.) The creation of a Freedom Academy would seem a logical first step.

B. To create, in the private sector, a disciplined understanding of Communist strategy and tactics so there will be—

(1) adequate public support for an American and free world offensive in the nonmilitary warfare field; and

(2) tenacious and skillful defense against Communist attempts to infiltrate or disorient private institutions in this country, in order to use them to handcuff and/or disarm our Military Establishment.

C. The purpose of both A and B, above, would be to stultify the Soviet fourth weapon and, gradually, to isolate, paralyze, and cripple Communist warmaking power with nonmilitary pressures. Eventually, the United States should develop economic, political, and cultural weapons to probe the internal weaknesses of the Sino-Soviet Empire and so carry the nonmilitary war into the camp of the enemy.

NOTE.—Obviously, in order to wage psychopolitical and economic warfare, we must have an impenetrable shield of science and military power. Hence, the public must understand that the fourth weapon is no substitute for airpower, the Navy, and an Army capable of fighting limited wars. Any campaign to alert the public to the case for an American fourth weapon must, necessarily, emphasize the need to match Soviet capabilities in firepower, missiles, submarines, etc. The fourth weapon is simply the sword that can be used, as the Communists are using it, from behind the shield of military and scientific preparedness.

III. THE NEED FOR NEW MACHINERY

A. Fourth dimensional warfare, since it involves social, economic, and political factors, cannot, in a free society, be exclusively dominated by Government. What is required is a new kind of partnership in defense between the military, the Department of State, and private institutions, defense industry, oversea corporations, professional societies, private foundations, universities, the public school system, youth groups, women's clubs, etc.

B. A Freedom Academy is needed to train the civilian and military components which must work together in voluntary cooperation if an American fourth weapon is to be used both offensively behind the Iron Curtain and defensively here at home to strengthen the climate of opinion against Soviet strategems.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, we also have a letter from Congressman Charles E. Bennett, of Florida with a very brief statement about this legislation which he asked to be put into the record.

Senator HRUSKA. It will be accepted with pleasure, a colleague of Congressman Herlong.

(The letter and statement referred to read as follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1959.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,
Senate Judiciary Committee
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I understand your subcommittee has been holding hearings on Congressman Herlong's H.R. 3880. I would appreciate your including the enclosed statement in the record of these hearings.

Thanking you, and with kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. BENNETT, *Member of Congress.*

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. BENNETT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, ON THE PROPOSED
FREEDOM COMMISSION ACT, H.R. 3880

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear here today in behalf of the proposed Freedom Commission Act. Coauthors of this proposal are Congressmen A. S. Herlong, Jr., and Walter H. Judd. I introduced a companion measure, H.R. 4988, to show my support for this marvelous proposal to strengthen the force of freedom in the battle for the minds of uncommitted peoples all over the world. I sincerely believe that enactment of this proposal would serve the cause of freedom throughout the world by establishing a freedom commission, a freedom academy, and a joint congressional freedom committee, each of which could be a valuable freedom weapon. I certainly hope this committee can give its approval and support to this fine proposal.

Senator HRUSKA. Mrs. Jessica Payne of Huntington, W. Va., a former member of the legislature of that State, has asked for permission to include in the record a statement on this general subject.

That permission, without objection, is granted, and upon receipt thereof, Mr. Counsel, you will turn it over to the reporter for inclusion in the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to reads as follows:)

STATEMENT ON FREEDOM ACADEMY

(By Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, (Mrs. Jessica Payne) Huntington, W. Va.)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, (Mrs. Jessica Payne) from Huntington, W. Va. I am a former member of the legislature, a lecturer and writer on Americanism versus communism and have defended constitutional government and our free enterprise system in every State, except the two newcomers. I appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee with this statement as a lay American, mother and former teacher, to speak in support of the Freedom Academy, which, if established, and protected from infiltration and indoctrination by the Communist, Socialists and the National Educational Association, should, and could prove to be the guiding light and guiding hand necessary to save our Republic.

Certainly, all else has failed to stop the Communist conspiracy and to "contain" communism and I am convinced that their expansion program, under the panoply of the cold war, will continue unless and until some sensible, fearless and honest approach is made toward understanding and exposing this conspiracy which is now interwoven into the very fabric of American life. Our Government, schools, unions, clubs and churches, because of the colossal ignorance (in spite of the fine work of the FBI, the Un-American Activities Committee and your own courageous work) are either victims, dupes or collaborators in some degree and aspect of their nefarious program.

Obviously, specific attention to this problem is indicated. Generalities, double-talk, half-truths, erroneous propaganda and outright falsehoods have so confused the American people about communism, that they are often willing and eager followers, if not participants, in its clever, deceptive conniving. Most people fall for the bait because it comes disguised as progress, brotherhood, freedom from prejudice, do-gooder programs, neutralism and many other "forms" to fool "conformers."

These known and documented facts point up the need for a pro-American Academy where the truth about the Communist conspiracy—its techniques, intrigues, espionage system, the roll of their saboteurs and their philosophy, is taught and made known to the American people.

As I listened to the fine points brought out by Congressman Judd, Herbert Philbrick and others, I was impressed with the question asked each of those appearing before the committee by the presiding chairman, Senator Roman Hruska, namely: Why are there so few pro-American textbooks in our schools and colleges? Obviously, the astute Senator realizes that there may be some connection between the easy acceptance of pro-Communist doctrine and the vacuum created in our educational system by deleting and slanting basic American concepts. There is such a connection, and much of our trouble today stems from the fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult to preserve American values—even the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence—because of un-American and non-American propaganda, through textbooks and other media which the social planners in education have substituted for sound principles in education and government. Every dictator knows the immediate impact of taking over and rewriting the textbooks when they want to condition a nation for the "kill." They change the vocabulary, replace or remove religious and national symbols, scoff at their national heroes and confuse the people about their allegiance to established traditions and mores by misinterpreting, or slanting history.

Do we have a parallel for these signs of decadence in America today? Yes. The proof is overwhelming to those who read and compare "modern" textbooks with those whose faithful reporting of the great experiment in individual liberty, known as the American Republic, inspired their readers to respect and preserve it. The creeping paralysis of changing our form of government under the guise of "social progress" and "progressive education" is everywhere apparent, and a thorough investigation and exposé of this major weakness in our national life is long overdue. When, and if, it is held the investigation should not be conducted by those leaders in education whose philosophies and textbooks helped to create the dilemma, but by a Government committee whose members are dedicated to the preservation of this Nation, it can be shown by evidence and documentation that our educational system (including most all textbooks in history, the social and political sciences and economics), has directed its students, and therefore the Nation, toward the Collectivist-Socialist welfare state. The visible beginning is found in the official records of the N.E.A. under "Addresses and Proceedings in Washington and Cleveland," 1934, vol. 72, page 647, under the title "Education for the New America" by Willard E. Givens. Every congressional committee dealing with the Communist-Socialist problem in America today should read the following Report and compare its bold statement with the pattern of education which developed under the leadership of the gentleman who made the report. A few months later he was made executive secretary of the National Educational Association and directed its program for many years until the present secretary, his protege, took over. Quoting from the Givens Report: "This report comes directly from the thinking together of more than 1,000 members of the department of superintendence. A dying laissez faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the owners, must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that, in our fragile, interdependent society, the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift nationwide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of all the people." No wonder parents and good teachers and elected representatives are concerned about the consequences of such an educational program.

Unfortunately, the very philosophy stated in the above report, which obviously was lifted right out of the Communist-Socialist philosophy and initiated program in America, became the motivation for changing our textbooks, and we find its wording and advice advocated through directives from the N.E.A., the modern curriculum, and the textbooks during the ensuing years. Today, civilian defense authorities are anxious that we watch the skies for enemy bombers and give the alert, but there were no "listening posts" in the classrooms when the far deadlier Communist-Socialist bombs dropped into the textbooks such devastating bombs as "Free enterprise is dead—The Supreme Court could and presumably should abolish constitutional property rights for the social good—Those who think that government is a competitor of free enterprise will only drive the United States into totalitarian dictatorship—The United States has already committed its power and wealth to changing conditions all over the world and enforcing the four freedoms—This Nation is part of a 'new world' in which national rights will be superceded by an international system—You cannot level wealth in America until legislation is passed which forbids parents leaving their inheritance to their children." You see, gentlemen of the committee, these were not "clean bombs" and the fallout changed the schools, the students, the Government, and the whole fabric of American life. Our present status, measured on the background of the above report and its reincarnation in leading textbooks presents a fait accompli: the Communist-Socialist prophesy fulfilled. To pinpoint the answer to the Senator's question regarding textbooks we should remember those whose influence was predominant in the N.E.A., the textbook field, educational policy decisions and the "modern" curriculum, some of whom were Moscow trained and oriented. John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, George Counts, Kirtley Mather, Henry Commager, the Schlessingers and their followers cannot escape the verdict of history relating to weakening American concepts of individual liberty, individual initiative, frugality, property rights, the free enterprise system, sound money, a balanced budget and constitutional Government, American style. The shift away from these tried and true precepts and concepts, to the deficit spending, lean on Government, less work for more pay, public housing, public everything philosophy came about through leading educators whose textbooks found their way into the academic bloodstream of America, and whose students carried the philosophy into the Government, when given high positions in policymaking quarters.

There are few pro-American textbooks today because education, per se, and those connected with it in the top echelons were not thinking, writing, or planning according to American tradition and previously accepted basic principles. Something new had been added and implemented. It is clearly defined in the Givens Report.

Why was this infiltration and indoctrination not stopped in its early stages, or even now? In my opinion, there are three obvious reasons. First, the National Education Association is still controlled by those who believe that the social gospel, Federal aid, and the child-centered school are dependable substitutes for reading, writing, arithmetic, character training, and reward for work well done. Second, the steamroller could have been checked by the P.T.A. and third, also by lay-independent school boards, but the N.E.A. quickly realized the necessity of bringing these two grassroot organizations under their watchful care and guidance. I have carefully checked much of the material, including the latest "Does Better Education Cost More?" sent out by the N.E.A. and propagandized for by the P.T.A., and the cry is always, "More money makes better schools." This is not necessarily so. Billions put into buildings and salaries will not reverse the Communist-Socialist trend in education unless and until the curriculum is changed to include fundamental education, American history, allegiance to God and country, and strength through character and devotion to family life. When textbooks are written with the preservation of the American Republic in mind, and when textbook committees refuse to adopt any others, and if adopted, State legislatures refuse to pay for them, we shall be on our way to retrieving our American heritage.

All the problems of space and the atomic age can best be settled by those who are equipped with fundamental education and love of and devotion to their country—freedom's native land. In fact, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" would be more secure in our keeping if modern textbooks were written with the spirit and intent expressed by Dr. Joes Steele in 1871, when, in the preface to his history book, he said: "This work is offered to American youth in the confident belief that, as they study the wonderful history of their native

land, they will learn to prize their birthright more highly, and treasure it more carefully. Their patriotism must be kindled when they come to see how slowly, yet how gloriously, this tree of liberty has grown; what storms have wrenched its boughs, what sweat of toil and blood has moistened its roots, what eager eyes have watched every outspreading bud, what brave hearts have defended it, loving it even unto death. A heritage thus sanctified by the heroism and devotion of the fathers cannot but elicit the choicest and tenderest love of the sons." Old-fashioned? Yes. Emotional? Certainly. So are the Ten Commandments.

When, may I ask you, did you read a textbook which would affect the spine and heart of our youth as does the above and bring them to "some to see" our glorious history? When? Yes, we need the Freedom Academy, and we need it now.

Mr. SOURWINE. May we have the same order for inclusion of a statement being prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Senator HRUSKA. It is so ordered.

(Dr. Dobriansky's statement reads as follows:)

STATEMENT ON S. 1689 BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I appreciate the opportunity of submitting this statement on S. 1689 which calls for the creation of a Freedom Commission and the establishment of a Freedom Academy. We are in complete favor of the passage of this extremely important measure. The tremendous and pressing need for this independent agency and the special educational institution cannot be too strongly emphasized.

For the serious consideration of the members of this committee and also in rational support of the affirmative position taken by us on this farseeing bill, we offer the following concise observations, all of which can be readily and reasonably documented:

(1) The necessity for the passage of this measure is inextricably tied up with the basic issue of the very survival of our Nation. This statement is no exaggeration. When one soberly considers how much has been lost in the past decade, he could with considerable validity caption his thoughts with the title "From Atomic Monopoly Power and Air Supremacy to Research Surrender." The pessimistic overtones of this title for our latest chapter in foreign policy, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, should not, of course, be accepted for the future. But who can reasonably deny that its elements bear varying degrees of factuality? Had we in operating existence what is sensibly designed in this bill, the probability is, to say the least, that we as a Nation would have maintained our clear-cut superiority in these respects. Lest we be mistaken, this is not entirely an observation from hindsight, even though such an observation would in itself draw respectful attention. The plain fact is that the fundamental nature of the imperialist Russian Communist enemy was openly revealed years before the outbreak of hostilities in 1939.

The farseeing character of this measure points to the most essential course open to us in combating successfully the conspiratorial and subversive inroads made by Moscow in the free world. With the relatively declining long-run importance of military might and power as our chief source of deterrence against both the further expansion of Moscow's empire and the horrendous outbreak of a global hot war, the critical area of the foreseeable future will be that of vigorous and imaginative cold war activity. The sheer adequacy of Communist arms and industrial capacity has produced a formidable counter-deterrent which shifts the points of comparative advantage to activities within the cold war area. Vested with complete futural significance of the most crucial sort, this measure aims to equip us with the necessary means to cope adequately with the expected intensification of devious cold war activities by Moscow.

(2) The passage of this bill would make possible concentrated studies of Russian cold war operations in terms of indispensable historical perspectives which would deepen our insights into the basic nature of the enemy. Careful analyses along these and primarily substantive lines would reveal that what we classify today as Moscow's cold war techniques and methods are essentially traditional to totalitarian Russian diplomacy. Contrary to rather superficial opinion, they are not the created products of so-called Communist ideology and opera-

tion. It can be readily demonstrated, for example, that methods now employed by Moscow in the Middle East, particularly in Iran, were in essence used by the white Tsars of the old Russian Empire. Except for accidental refinements, many of the techniques manipulated by the rulers of the present Russian Empire can be traced as far back as the 16th century. Indeed, over a half century before Marx, the Russian ambassadors of Catherine the Great utilized class division techniques to prepare for the partitions of Poland. Numerous other examples of striking comparative worth and value can be cited.

Such specialized studies conducted by an independent agency set up to concentrate on cold war phenomena stand to have more value for our national security and defense than literally the billions spent upon military hardware. These fashioned techniques and methods of Moscow are new to us by virtue of our unfamiliarity with them. Yet, significantly, they are old and tried to many subjugated nations in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. In contrast to the ways and means of past Western imperialism and colonialism that thrive on oversea possessions, the methods of Russian imperialism and colonialism were forged to extend an overland empire, with all their borderland implications. By these methods and techniques an unprecedented empire was built over the centuries and revived and even greatly expanded by present Muscovite rulers. Of conspicuous note concerning the past as well as contemporary Russian expansion is the outstanding fact that the polyglot military forces under Moscow played essentially a secondary role. The primary role has consistently been played by Russian diplomacy, conspiracy, and subversion. And this includes our latest period, from World War II to the present. Our understanding of these Russian "cold war" operations as pursued by tyrannical Russian rulers over the centuries is indispensable to adequate preparations and ability on our part to cope with phenomena of intensive revolutions and conquests from within in independent and also emerging nations of the free world. The objectives envisaged by S. 1659 point in this direction.

(3) In the light of the swift-moving developments of the past decade and more, this measure and its passage are actually long overdue. The essential ideas of this measure were considered by the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression Since 1918. Shortly thereafter, Senator Douglas of Illinois sponsored a measure aimed at the creation of a Freedom Commission a few years ago. The present bill in more elaborate and adequate form crystallizes the thoughts and vision of the many who have given serious consideration and study to the nature and scope of cold war operations under contrived conditions of "neither peace nor war." Based on much precedent thought, this measure promises to lay the necessary foundations for us to contend intelligently and competently with the cold war thrusts and maneuvers of Moscow.

(4) By analogy, the existence of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy is as necessary to our national being today as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In like manner that the latter is purposed to achieve stability and balanced development in our economy, the former would strive to accomplish the same in our undertakings under indefinite conditions of "neither peace nor war." It is safe to say that because the American people have not, by and large, understood the nature, scope, and depth of Moscow's cold war operations, they have been constantly subject to wide fluctuations of mood and sentiment, giving way at times to dangerous complacency and even seeming indifference toward the vital force of their treasured principles and values. The Mikoyan spectacle earlier this year was a case in point. Trips to Moscow to gain political popularity at home have developed into a veritable joke, with many indirect propaganda advantages and gains accruing to Moscow itself. These and many other developments have broad cold war significance. They require continuous studied assessment leading to recommendations for adequate counteraction.

(5) To satisfactorily meet the tasks and requirements cited above, an independent agency devoted exclusively to the content of cold-war operation is indispensable. There is no existing agency or department in our Government that is equipped by intent or resources to meet these tasks. No existing governmental body is designed to treat and study Russian cold-war phenomena in all their interrelated aspects. Administratively, there is no principle of coordination represented by any body in this intricate and complex field. The creation of a Freedom Commission would correct these defects and fill in the gaps that presently exist. It would, at long last, provide us with a functioning apparatus to deal with a foremost challenge in a totalistic and coordinated way, rather than the piecemeal and sporadic efforts that have prevailed up to the present.

(6) Similarly, there is no educational institution maintained by our Government or any private body that is capable of conducting necessary and continuous studies and instruction on this new plane of cold-war operation. The intended Freedom Academy would satisfy this basic need.

(7) And both bodies, the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, would become valuable and effective media for our public and private institutions as concerns general enlightenment and understanding of the constant, dangerous threat that confronts our Nation and the free world. Their very existence and work would bar indifference or complacency toward this persistent totalitarian peril which is centered in Moscow. In short, their service in this specialized field would be in the fundamental service of our own survival as an independent nation. On grounds of national survival, we cannot afford to even risk the prospects of psychological attrition or isolation, not to mention other nonmilitary avenues of national reduction.

Mr. SOURWINE. Senator Mundt has advised us that he has prepared a statement which he would like included in these hearings.

Senator HRUSKA. It may be included.

(The statement above referred to reads as follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT ON S. 1689, THE FREEDOM COMMISSION ACT

I am delighted to have the opportunity to present this statement to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in behalf of S. 1689, the Freedom Commission Act, a bill which I introduced in the Senate on April 15, with the cosponsorship of Senator Douglas of Illinois and Senator Case of New Jersey. S. 1689 and its companion in the House, introduced by Congressmen Herlong and Judd, is a bill which should engage the attention and serious consideration of every Member of the Congress of the United States. This bill proposes a positive plan of action, which it seems to me must be implemented at an early date, if we are to succeed in the grim struggle against the pervading forces of international communism.

S. 1689 proposes the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy to train and inform the citizens of the free world as to the conspiratorial, organizational, and operational techniques of communism, and of the means and methods of counteraction, which can be employed most effectively against the International Communist psychological and political warfare offensive. The conspirators, who are directing the Communist attack on the free nations of the world, have developed their organizational and operational techniques to the point of a pure science. Their every action is well calculated and minutely planned to do the greatest destruction to the free world cause. Each Communist psychological warfare thrust is artistically designed in conformity with an overall master plan for world domination. Through this unified, scientifically developed, and well calculated psychopolitical plan, the Communists have succeeded in penetrating every level of our free world society. This grave threat to the free world continues to an ever-increasing intensity. Grave as the threat may be, the situation is far from hopeless, providing this country, the acknowledged leader of the free world, is willing to undertake an organized and well-directed program of counteraction. The Communist challenge cannot be met with mere rhetoric and good intentions; the urgent need is for positive and unified action. S. 1689 is designed to provide the framework for such a program of action.

This Nation and the other nations of the free world have dedicated themselves to the mutual development of a powerful defensive and offensive military establishment capable, if necessity requires, to meet and defeat the combat forces of the Communist world on the battlefields of a hot war. Tragically enough, we have ignored in great measure the political battlefields of the cold war, where the crucial struggle against atheistic communism could be lost without the firing of a shot or the launching of an ICBM. It is on to these political battlefields that the Communists have dispatched highly trained echelons of conspirators to infiltrate, subvert and control many of the institutions of the free world. These same cadres of Communist subversion are being rapidly deployed in many of the uncommitted nations of the world. We, of the free world, are not effectively meeting or counteracting this intense Communist activity in the field of political warfare. We cannot effectively counteract this type of Communist cold war activity with apathy and ignorance; if we are to win, if we are to survive, we

must confront this political vanguard of the totalitarian forces with a program of action, indeed, counteraction and enlightenment. It is to provide this enlightened force of counteraction to fight on the political battlefields of the world that Senator Douglas and I are proposing and urging the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy.

Under the provisions of S. 1689, the initial step would be the establishment of a Freedom Commission, composed of seven outstanding U.S. citizens. This Commission must be staffed with our top experts in the field of political and psychological warfare. Its members must be highly sophisticated individuals, keenly aware of the plans, techniques, and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy. These individuals must be men of breadth and vision; they must be earnestly dedicated to the causes of freedom and they must be aware and deeply respectful of the many divergent beliefs and philosophies which combine to form the total concept of freedom. I think that it is grand that two proponents of such widely divergent political philosophies, as are Paul Douglas and I, should join in the cosponsorship of this legislation, for it indicates the type of broad-based coalition, which the free world must present in this political warfare against the forces of communism.

The posts on the Freedom Commission will be full-time jobs and the employment activities of the members must be restricted exclusively to the work of the Freedom Commission. The activities envisioned in S. 1689 are so vast in both scope and importance that a full-time administrative branch is an absolute necessity if this plan of action is to succeed. The Commission will consist of six members and a chairman. These seven individuals will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The individual members will serve for staggered terms of 6 years, and the chairman will serve at the pleasure of the President. A primary responsibility of this presidentially appointed Commission will be the establishment and direction of the Freedom Academy. The Commission will direct the selection of the Academy faculty, and will cooperate with the faculty in drawing up the curriculum and proposed course of study. It will, additionally, be necessary for the Commission to draft a workable selection system, by which the Academy's students will be chosen.

The Commission will also be responsible for establishing an information center, the principal function of which will be to disseminate information and materials which will assist persons and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy and the ways and means of defeating that conspiracy.

S. 1689 attempts only to chart a general course to be followed by the Commission and Academy. The bill is not restrictive in its terms, and leaves much of the matters of detail and specific approach to the discretion and sound judgment of the Commission. However, the program envisioned in S. 1689 is too vital to the future of the free world to leave exclusively under the supervision of seven individuals. So S. 1689 proposes the creation of a Joint Congressional Freedom Committee, composed of 14 members, 7 from each House of the Congress. This joint committee shall make continued studies of the activities of the Freedom Commission and of the effectiveness of the educational and informational programs being directed by the Commission. The Joint Freedom Committee will report from time to time to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Academy is, of course, the hub of this activity of counteraction against the Communist political warfare. It is in the Freedom Academy that individuals from public and private life will be informed as to the organizational techniques of the Communist conspiracy and of the methods which must be employed to win in a battle of international political warfare. The Academy students will be thoroughly informed as to the Communist ideologies; they will be shown how the Communists, with their well-developed organizational techniques, infiltrate our free institutions and later subvert them to their own conspiratorial and tyrannical purposes. Once thoroughly acquainted with the nature and character of the foe, the student will be schooled in the elements and essentials of successful counteraction. The student will be trained to engage in political infighting in specific types of situations, in specific areas of society, and in specific areas of the world.

The student body of the Freedom Academy will not be drawn from the United States alone, but will be selected from all parts of the free world. Students will come from all walks of life; the student body will include trade unionists, professional men, teachers, clergymen, housewives, municipal officials, technicians,

business executives, and Government employees. This divergency of background is essential to successful counteraction, for the Communist organizational campaign of infiltration and subversion is directed at all strata of society. Mr. Chairman, it is the intention and purpose of S. 1689 to train a cadre of dedicated anti-Communists to lead and direct the forces of freedom on the political and psychological battlefronts of the world.

To effectively offset and defeat the Communist organizational weapons, we need trained and dedicated people who understand the Communist strategy and who appreciate the tactics and realities of a total global power struggle. Such an academy as that proposed in the Mundt-Douglas and Herlong-Judd bills would have the means and the objectives of providing the free world with skilled professional operatives to promote freedom's side of this cold war into which we have been reluctantly but realistically forced.

It is not our intention to emulate Communist conspiratorial techniques in conducting our side of this global struggle. Our methods and techniques can and should be developed in full harmony with our democratic principles, our Christian ethics, and our civilized concept of morality. With right on our side, however, we should be able to evolve methods and means far more effective than those utilized by the Communists.

We are late, very late, in developing the proper and effective methods of repelling the Communist conspiracy. But there is still time if we devote our great American talents, vision, and resources to this immediate problem. I think S. 1689 contains at least a partial answer to the development of effective counteraction against the Communist conspiracy. I commend this bill to the attention of this committee with the high hope you will recommend its enactment by the 86th Congress.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understand that Senator Paul Douglas, one of the sponsors of the Freedom Commission bill, also has a statement he wishes to have included in the record. May that be accepted?

Senator HRUSKA. It will be received for the record and printed if available in time.

(Senator Douglas' letter and the document referred to therein read as follows:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
June 22, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am very glad that you were able to schedule hearings on S. 1689, the bill to create a Freedom Commission, which I joined Senator Mundt in sponsoring.

The idea behind this measure is an important one, and while improvements can undoubtedly be made in certain of the approaches which are made in this first draft, I hope that the measure will be of sufficient interest to your subcommittee and to the full committee to be given their earnest consideration.

I was also struck by the value of the first chapter of the book recently written by Mr. Harry Welton of Britain, entitled "The Third World War" and believe that you may find it desirable to include in the record of your subcommittee hearings a copy of that chapter, which I am also inserting in the Congressional Record in another connection.

In any case, I am glad to enclose the above material with this letter, and if you think it an appropriate review of the strategy and tactics of the Communist conspiracy, I would be glad to have it included in the record of your hearings.

With kindest regards,

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This is not a cloak and dagger story. That it occasionally reads like one is due entirely to the nature of the war unleashed by the Soviet Union against the free peoples.

The evidence I have accumulated is not secret, although it has never before been presented in one document. I would, however, make it clear that the reader looking for "ear-to-the-keyhole" stories will be disappointed.

The facts are themselves startling enough, and because of this I have felt it necessary to provide full documentation. Emphasis in all cases, except where otherwise stated, is my own.

CHAPTER 1. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE WORLD

In every inhabited part of the world the forces of communism and democracy are locked together in combat. In this struggle there are no neutral territories. In some countries the Communists are firmly entrenched, in others, such as the United States and the British Commonwealth, the free peoples hold positions of immense strength. There is, however, a vast no man's land composed of nations in which the issue is in the balance, where probably within the next two decades the supremacy of one side or another will decide the fate of mankind for centuries to come.

This is not an all-out military struggle, and it is unlikely to develop into one, fought even with conventional weapons. A nuclear war, with whole cities being blasted out of existence in a matter of seconds, is even more unlikely. Such events would be the products of madmen. These do not exist among the leaders and potential leaders of the free nations. Nor does Khrushchev, even when he is in his cups, show the slightest inclination to risk the destruction of what he and his forerunners have taken such pains to build. The evidence of the Berlin blockade, Korea and the Middle East show beyond doubt that armed conflict on a global basis is not part of Soviet strategy.

Indeed there is no reason why it should be. The Russian leaders are realists. They know that the third world war is already in progress, and believe that they are winning it. This great and decisive struggle for supremacy is being fought, not between sputniks in outer space, but between economic systems on earth.

The weapons are marketable commodities such as cars, tractors, industrial equipment, power stations and consumer goods of all types. The main armies are not soldiers, but salesmen who, operating as a disciplined force, have been told to get into world markets and drive out the products of the western democracies.

That is the new war. It is based upon the simple truth that Britain—still regarded as the main bulwark against the spread of communism—is either a great trading nation or is not a great nation. Deprived of our trade we become a comparatively unimportant island in the North Sea. We would be incapable of defending ourselves, of maintaining our population or playing our full part in world affairs. Without a constant and sufficient supply of food and raw materials from overseas we are doomed. We know that, and so do the Russians.

We are also the heart of a great Commonwealth, and the mainspring of the sterling area. Break this country through destroying its economy and the dream of world communism comes much nearer to reality.

This type of warfare is the more dangerous because of its subtlety. We may not awaken before it is too late. For this reason the Soviet Union runs the most efficient and most costly propaganda machine in the world. Day in and day out it conducts a barrage against the minds of the free peoples. By lies, half-truths and innuendoes, it seeks to weaken our morale, undermine faith in our way of life, and above all to direct our attention away from the real danger.

Not the least important part of the Soviet trade-war machine exists inside Britain's key exporting industries. There, under the guise of militant trade unionism, a constant battle is going on against the productive efficiency without which we cannot in the long run meet the Soviet challenge.

These Soviet agents, many of whom hold important positions in the Trade Union Movement, have caused concern among such men as Bill Carron, president of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, who has described them as subversives "acting under the dictates of a foreign power with the declared purpose of wrecking Britain's economy."¹

It is in this light that the activities of Communists everywhere must be assessed. They are part of a plan, which has been avowed by all Russian leaders from Lenin to Khrushchev, to establish communism on a world basis. Like Hitler, these men, and the theoreticians before them, have frankly declared both their aims and the methods through which they hope to achieve them. Unlike

¹ Empire News, Sept. 8, 1957.

Hitler they have relentlessly pursued these aims without unnecessary risk of armed conflict. They are not men in a hurry.

There is a further similarity. When Hitler was proclaiming his intentions from the housetops, many people either dismissed him as a crank, or in any event refused to heed the warning. So it is today. Leaders of British public opinion, perhaps influenced by the day-to-day propaganda utterances of the Soviet leaders, are reluctant to accept Communist avowals at their true value.

We cannot complain that they have not been constantly and concisely expressed. Over a century ago, for example, the Communist Manifesto, the first fundamental document of modern communism, was simple, straightforward, and to the point. It stated:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. In it the proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite."

This was given reality by the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia in 1917. The world movement achieved a base from which it could reach out into the farthest corners of the globe. Adherents in all countries have since then consciously accepted the doctrine that the U.S.S.R. is the Communist heartland, and that its rulers are the potential masters of all mankind.

Directives circulated through hosts of subsidiary organizations have since poured out from the Kremlin, and been accepted and acted upon without question by party members and supporters in every country. These Soviet agents straddle the earth, ready to subordinate everything, their country, their trade unions, their families and even themselves, to the task of ensuring Soviet domination.

Their duty has, in spite of the heavy Marxist jargon, never been more clearly expressed than by P. E. Vishinsky, the Soviet theoretician who stated in 1948:

"At present the only determining criterion of revolutionary proletarian internationalism is: Are you for or against the U.S.S.R., the motherland of the world proletariat? An internationalist is not one who verbally recognizes international solidarity or sympathizes with it. A real internationalist is one who brings his sympathy and recognition up to the point of practical and maximal help to the U.S.S.R. in support and defense of the U.S.S.R. by every means and in every possible form. Actual cooperation with the U.S.S.R., the readiness of the workers of any country to subject all their aims to the basic problem of strengthening the U.S.S.R. in their struggle—this is the manifestation of revolutionary proletarian internationalism on the part of workmen in foreign countries. * * * The defense of the U.S.S.R., as of the socialist motherland of the world proletariat, is the holy duty of every honest man everywhere and not only of the citizens of the U.S.S.R." ²

This welding of international Communist forces into one mighty army directed and controlled by Russia, and owing unqualified allegiance to those in power in that country, has been a prime task of party members everywhere since 1917. Any sign of deviation or movement toward national communism has been ruthlessly suppressed, either by mass executions where Communists rule, or expulsion from the party where dissident comrades are fortunate enough to live in a democracy.

How this army could be used to achieve world conquest was outlined by Lenin many years ago, and incorporated in volume V, page 141, of his *Selected Works*. It so impressed Stalin that he repeated the general theme in a major speech in 1924, and it has since been included in every edition of his works (the most recent being in English in 1943 and in Russian in 1949).

This important directive boils down to four essentials:

1. Building up the strength of the Soviet Union.
2. Organizing subversion in the industrialized capitalist states.
3. The fomenting of revolt in colonial countries.
4. A final onslaught, using whatever methods are most suitable in the light of prevailing conditions in the country or countries concerned.

The struggle for the world

The essential aim was summarized in the following statement:

"The victory of socialism in one country is not a self-sufficient task. The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as

² "Problems of Philosophy," Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1948.

a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, a means for hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries. For the victory of the revolution in one country, in the present case Russia * * * is the beginning of and the groundwork for the world revolution."³

These are the words of Stalin, taken from *Problems of Leninism* published in 1941. They declare the blunt truth—that Soviet foreign policy is one of world-wide expansion.

The example of Hungary shows exactly the conditions under which the Soviet leaders will go to war. They will do so when the victim is helpless to retaliate, when they feel they are secure from armed intervention by other nations, and when the use of Soviet armed strength is necessary to obtain or retain complete and absolute control.

Korea and Malaya are instances of an attempt to achieve conquest by proxy, although in each case the immediate aim was almost certainly more economic than military. The importance of Malayan rubber to the economies of Western Europe and to the stability of the sterling area is as evident to the Russians as it is to us.

The Korean war, apart from sparking off a propaganda campaign in which the Russians out-Goebbeled Goebbels, also caused the British Labor Government to embark upon an arms program which, by diverting men and materials from badly needed schemes for capital development, and the manufacture of products for export, struck a severe blow against our economy. It also paved the way for many of the industrial troubles from which we have since suffered. Those who doubt the ability of Russia to exert immense influence in this country might ponder over the fact that from 1950 onward our whole budgetary structure was conditioned by the Soviet military adventure in Korea.

The shift of emphasis from military conflict to trade war was foreshadowed by Stalin in a treatise published just before his death. Referring to the economic integration of the Communist bloc, he stated:

The result is a fast pace of industrial development in these countries. It may be confidently said that, with this pace of industrial development, it will soon come to pass that these countries will not only be in no need of imports from capitalist countries, but will themselves feel the necessity of finding an outside market for their surplus products.

But it follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sale in the world market will deteriorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity.⁴

Since then this has become the spearhead of the Russian attack. It has dominated life behind the Iron Curtain, where the interest of workers, particularly in the satellites, have, as we shall see in ensuing chapters, been sacrificed to achieve capital formation in excess of that justified by existing productive capacity. Indeed, it is important to reemphasize that the drive for trade mastery has little in common with normal commercial rivalries between competitor countries. Inside the Communist countries it is planned, conducted, and financed as a military operation to be successfully concluded without regard for cost. Further, the attack has been launched with the active assistance of Communists working in every democratic country.

By 1955 the progress already made justified the Soviet announcement that communism has become a world system which is in economic competition with capitalism.

Khrushchev was even more specific when, at a reception held at the Norwegian Embassy in Moscow, he told a British reporter that "Your system will collapse through economic competition with communism."⁵

The Communists, then, have made no secret of their aims or their methods. Political penetration, the actuality or threat of military attack, and the trade war are the avowed weapons to be used to achieve an avowed aim.

Yet in spite of warnings, and the lessons of postwar history, there are still people in high places who believe that the Kremlin is peopled by men and women dominated by fear of encirclement by hostile capitalist powers, and who have only to be given a little encouragement to become good neighbors with whom schemes for the mutual advancement of all countries can be worked out.

³ "Problems of Leninism," Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1941, p. 113.

⁴ Stalin: "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.," Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, p. 36.

⁵ Sunday Times, Nov. 13, 1955.

In other words, they believe that the Russians are taking steps toward world domination with great reluctance, not because it is an integral part of the Communist creed, but in self-defense against the machinations of the democratic powers.

When Mr. Aneurin Bevan, then Britain's "Shadow" Foreign Minister, visited Moscow in 1957, he returned to express the view that the utterances of Soviet leaders could be dismissed as ritualistic exercises. These deserve to be categorized as famous last words. Seldom has such a dangerous statement been made by such an important man.

There is nothing ritualistic about Khrushchev's reaction when Hungary attempted to break away from the Soviet empire. Nor was it provoked by a neighborly desire to safeguard Hungarian democracy. His action was provoked by fear that if Hungary succeeded in achieving its freedom, the other satellites in which a great deal of restlessness existed would quickly follow suit.

Anyone who believes that the Communists are playing theoretical games must have slumbered since the Hitler-Stalin Pact, in August 1939, made the Second World War inevitable. This began a period of open expansion. Of the three main powers ultimately engaged in the war against Nazi Germany, only the Soviet Union gained territory.

Poland was invaded. This was followed by the attack on Finland, the annexation of Bessarabia and Bukovina, and forcible incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Those who believe that there is an easy way to peaceful coexistence with communism should note that Russia had freely negotiated nonaggression pacts with all these countries.

This expansionist phase, reminiscent of imperialism at its worst, received a setback when Hitler rounded on his ally and invaded the Soviet Union.

Once victory in Europe had been achieved, however, Russian imperialism went on with renewed impetus.

What makes this postwar period one of the great water sheds of history is that the extension of Russian control to other countries coincided with an even greater movement of withdrawal and noncommitment on the part of the democracies. At each successive stage, barriers against Communist penetration were weakened over large areas inhabited by millions of people. Russia herself became enriched by the addition of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Eastern provinces of Poland, Bessarabia, and Bukovina from Rumania, the Carpathian-Ruthenia province of Czechoslovakia, half of East Prussia from Germany, slices of Finland, Tannu Tuva, Dairen, and Port Arthur from China, and the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin from Japan. Quite an impressive record for a power said to be in the forefront of the fight against imperialism.

Further, it was Russia who provided aid to the Communists in China and helped to achieve the overthrow of the Nationalist Government which, incidentally, had been recognized by Stalin and Molotov in words oddly reminiscent of Hitler's solemn promises to Poland.

China thus became part of a gigantic Sino-Soviet bloc that is now in the process of becoming one huge industrial unit, from which, sooner or later, goods will flow into world markets in ever-increasing quantities.

Once in power, the Chinese Communists followed the example of their Soviet tutors. Tibet was invaded and occupied, North Korea and North Vietnam were subjugated.

It is instructive to examine the methods used by the Soviet rulers to extend the Communist base. Georgia provides a very early example of double dealing. In March 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty in which it unreservedly acknowledged the independence and sovereignty of the Georgian State, and renounced voluntarily all the sovereign rights which had appertained to Russia with regard to the people and territory of Georgia. It also pledged itself not to interfere in any way in Georgia's internal affairs.

In February 1921, Soviet troops invaded Georgia, and Tiflis, the capital, fell to the Bolsheviks. On the day this happened Georgia was proclaimed a Soviet republic.

The annexation of eastern Poland is another instance of Communist duplicity. In the spring of 1939, while Britain, France, and Poland were negotiating with the U.S.S.R. to form an alliance against Nazi Germany, Stalin's agents were secretly in consultation with Hitler himself. The result was a nonaggression pact between the two countries, under which the eastern half of Poland was recognized as a Soviet sphere of interest. The Nazis invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, and thus sparked off the most destructive war in the history of man. By prearrangement, the Soviet Army marched in from the east.

Soviet Foreign Minister, Molotov, speaking on October 31, 1939, boasted:

"One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army, and then by the Red army, and nothing remained of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."⁶

Bessarabia and the northern province of Bukovina were acquired by the simple procedure of massing Red army troops on the Rumanian frontier, and delivering an ultimatum that the Rumanian forces move out of these areas and be replaced by Soviet military units, and that all railways, bridges, airfields, factories, and powerplants be handed over in good order.

The Russians moved in on June 28, 1940, and by a combination of force and bullying, seized these territories.

Another classic example of Soviet foreign policy in action occurred in Finland. In the autumn of 1939 Russia demanded territorial concessions and attempted to obtain them by diplomatic bullying and threats of force. When these maneuvers failed, the Soviet Government decided to invade.

In defiance of the Russo-Finnish Non-Aggression Pact of 1934, an armed attack was launched on November 30, 1939. Finland promptly appealed to the League of Nations, and as a result Russia suffered expulsion from that body. The Finns held out until March of the following year, when they were compelled to surrender large areas including Karelia, in which was situated Viipuri, their second largest town.

Further hostilities broke out in June 1941, and when an armistice was signed 3 years later, the Soviet Union had, by armed aggression, acquired nearly 18,000 square miles—about one-eighth of Finland's total territory—and a population of nearly 600,000 people. Two-thirds of these chose to be resettled in other parts of their country rather than remain under Soviet rule.

The fate of the Baltic States, like that of eastern Poland, was settled by the secret pact agreed by Hitler and Stalin in 1939. All three, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, had signed nonaggression pacts with the U.S.S.R.

When the war broke out they gave way to severe diplomatic pressure and reluctantly accepted pacts of mutual assistance which gave the Soviet Armies the right of admittance into their territory.

Molotov, surely one of the most cynical statesmen in history, gave his assurance that these agreements "strictly stipulate the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states, and the principle of noninterference in each other's affairs. They are based upon mutual respect for the political, social and economic structure of the contracting parties, and are designed to strengthen the foundations for peaceful, neighborly cooperation between our peoples."⁷

Molotov said this when he knew that Stalin, by agreement with Hitler, had already decided to annex these countries.

When the Baltic States were finally occupied by the Red army in 1944, the people did not surrender without a struggle. Russia embarked upon a campaign of terror, execution and mass deportation which lasted for several years. Thousands of Estonians, Lithuanians and Latvians were dispatched to Siberia, and thousands more fled to West Germany and Britain. One of the most pathetic incidents reported was that 30,000 Estonians set out for Sweden in an armada of small boats, a venture, which was estimated to have cost nearly 10,000 lives.

The methods used in all three cases followed the familiar pattern—broken treaties, duplicity and ultimatum backed by force. With the fate of Finland staring them in the face, the three tiny countries, with a total population of less than 6 million, had no alternative but to yield.

Rigged elections on the usual Communist lines took place, and the grisly farce was played out to the end when at their own request Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, their peoples, culture, traditions and way of life, vanished behind the Iron Curtain.

With the war over, Russia was not content to rest on her very considerable territorial gains. She began to export revolution in earnest. Trained Communist cadres, Soviet troops and political police armed with an established technique for rigging elections, poured into Eastern European countries.

The principles of Potsdam and Yalta were speedily jettisoned, and many European statesmen had their first practical experience of Communist double-talk and double-think. Clauses in the agreements were distorted beyond recognition. "Democratic elements," for instance, was so twisted that it referred only to Communists and their sympathizers. "Fascists" and "reactionaries"

⁶ Speech to the Fifth (Extraordinary) Session of the Supreme Soviet, Oct. 31, 1939.

⁷ *Ibid.*

became terms of abuse applied to everyone, even democratic socialists, who resisted the encroachment of the Soviet Union. The Red army, which was deployed across Eastern Europe, became the dominating factor. Its ranks were stiffened by Moscow-trained Communist leaders of all nationalities, together with units of political police. Before the dust of conflict had time to settle they began the task of systematically destroying national resistance to Communist rule.

One by one the Eastern European countries were caught in the Soviet net. The technique in each case followed the same broad lines; "united front" governments were formed in which Communists held the key positions, and opponents who could not be intimidated were promptly dealt with either by execution, deportation, or imprisonment. Rigged elections were held to give the process an appearance of legality.

Whether these tactics would have succeeded on their own is doubtful. In fact, Stalin took no risks. He knew that with Europe in its war-weary state he could use, or threaten to use, military force within the areas controlled by the Red army without fear of retaliation.

The Communists themselves have openly admitted that Soviet Army backing was an essential ingredient in the early postwar prescription for revolution.

In March 1956, Miron Constantinescu, First Deputy Chairman of the Rumanian Council of Ministers, said:

"The peaceful development of the revolution was facilitated by the fact that at that period the Soviet Army was stationed on Rumanian territory and . . . by its mere presence paralyzed the action of the reaction forces."⁸

The Cominform journal of March 15, 1949, carried the interesting admission that "one of the prerequisites of setting up the people's power in Poland was the liberation of Poland by such a revolutionary force as the Soviet Army."

So the tide of Soviet communism swept across Europe toward the Western nations, then impoverished by the dislocation and destruction of war, and, in the view of Soviet economists, on the verge of economic collapse.

In 1947 Stalin had reaffirmed his aims with complete frankness. The tasks of the Communist Party, he said, were:

(a) To make use of all the contradictions and conflicts among capitalist groups and governments which surround our country, with the object of destroying imperialism.

(b) To use all their strength and resources to assist the worker's revolution in the West.

(c) To take all measures to strengthen the national liberation movement in the East.

(d) To strengthen the Red army.⁹

Among the factors which prevented the further immediate extension of Communist rule was the need to consolidate their hold on areas already dominated by Russian troops. Stalin at that stage was in no position to attempt military invasion of territories occupied by Allied forces.

Another important point was that Stalin's economic advisers were over-optimistic. The threatened collapse of the Western democracies, although perilously close during the winter of 1947, did not materialize. Nor did the successful revolutionary uprising, which Stalin confidently expected, take place in France and Italy, although there were political disturbances on a large scale.

The United States, quick to see the danger, rushed in with massive economic aid through the Marshall plan and the European recovery program which, for obvious reasons, was bitterly opposed by Communists everywhere.

This was a serious blow to Soviet ambitions. So was the speedy United Nations reaction to the invasion of South Korea in 1950, and the building up of defensive alliances designed to prevent further Soviet attempts to annex other countries by force.

Faced with more formidable obstacles, the most potent of which was the American possession of the atomic bomb, the Soviet Government paused both to consolidate and strengthen their base, and to consider future strategy. So far greater strides toward world domination had been made through a planned policy of bullying and repression. By use of military force and diplomatic pressure, aided by a willing fifth column in the victim countries, Communist rule was established over one-third of the world.

⁸ Cominform journal, Mar. 9, 1956.

⁹ Stalin: "The Party Before and After the Seizure of Power," Works, Moscow, 1947, vol. V, p. 111.

Could these same weapons be used to conquer the remainder? Not, the Communist leaders decided, without risk of provoking a major conflict. Tactics were therefore changed. As George Dimitrov, then secretary-general of the Communist International, and later dictator of Bulgaria, had put it:

"We are sometimes accused of departing from our Communist principles. What stupidity, what blindness. We should not be Marxist and Leninist revolutionaries, nor disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, if we were not capable of completely altering our tactics and our mode of action as circumstances may dictate. But all the deviations, and all the ins and outs of our tactics are directed to a single end—the world revolution."¹⁰

From this reappraisal of the position two clearly defined lines emerged. It was decided to harness the fear of war instead of war itself to the Communist cause. So the "peace" campaign, always an essential part of Soviet strategy, assumed even greater importance. The worldwide propaganda machine went into action with the simple instruction—everything Russia does must be depicted as a great, magnanimous gesture for peace. By contrast, the policies of the United States, Britain, France, and Western Germany must always be denounced as warmongering imperialism.

In this way Stalin, after his death admitted by Khrushchev and the whole Russian Communist Party to have been a bloodthirsty tyrant, became the leader of "peace lovers" throughout the world. Through subsidiary or "front" organizations operating inside the democracies, the Soviet leaders repeatedly appealed to the peoples of these countries over the heads of their governments. One aim was to lead the free nations into a false sense of security. Thus, while propagandists were attacking the western manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons, glowing accounts were given of progress in Russia, where the concentration was said to be entirely on the peaceful use of nuclear fission. Events have proved just how much truth there was in this version of Soviet policy.

The propaganda machine, together with the industrial and trade attack, were deemed by the Soviet leaders to be the swiftest and surest way of continuing the struggle for power that began even before the war against Germany and Japan was finished.

This new emphasis becomes even more intelligible when it is appreciated that while communism was engulfing and enslaving a third of the earth, the Western Powers set about liberating millions of subject peoples. Freedom and independence were granted to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Libya, the Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, Ghana, and the West Indian Federation.

Some of these places are now "trouble spots" which have been infiltrated by Soviet agents and technicians. They are also areas which, because of their economic importance, can be decisive in the struggles which lie ahead.

As Spotlight, the monthly bulletin of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to which our own T.U.C. is affiliated, summarized it in November 1957:

"Looking at the facts, we see that only Communist powers such as the Soviet Union and China are now engaged in an aggressive campaign to enslave nations and even whole continents behind a smokescreen of anticolonialism and anti-imperialism. Indeed, during the time when the Western colonial powers granted freedom and independence to 900 million people the Communists have enslaved 900 million people and deprived them of their freedom and independence."

It is indicative of the help given to Russia by well-meaning but foolish people; that in spite of these facts Prof. A. J. P. Taylor could, even at the time of the Hungarian uprising, be heard on television bracketing the Soviet suppression of Hungary with the "colonialism" of the British Government.

The unfortunate truth is that these willingly granted extensions of the democratic principle of government have in themselves strengthened the liberty-destroying forces of totalitarianism. Every one of the nations now in or approaching new manhood had its own particular ferment. Each came into being infected with a touchy, easily wounded pride, quick to resent and suspect even the friendliest gesture on the part of the former colonial power. Each had the ravages of war, and admittedly in some cases the neglect of peace, to remedy. Each was the victim of years of unscrupulous Communist propaganda which attributed every problem to the alleged rapacity of the previous overlords. Stress was laid upon what the "imperialists" had taken out of these lands; very

¹⁰ Speech to Seventh Congress of Communist International. Verbatim Report No. 39, p. 1846.

little was said about what had been put in—the vast capital sums, the technical know-how and the dedicated efforts of thousands of Europeans who had fought with blood, sweat, and tears the poverty, ignorance, and disease which were, and would have remained, an insoluble obstacle to progress.

With their newly won freedom these nations are battling against their own individual problems and their political, racial, and religious rivalries. To keep on the crest of the 20th century wave of expansion in Africa, Asia, and South America, all of them need more capital, more technicians, more trade credits, better education, better health services, and an adequate supply of consumer goods. If the tacticians of the Kremlin could have wished into existence favorable conditions in which to apply their own blueprint for power, they could scarcely have thought of anything better than this new postwar world.

Countries such as these are the natural victims of Soviet infiltration. Unskilled in the arts of government, they are crying out for help and sympathy. These things they are getting, and will continue to get, on a large scale from Russia. Small wonder that Soviet trade missions and financial advisers are swarming into South America and the Far and Middle East, offering prices and terms with which the democracies will find it difficult, if not impossible, to compete.

Some commentators, while fully alive to Soviet intentions and tactics, allow their misgivings to take refuge behind the economic difficulties now apparent inside Iron Curtain countries. These, it is said, set a severe limit on the ability of Russia and her satellites to meet the commitments which, for political reasons, they are cheerfully accepting. So they do—for the moment. But Russian strategy is not based on this year or the next; it is the ultimate strength of the Soviet bloc that must be considered.

At the moment the trade war is being waged with an abandon that would be ruinous if judged by normal commercial considerations. Only an empire built on industrial slavery can consistently market its products at less than cost price. Only a system in which political opposition and ordinary trade-union functions have been obliterated can achieve such concentration on heavy industry that immense production increases take place without a proportionate increase in living standards. Yet that is what is happening inside the Communist countries. The workers are paying heavily for their leaders' ruthless determination to undermine the free world.

Because of the great advantage enjoyed by totalitarianism, it is possible for communist trade to be conducted on other than a commercial basis. A surprisingly frank admission of present objectives was made by the Czechoslovak Statistical Institution which, in a reference to the Soviet trade campaign in southeast Asia and the Middle East, stated:

"Czechoslovak participation in this expansion of trade is not guided by purely practical considerations. It follows a plan carefully drawn up in accordance with political considerations."¹¹

We would be extremely unwise to underrate the potential strength of a group of powers with subservience at home and aided by political and industrial agents abroad who are constantly pounding away at the economic stability of the free nations. Under these circumstances time is not too important. The rulers of the Kremlin can afford to wait for their rivals to disintegrate before delivering the knockout blow.

If the decision was imminent there would be some justification for complacency about the result. The truth is, however, that this new form of warfare will be with us for years ahead. It is likely that the Russian leaders are thinking in terms of 15 or 20 years, but they know what they are doing, and why they are doing it. I wish the democracies could say the same.

As we shall see in ensuing chapters, the Communists are laying their foundations well. By 1975 they hope to have achieved the complete coordination of all Communist countries, including China, into a single workshop directed and fed from the Soviet Union. Division of labor will be extended so as to insure that each country is concentrating on the type of product to which it is best suited. If and when this reaches fulfilment, the ability of this group to swamp selected markets with cheap industrial products will be frightening.

Even now Russia is in a position to inflict considerable damage in some areas and on certain of our industries. This is clear from the testimony of many businessmen who have penetrated the Iron Curtain, and who have toured the uncommitted countries. They have expressed grave concern, not only at the

¹¹ The Observer, Dec. 11, 1955.

Soviet trade potential, but at the immense strides already being made in Britain's traditional markets. Goods are constantly offered at below cost of production prices in order to get or keep a foothold.

While this battle is on, the air will continue to be thick with slogans designed to mislead the innocent. "Peaceful coexistence" and "friendly competition" will figure in almost every Communist propaganda tract.

Offers of economic aid, technical and financial assistance without strings and, of course, armaments to help "preserve the independence of the peoples struggling against imperialism" will be made.

Khrushchev himself can be relied upon to assure the world repeatedly, as he did in November 1955, that:

"We are often accused of trying to export Communist ideas to other countries; many other stupid things are said about us. But we have never forced on anyone, nor do we now force, our views on reforming society."¹²

To deduce that such statements indicate that Russia's new rulers are content to go their own way and allow other countries to work out their own salvation would be criminal folly. The Soviet Union's export of ideas has not won over any nation to her side, but her export of revolutionary force has gained her the whole satellite empire.

Now that has, for the moment at least, outlived its usefulness. The other weapons in the Communist arsenal are being used. Some of them are old and trusted, others are of more recent date. These include the exploitation of nationalism in such areas, vital to the Western economies, as the Middle East, offers of technical assistance to backward nations and economic missions designed to establish what are now called client states—countries which become so dependent upon trade with Russia that they cannot break away without risk of industrial collapse.

A hard task confronts the nations of the free world. For 40 years communism has progressed. One thing that must be done now in the new nations bent upon building their future is to tell the truth about Soviet history and its present methods and intentions. We ourselves must know more about what is going on both behind the Iron Curtain and inside the vital industrial concerns of our own country.

The trade war is the kind of conflict to which we ought to be well suited. We have been tackling world markets for the last 200 years with a great measure of success. We have a wealth of experience behind us which should stand us in good stead.

Further, together with other democracies, we can, if we will, present a solid economic front which the Soviet empire will find it impossible to break. All these things we can do if we have determination based upon a sound knowledge of the threat under which we are living and working.

This book is what in Army terms would be described as "an appreciation of the situation." How strong is Russia's present position and what is her potential power? Who are her agents in the democratic countries and how do they operate? What are their weakest points? What forces are at our disposal and how should they be used? In answering these questions I shall draw on authentic and documented reports from Iron Curtain countries, and on a great deal of personal knowledge of Communist subversion inside industry and the trade union movement.

In the following chapters we shall see how the Communist forces swung into action in places as far apart as Korea, the London docks and the British motor industry. I shall show how a meeting in Canada resulted in almost complete paralysis in Britain's docklands, and how riots outside Parliament were directed from Prague.

We are in the throes of a war which we dare not lose, yet lose it we will unless free peoples everywhere awaken to the danger, and unite in defense of the freedoms which have taken centuries to build, but which can be destroyed almost overnight.

Senator HRUSKA. The committee stands in recess.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

¹² Cominform journal, Nov. 25, 1955.

INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

A

	Page
Academy of Pedagogy.....	86
Academy of Red Professors.....	87
Academy of Sciences.....	86
Academy of Social Sciences.....	85
Adult Education Teachers.....	75
AFHQ.....	60
AFL-CIO.....	55, 56
African Communists.....	15
Agrarian reformers.....	106
Air Force Academy.....	147, 149, 154
Air War College.....	91
Alexander, Professor (Rutgers University).....	15
All-University Department of Philosophy, New York University.....	56, 57
Alsof column.....	15
American Medical Association.....	109
Ankara, Turkey.....	59
Arendt, Miss Hannah.....	35
Argentine police.....	15
Armed Forces Department.....	83
Armed services.....	30
Army War College.....	91
Athens.....	125
Atomic Energy Act.....	24, 25, 26
Atomic Energy Commission.....	129
Attorney General.....	33

B

Baltimore Sun.....	102
Bar Association of the City of New York.....	10
Baylor University School of Law.....	10
Beilan case.....	39
Bennett, Representative Charles E. (Florida).....	7, 156
Letter from and statement.....	156
Benson, Dr. George.....	138
Berlin.....	120, 141, 145, 147, 148, 164
Bevan, Mr. Aneurin.....	167
Biemiller, Andrew J.....	55, 56
Letter inserted in record.....	55
Statement inserted in record.....	56
Bochenski, Father.....	90
Bologna, Italy.....	81
Bonnet, Col. Gabriel.....	88
Bonsal, Dudley B. (president, Association of Bar of City of New York).....	10
Boy Scouts.....	75
“Brainwashing in Red China” (book).....	100
“Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defy It” (book).....	100
British Museum.....	132
Broger, John.....	30
Brune, Chief Judge Frederick W. (Maryland Court of Appeals).....	38
Letter inserted in record.....	38-39
Bubnov.....	115
Budget, Bureau of the.....	39
Budenny, Marshal Simeon.....	115
Bukharin, Nicolai.....	114, 115
Byfield, Robert.....	137

C	Page
Capri.....	81
Carron, Bill.....	164
Case, Senator.....	161
Castro.....	138
Castro, Dr.....	93
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).....	17, 18, 29, 30, 32, 64, 66, 104, 145
"Century of Conflict, A "book).....	14, 17
Chadwick School, Rolling Hills, Calif.....	7
Chennault, General.....	110
Chennault's (General) Flying Tigers.....	110
Cherne, Leo.....	109
Testimony of.....	139-152
Statement of.....	145-148
Chicago Federation of Labor.....	75
Chicago Labor College.....	75
Chicago, University of.....	38
"Child of the Revolution" (book).....	68
Chilean party.....	15
Chinese Communist Party.....	14
Chinese Nationalists.....	120
Christian Register.....	75
CIO Textile Workers' Union.....	75
Citizens News, Hollywood, Calif.....	8
Clausewitz.....	88, 115
Columbia.....	64, 70
Columbia Broadcasting System.....	80
Cominform.....	169
Commager, Henry.....	158
Commission on Government Security.....	9
Comintern journal.....	87
Committee of One Million.....	105, 106
Committee on Fourth Dimensional Warfare.....	153
"Communism and Christ" (book).....	37
Communism in Latin America.....	15
Communist/s, Chinese.....	106, 120, 167
Communist China.....	1
Communist International.....	78, 170
Communist Manifesto.....	13, 37, 165
Communist manifests.....	35
Communist Party, Central Committee of.....	83
Communist Party, French.....	16
Communist training school uncovered by Argentine police.....	15
Constantinescu, Miron.....	169
Council Against Communist Aggression.....	73, 74
Council of Ministers.....	86
Counts, George.....	158
Court of Appeals, Maryland.....	38
Cramton, Professor.....	39
Cutler, Robert.....	19, 20
Czechoslovak Statistical Institution.....	171

D

Daily News-Miner (Fairbanks, Alaska).....	8
Daily Sun (Lewiston, Maine).....	8
Debs, Eugene.....	75
Defense Department.....	17, 30, 111
De Jaegher, Father (Belgian Catholic missionary).....	14
Democratic Party.....	26
Demosthenes.....	125, 126, 132
De Toledano, Ralph.....	135
Dewey, John.....	158
Dien Bien Phu.....	121
Dillon, Douglas.....	18
Dimitrov, Geo.....	170
Dobriansky, Dr. Lev E.....	159-161
Statement of.....	159-161

	Page
Dodd, Senator Thomas J.....	1
"Does Better Education Cost More?".....	158
Dorashev, I. A.....	85
Douglas, Senator.....	1, 7, 160-163
Letter from dated June 23, 1959.....	163
Statement of.....	163-172
Dulles.....	151

E

Ecole de Guerre in Paris.....	81, 88
"Education for the New America" by Willard E. Givens.....	157
Ehrenburg, Ilya (writer).....	87
Elson, Dr. Edward L. R.....	37
"Enemy Within, The".....	14
Engels.....	118, 170
Ercoli.....	118
European Communists.....	15
Exhibit of Joseph Z. Kornfeder re curriculum of Lenin University.....	115-118
Eydeman.....	115

F

Facts Forum (periodical).....	15
Fairbanks, Alaska.....	8
Far Eastern University.....	81
Farrar, Straus (publishers).....	100
FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation).....	18, 134, 135, 136, 139, 156
Federal Communications Commission.....	129
Field, Noel.....	75
Fisher, Roger (Harvard University Law School).....	9
Florida.....	1
Flying Tigers (Chennault's).....	110
Ford Foundation.....	102
Foreign Policy Research Institute (University of Pennsylvania).....	14, 79
Foreign Service.....	147
Foreign Service Institute.....	149
"For Lasting Peace, For A People's Domestic Democracy" (Cominform Journal).....	87
Formosa.....	106
FRASCO—Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.....	33, 34, 37
Free Europe Committee.....	60
Free-World Academy.....	19
Fribourg, Switzerland.....	90
Frunze Military Academy.....	81
Furtseva, Madame.....	85

G

General Staff.....	82, 83
General Staff School.....	88
Geneva Armistice, 1954.....	141, 147
Georgetown.....	14, 17
German Foreign Office.....	79
Germantown, Pa.....	73
Germany, Nazi.....	141, 167
Germany, Soviet Zone of.....	147
Givens, Willard E.....	157
Goff, Kenneth.....	57
Gorki.....	81
Gotterdammerung (a twilight of the gods).....	36
Graham, Dr. Billy.....	37, 143
Grant, Alan G. (testimony of).....	10-33, 139, 149
Green, Montgomery.....	15
Guide for Political Espionage.....	84
Gundorov, A. S.....	87
Gussev, S. T. (also known as Green).....	115

H

	Page
"Hands Off the Chinese People"-----	77
Harding College, Searcy, Ark-----	138
Harriman, Averell-----	143
Harvard-----	64
Harvard University-----	136, 138
Harvard University Law School-----	9
H-bomb-----	16
H-bomb tests-----	145, 148
Herlong, Representative A. S., Jr. (Florida)-----	1-10, 20, 21, 32, 119, 156, 161
Testimony of-----	7-9
Herlong-Judd bill-----	163
Herter-----	151
Hitler-----	151, 164, 165, 168
Hitler-Stalin pact-----	167
Ho Chi Minh-----	113
Hochschule fuer Politik-----	88
Hoffmann, Sal B-----	74
Hollywood, Calif-----	8
Hook, Sidney (New York University)-----	56
Letter inserted in record-----	56-57
Hoover, Herbert-----	109
Hoover Library on Revolution, World Peace, at Stanford, Calif-----	91
House Appropriations Subcommittee-----	18
H.R. 4988-----	156
House Un-American Activities Committee-----	22, 27, 34
Hruska, Senator Roman L-----	1, 119
Hungarian Revolution-----	35
Hungary-----	100, 112, 166, 167, 170
Hunter, Edward-----	35, 86, 99-113
Testimony of-----	99-113

I

ICBM-----	161
"Ideology of Freedom versus the Ideology of Communism, The" (document)-----	34
"I Led Three Lives"-----	15
Illinois-----	77
Immigration and Naturalization Service-----	33
Industrial College-----	91
Industrial College of the Armed Forces-----	141, 142, 146, 147, 151, 154
Information Center-----	27, 31, 32
Institut d'Etudes Politiques-----	88
Institute or Academy of Red Professors-----	81
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J-----	79
Institute for Marxism-Leninism at Leningrad-----	84
Institute of Political Studies-----	88
Institute of World Economics-----	85
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions-----	150, 170
International Democratic Federation of Women-----	87
International Labor Relations-----	73
International Olympics Committee-----	76
International Rescue Committee-----	140, 141, 146, 147
Iron Curtain-----	14, 126-129, 141, 146, 155, 166, 168, 171, 172
Islamic areas-----	86

J

Jackson, Representative (California)-----	7
Jackson, C. D. (vice president, Time, Inc.)-----	59-67, 70-72
Testimony of-----	59-67
Jackson Committee-----	60
Jackson, William-----	60
James, Daniel-----	15
Japan-----	144
Japanese tax-----	148
Jessup, John K-----	20
Johns Hopkins-----	64

	Page
Joint Atomic Energy Committee.....	27
Joint Congressional Freedom Committee.....	162
Judd, Hon. Walter H. (Minnesota).....	8, 109, 119-133, 156, 157, 161
Testimony of.....	119-133
Justice Department.....	22, 39

K

Kamenev.....	115
Khrushchev.....	83, 125, 145, 148, 151, 164, 166, 167, 170, 172
Kilpatrick, William.....	158
Kirsienova.....	118
Kiwanis.....	109
Know Your Enemy Speakers.....	11
Knyazen, S. P.....	84
Kohlberg, Alfred.....	10
Kommunist (magazine).....	85
Konsularakademie.....	88
Korea, Red POW brainwashing camps in.....	111
Kornfeder, Joseph Z.....	15, 113-118
Statement of.....	113-114
Exhibit of.....	115-118
Kusnetsov, F. F.....	82
Kuusinen, Otto.....	114

L

Latin America.....	15, 31, 86, 145, 148
Latin American Communists.....	15
League of Nations.....	168
Leibowitz, Judge Samuel.....	143, 144
Lenin.....	31, 35, 75, 81, 85, 113, 115, 118, 164, 165, 170
Lenin Academy of Political Warfare.....	82
Lenin Institute.....	15, 19, 81, 84
Lenin Institute of Political Warfare.....	154
Lenin Military Political Academy.....	82
Lenin University, Curriculum of.....	115-118
Leningrad.....	75
Leninist Academy in Moscow.....	36
Lenin School.....	137
Leonhard, Wolfgang.....	68
Lerner case.....	39
Letters inserted in record:	
Adams, R. A. and Grace.....	57
Bennett, Hon. Chas. E.....	156
Biemiller, Andrew J.....	55
Brune, Chief Judge Frederick W.....	38-39
Douglas, Senator.....	163
Hockmeyer, John and Mrs. Marie.....	57
Hook, Sidney.....	56
Miller, Virgil I.....	57
Sarnoff, David.....	39
Shiverdecker, Mr. and Mrs. Coats.....	57
Stough, Claude V. and Mrs.....	57
Walsh, Deputy Attorney General Lawrence E.....	39
Lewiston, Idaho.....	8
Lewiston, Maine.....	8
Life (magazine).....	7, 8, 20, 91
Lilly, Dr. Edward P.....	18
Lilly report.....	142, 147
Lincoln-Petkov Academy.....	19
Little, Brown Publishing Co.....	138
Longjumeau, Paris.....	81
Losovsky, S.....	118
Lowry, Charles Wesley.....	33-38
Statement of.....	33
Lubell, Sam.....	20
Lyons, Eugene.....	151

	M	Page
MacArthur, Gen. Douglas	-----	141, 144, 146, 147
Malstus	-----	118
Manchester, Colonel	-----	109, 153-155
Statement of	-----	153-155
Mandel, Benjamin	-----	1
Mao Tse-tung	-----	88, 106, 126
Manuelsky, Dimitri	-----	114
Marshall plan	-----	169
Marx, Karl	-----	35, 85, 99, 132, 160, 170
Mather, Kirtley	-----	158
McCall, Dean Abner	-----	10
McDowell, Arthur G.	-----	73-76
Testimony of	-----	73-76
McGraw-Hill	-----	16
Methodist Federation for Social Service	-----	75, 78
Middle East	-----	155, 160, 164, 171, 172
Mikoyan	-----	124, 149, 151, 160
Mindzenty, Cardinal	-----	141, 147
Mingulin	-----	118
Mitin, M. B.	-----	87
Molotov	-----	167, 168
Molotov, Vyacheslav	-----	118
Moorehead, Alan	-----	91
Morning Tribune, Lewiston, Idaho	-----	8
Morris, Robert	-----	135
Mundt, Senator Karl E.	-----	1, 7, 9, 161-163
Statement of	-----	161-163
Mundt-Douglas bill	-----	134, 163
Mussolini	-----	151

N

National Archives	-----	79
National Education Association (NEA)	-----	156-158
National Security Council	-----	19
National War College	-----	18, 70, 79, 82, 91, 96, 98, 140, 142, 146, 147, 149, 154
NATO	-----	155
Naval Academy	-----	127, 147, 149
Navy War College	-----	91
Nelson, Steve	-----	114
NEP	-----	11
New China	-----	15
New Hampshire	-----	9
New York Daily News	-----	8
New York Times	-----	102
New York University	-----	56
Niemeyer, Dr. Gerhart	-----	18, 67-69, 73, 89
Statement of	-----	67-69
Testimony of	-----	67-73
Nixon, stoning of	-----	20
Notre Dame (University of)	-----	18, 67, 70
Nowell, William C.	-----	15
"No Wonder We Are Losing" (book)	-----	135

O

Ober, Frank B.	-----	10
Obichkin, G. D.	-----	84
Oglethorpe	-----	70
Oklahoma Education Association	-----	136
Olympics	-----	105
Operations Coordinating Board	-----	18, 20
Oppenheimer, Dr.	-----	138
"Organizational Weapon, The" (book)	-----	14, 16
Orlando, Fla.	-----	10, 13
Orlando Committee for the Freedom Academy	-----	10-33
Orlando Sentinel Star	-----	8

	Page
Ostkolleg (Cologne).....	69
Overstreet, Bonaro.....	136
Overstreet, Harry.....	136
Ovseyenko, Antonov.....	115
Oxford University.....	78, 79

P

Panmunjom.....	122
Parkersburg (W. Va.) News.....	8
Partisan Intelligence Agent.....	84
Pasha, Glubb.....	89
Pavlov.....	35
Payne, Mrs. Jessica (statement of).....	156-159
Pearl Harbor.....	113, 155
Pennsylvania Legislature.....	75, 77
Pennsylvania, University of.....	79
Pentagon.....	30, 127
Peronism.....	35
Petkov (Hungarian patriot).....	19
Petrovsky.....	118
Philbrick, Herbert A.....	15, 109, 134-140, 157
Testimony of.....	134-140
Piatnitzky, Ossip.....	118
Pittsburgh.....	75
Poland.....	160, 167, 168
Ponomarenko, P. K.....	83
Popova, N. V. (Madame).....	87
Possony, Dr. Stefan.....	14, 17, 79-99
Testimony of.....	79-99
Post (magazine).....	15
Potsdam.....	168
Prague.....	15, 172
Presidium of Soviet Solidarity Committee for the Asian and African countries.....	86
Prime Minister of White Russia.....	83
Princeton.....	70, 79
Problems of Leninism.....	166
"Program for a Political Offense Against World Communism" by David Sarnoff.....	39, 40, 41-55
Text of memo.....	41-55
"Program Provides Millions for Training United States Leaders," article in Baltimore Sun.....	102
Progressive Miners in Illinois.....	77
"Protracted Conflict" (book).....	14
PTA.....	13, 28, 158
Pulitzer prize.....	75

Q

"Questions of Philosophy".....	87
--------------------------------	----

R

Radio Cairo.....	89
Radio Corp. of America.....	39
Radio Free Europe.....	60, 114
Rand Corp.....	14
Red POW brainwashing camps in Korea.....	111
Republican Party.....	26
Research Institute of America.....	109, 140, 141, 144, 146, 148
Reserve Officers Association (ROA).....	109, 153, 154
Rhodes scholarship plan at Oxford University.....	78, 79
Ricardo.....	118
Rolling Hills, Calif.....	7
Rooney's (Congressman) subcommittee.....	22
Roosevelt, President.....	157
Rotary Club.....	109
Rudasz.....	118

	Page
Russian Constitution.....	107
Russian Revolution (book).....	91
Russo-Finnish Nonaggression Pact of 1934.....	168
Rutgers University.....	15
S	
S. 1689, text of bill.....	1-7
St. Basil's Cathedral (Russia).....	143
St. Louis, Mo.....	75
St. Petersburg Times.....	8
SAS.....	89
San Francisco.....	74
Sarnoff, David (chairman of board of RCA), letter together with copy of his brochure inserted in record.....	39-55
Saturday Evening Post (magazine).....	107
Scarsdale, N.Y., school library.....	140
Schlesingers, the.....	158
School for Political Warfare in Prague.....	86
Schroeder, Frank W.....	1
Scottsboro boys.....	144
Scripps-Howard.....	75
SEATO.....	155
Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression Since 1918.....	160
Selected Works (of Lenin).....	165
Selznick.....	16
SHAEP.....	60
Sino-Soviet Axis.....	154, 167
Society for the Propagation of Political and Scientific Knowledge.....	87
Sourwine, J. G.....	1
South Africa.....	69, 71
South Bend, Ind.....	67
Souvarine, Boris.....	82
Soviet Peace Committee.....	87
Soviet Solidarity Committee for the Asian and African countries.....	86, 87
"Spies, Dupes, and Diplomats" (book).....	135
Spotlight (bulletin).....	170
Stachel, Jack.....	15
"Staff and Assistance; Utilization of Federal Departments and Agencies; Armed Protection".....	24
Stalin.....	82, 114, 166, 168, 169, 170
State Department.....	18, 22, 64-66, 76, 145
State, Secretary of.....	33
Steele, Dr. Joes.....	158
Steinhardt, Laurence.....	59
Stough, Mr. and Mrs. Claude (letter of).....	57
Strategic Air Force.....	155
Student Liberal Club.....	75
"Studying Freedom" editorial in New York Times.....	102
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	137
Suez Canal.....	145, 148
Sun Yat-sen University.....	81
Supreme Court.....	39
T	
Tampa Tribune.....	8
Tashkent.....	86
Taylor, Prof. A. J. P.....	170
"Third World War, The" by Harry Welton.....	163
Thirty-second Triennium Convention.....	74
Thomas, Norman.....	75
Time, Inc.....	59
Time (magazine).....	15
Toynbee.....	125
Trotsky.....	114
Tuehachevsky.....	115
Tulsa Tribune.....	8

U

	Page
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America-----	159
Unitarian Church-----	75
United Auto Workers-----	75
United Furniture Workers-----	75
United Nations-----	96, 105, 169
University of Pennsylvania-----	14
University of Pittsburgh-----	75
Upholsterers International Union of North America-----	73, 74, 75
USIA (U.S. Information Agency)-----	32, 39, 68, 145
U.S. Information Service Act-----	33
USIS-----	104
U.S. Military Academy-----	8, 111, 127, 139, 141, 146, 147, 149, 154
U.S.S.R.-France-----	87
U.S.S.R.-U.S. Friendship Society-----	87

V

Vanguard Press-----	100
Vasiliev-----	118
Versailles Treaty-----	168
Vienna, Austria-----	79, 88
Vienna, University of-----	79
Vietnam-----	141, 145, 147, 148
North-----	167
Vishinsky, P. E.-----	165
Voice of America-----	114
Vorkuta (slave labor camp)-----	144
Voroshilov Higher Military Academy-----	81, 82

W

Walsh, Deputy Attorney General Lawrence E., letter inserted in record---	39
War College-----	67, 92, 97
War Department-----	141, 146
Watson-----	35
Wedemeyer, Gen. Albert C.-----	135
"Wedemeyer Reports" (book)-----	135
Welton, Harry-----	163
West Berlin-----	8
West Point. (See U.S. Military Academy.)	
Westover, Brig. Gen. Wendell-----	153
West Virginia-----	8
"What We Must Know About Communism" (book)-----	136
White House-----	66
White, Lincoln-----	76
Woltman, Fred-----	75
World Peace Council-----	87
Wright, Loyd-----	9
Wyman, Attorney General Louis-----	9


Y

Yale-----	70
Yalta-----	120, 168
YMCA-----	75
Young Communist League-----	136

Z

Zhukov, E. M.-----	86
--------------------	----







BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1951



