

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA  
ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES 27

---

---

HEARINGS

U.S. Congress. House. BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122

BILLS TO CURB OR OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF THE UNITED STATES

---

PART 1

TESTIMONY OF HON. WILLIAM C. BULLITT

---

MARCH 24, 1947

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1947

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

J. PARNELL THOMAS, *New Jersey, Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, *South Dakota*

JOHN McDOWELL, *Pennsylvania*

RICHARD M. NIXON, *California*

RICHARD B. VAIL, *Illinois*

JOHN S. WOOD, *Georgia*

JOHN E. RANKIN, *Mississippi*

J. HARDIN PETERSON, *Florida*

HERBERT C. BONNER, *North Carolina*

ROBERT E. STRIPLING, *Chief Investigator*

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 3:30 p. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The following members were present: Hon. Karl E. Mundt, Hon. John McDowell, Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Hon. Richard B. Vail, Hon. John E. Rankin, and Hon. Herbert C. Bonner.

Staff members present: Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Louis J. Russell and Donald T. Appell, investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. This afternoon the committee will hear the testimony of the Honorable William C. Bullitt on the bills H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, which seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. Bullitt, if you will please stand and be sworn.

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, we have certain bills before us, H. R. 1884, introduced by Mr. Rankin, and H. R. 2122, introduced by Mr. Sheppard, both aimed to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. We have invited you and some other prominent people in this country to come here and express your views in relation to this legislation. We appreciate very much your acceptance.

For the record, I would like for you to give your full name and your address and then a statement of some of the very important posts that you have held, and then, if you will, just continue with any statement that you would like to make showing the connection between the Communist Party here in the United States and a foreign power, and make any other observations as you think would help us in the consideration of this legislation and in the consideration of this very important subject.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please give your full name and your address.

Mr. BULLITT. William Christian Bullitt, 1811 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

You would like me to name some of the posts I have held under the American Government?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, in recent years: I was special assistant to the Secretary of State in 1933; I was a member of the American delegation to the International Economic and Monetary Conference in Lon-

don in 1933; I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936; I was Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1940; I was personal representative of the President with the rank of Ambassador for all countries in 1941 and 1942; I was special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy thereafter for approximately a year and a half.

Is that sufficient?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, anything else that you think of at the moment?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think that covers it. I could go into a lot of other things.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if I may interpolate, he is also the author of a very important and factual book on modern Russia entitled "The Great Globe Itself", published by Harper's, I believe—

Mr. BULLITT. Scribner's.

Mr. MUNDT. Published by Scribner's, and which I think ranks right along with "I Chose Freedom," by Victor Krishenko, as the most readable and understandable and factual books from the American press today on modern Russia. "I Chose Freedom" was also published by Scribner's.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, if you will just make whatever observations you care to make, keeping in mind that we are particularly interested in communism in the world as you have seen it. And I would like to suggest this to the members of the committee: That we permit Mr. Bullitt to go ahead and make his statement and afterward we will ask him questions, so that we will not interfere with his statement.

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement, but I shall try to follow the line that you have indicated.

The basis of Communist action in the world, whether in the United States or any other country, is the Communist creed, which is a belief that there will be no peace on earth until all the nations of the world are Communist. This is a very genuine belief which is held by a large number of people, and in the furtherance of that belief they have developed a doctrine that the end justifies the means, and that any means, even the most foul, are justifiable in order to achieve this domination of the world by communism.

I don't know whether you would care to have some citations on that, but I can find you some which perhaps might be of some interest. Here are four short statements by Lenin and Stalin which cover the fundamental thesis on which Soviet policy is based.

First, a statement from Lenin, from his collected works, volume 24, page 122, Russian edition. The statement of Lenin:

We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable.

The second is from Lenin's Twenty-one Theses of January 20, 1918:

From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country questions must be determined \* \* \* solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist revolution which has already begun. The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist revolution which has already begun.

The third is from Lenin's book, *The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism*:

It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth.

And the fourth is from Stalin's speech on the American Communist Party on May 6, 1929:

The Comintern is the holy of holies of the working class.

The Comintern, as you know, is the international organization of the different national Communist parties.

The doctrine that war is inevitable between the Soviet Union and the states which the Communists call bourgeois or imperialist, which includes the United States of America—indeed, all states which are not Communist—grows from the fact that what the Communists intend is the conquest of the earth for communism. It is entirely clear and one may find it in writing after writing, and there is not much point in my quoting further excerpts.

The present situation in the world is the following: The Soviet Government, in the furtherance of its intention to control the earth for communism, has annexed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a large portion of Poland, a portion of Finland, a portion of Rumania, and has established absolute control, through puppet governments, over the whole of Poland, the whole of Bulgaria, the whole of Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania, and it is closing its iron fist steadily on Finland, on Hungary, on Czechoslovakia. It also controls fully the Red Army zones in Germany and Austria. Thus, the Soviet Government has brought under its control more than 100,000,000 persons in eastern Europe.

In addition, through its fifth columns—and its fifth columns are like the Nazi fifth columns, since the truth is that communism is Red fascism and uses fifth columns just the way Hitler used them, only much more effectively. Hitler was never able to build up in the countries which he intended to conquer parties or fifth columns having anything like the strength of the Communist Parties which have been built up by the Soviet Union. Using these Communist Parties as fifth columns Stalin is threatening the independence of the remainder of Europe.

The Communist Party in France, for example, is extremely important. It is, in fact, the largest party today in the French Parliament. But there are so many other parties in the French Parliament that, although the Communist Party is the largest party, it only has 28 percent of the seats in the French Chamber of Deputies. Nevertheless, it has acquired control of the French CGT, which is the one big trade-union of the whole country, and it can pull a general strike in France whenever it may choose. Since France has not yet recovered from the war and has a very difficult economic situation to deal with, the threat of a general strike is an appalling one.

Moreover, the Communists have infiltrated the air force to such an extent that they fully control the ground crews of the air force, and there are many officers in the French Air Force who are also Communists. Furthermore, they have got such a grip on economic life in France that today any manufacturer who wants to get raw materials for his business is obliged to pay regular monthly sums in blackmail to the Communist Party treasury, or he gets no raw materials.

The result is that in spite of the fact that 72 percent of a democratically elected parliament in France is anti-Communist, there is a very good chance that the Communists through a general strike and revolutionary activity may be able to take over France.

What does that mean for us? If France falls into Communist hands it will produce a cataclysm in Europe. Without question Italy, where the Communist Party is also very strong would go Communist, Spain and Portugal and all the smaller European countries would follow suit. A Communist France would, therefore, mean not merely a Communist Continent of Europe, but also a Communist Mediterranean, because France, as you know, has as colonies Morocco and Tunisia, and as one of her Departments, Algeria. The result is, if by action of the French Communist Party France begins to take Stalin's orders, we shall have to expect that Casablanca and Dakar, which lies in the French colony of Senegal opposite the bulge of Brazil, will be in Stalin's hands, and his planes will be stationed there. Furthermore, the French colonies on this side of the Atlantic will be open to so-called French planes, which will be Russian planes with French markings, and we shall have them off the Panama Canal, at Martinique and Guadeloupe, and shall have them at the entrance to the St. Lawrence River, at St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Those are some of the consequences to the United States which would ensue from a triumph of the French Communist Party in France. And if it may seem strange that Communist penetration of France has gone this far, let me add this fact: That the vice president of the French Government today, Thorez, is actually a deserter from the French Army in the year 1939. He deserted the French Army in full fight against the Germans and left for Moscow, but the Communists have been able to impose him on the French Government.

I merely call your attention to this situation. I don't propose to try to go into all the situations in the world, but the French situation is so extraordinarily serious that I think it is worth while calling it to your attention, because if France goes we will be closed out of Europe by Stalin's iron curtain. It is as simple as that.

At the other end of the world, in China, the situation is very much worse than it was when General Marshall was sent there to try to reconcile the Communists and the National Government and stop the fighting, more than a year ago. It is always, in the long run, impossible to have a national government working with Communists, for the simple reason that to take Communists into your government, or into close association with it, is to take an assassin into your bed, since the objective of the Communist is, invariably, to overthrow democratic government in the interest of the domination of the democratic country by the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement.

That may suffice as an example of the world situation. Perhaps I might go on to the domestic problem of the American Communist Party.

Here our Communist Party, like all other Communist Parties, is subject to orders from Moscow. It follows the party line laid down in Moscow with extreme care. We are all familiar with the manner in which the American Communist Party has followed faithfully the line laid down in Moscow and has shifted its position in accord-

ance with every shift of Soviet foreign policy. The party is, in the first place, an agency of the Soviet Government for the purpose of weakening the United States for the ultimate assault that the Soviet Government intends to make on the United States. It is, furthermore, if you will look to the experience of other countries, a conspiracy to commit murder, since in whatever country the Communists dominate they establish a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which is defined by Stalin in the following words--this quotation, I may say, is from his book *Problems of Leninism*:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie unobstructed by law and based upon violence, enjoying the sympathy and support of the working and exploited masses.

Now, "unobstructed by law and based upon violence" means that what is done is what is called liquidating the opponents of the government, and "liquidate" is simply a happy euphemism for murder. Murder is carried on on the very large scale. Individual assassinations are not very often used by the Communist Party, but murder on an extremely large scale is very frequently used and is a regular piece of the mechanism of establishing their authority.

Therefore, I should consider the Communist Party of the United States composed, in the first place, of potential traitors, since certainly if the United States were in war with the Soviet Union the members of the American Communist Party would do all they could to help the Soviet Union and to injure their own country. In the second place, I should consider it a conspiracy to commit murder on a mass scale.

That, I think, confronts us with a very practical question of what to do under the present circumstances. The United States, without question, today is in danger, as President Truman very clearly brought out in his statement asking for support for Greece and Turkey. He said that the national security of the United States was involved. I believe those were his exact words. Perhaps I have not quoted him correctly, but that was the sense of some of his words. The safety of the United States is involved because the gradual taking over of countries, the gradual taking over of areas, while possible future victims are lulled into a false sense of security, is the essence of the Soviet tactics, just as it was the essence of Hitler's tactics.

And I make this observation, realizing that it is one that it will be difficult, perhaps, to believe: The situation of the United States today very greatly resembles the situation of the French Republic in the year 1936. At that time France had the largest air force in the world, by far the most powerful army in the world, and a navy which was vastly superior to the German Navy. Nevertheless, at that moment Hitler dared start on his career of conquest by marching his troops into the Rhineland on the 7th day of March 1936. The French could have crushed him with extreme ease. They had every right to, as it was a flagrant violation of the Treaty of Versailles, and they had a right to march to Berlin, if they chose, and take over Germany and impose whatever terms they pleased.

But France wanted to balance its budget. Mobilization of the army was extremely unpopular, as it always is, because it tears men away from their homes and their affairs, and furthermore Hitler constantly was saying that he bore no ill will toward France, and that

he had no intention of ever attacking France. In consequence, there were a lot of perfectly good Frenchmen of good intention and weak heads who believed that Hitler would never attack France—like certain star-gazers in the United States, who believe that the Soviet Union will never attack the United States. So what did the French do? They did nothing. Hitler consolidated his position in the Rhineland, built the Siegfried Line and by it locked France out of central and eastern Europe entirely, successfully seized the countries who were France's allies in eastern Europe, made his deal with Stalin, divided Poland with Stalin, and finally attacked France. The only thing that France had gained by not marching and smashing Hitler, as she could have very easily in 1936—in fact, we even have the document in which Hitler ordered his troops to leave the Rhineland if the French should mobilize—the only thing they acquired by their quiescence was to be crushed completely 4 years later.

At the present time the United States is far stronger than the Soviet Union. We are as much stronger than the Soviet Union today as France was stronger than Germany in 1936—and Stalin knows it.

When we took a strong stand on Turkey last year, when we took a strong stand on Iran this year, the Soviet Union did not dare to move. But time is running against us, exactly as it ran against France after 1936. The Russian Army and Air Force are growing stronger every day. They are still turning their major energies into the production for war and not into consumer goods. They are consolidating their hold on the hundred million people they have taken over in eastern Europe and could use them all today, or almost all of them, for war purposes. Their aggression in China is progressing, although at the moment Chiang Kai-shek's armies are advancing, for behind his lines there is such economic difficulty that the whole Chinese Government position is threatened. Communists trained in Moscow have achieved leadership of the Indochinese independence movement, an entirely genuine movement at bottom, but now in the hands of the Communists.

In South America the Communists are increasingly infiltrating the trade-unions and have control of the trade-unions in many countries. There are three Communist members today of the Government of Chile. The Communists have grown so strong in both Cuba and Venezuela that democratic government is threatened in both countries, and in Brazil recently, after an election, the country woke up to discover that the Communists had become the largest party in the city council of its capital, Rio de Janeiro.

Now, under these circumstances the existence in the United States of an enormous fifth column of the national Communist dictator is an even greater threat to the United States than was ever the fifth column of the National Socialist dictatorship of Hitler, and, therefore, I think that you have brought up this question at an extremely appropriate moment.

Nevertheless, I should like to say that I am not at all sure that it is wise, in the public interest of the people of the United States, to declare it a crime, at the present time, to belong to the American Communist Party, for the following reasons:

We know that the Communist Party in this country is organized as follows: There are the dues-paying members, who have party books,



and so on. Those are the more or less public members of the party. There is then the underground organization of the party. That is a series of small groups, of three or five persons, organized secretly in a secret organization, which even if the party should be suppressed by law, could continue to function. In the third place, there is that extraordinary group, usually very able men, men who are so important to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Party that they are not allowed to admit that they are members, because it may get them into trouble. That is a very important group, although not large.

If we should make it a crime to belong to the Communist Party, I do not believe that today we have sufficient information with regard to all these groups to put our hands on them effectively, nor do I believe that if we did put our hands on them effectively we would actually go through with any punishment of them.

For example, when I was Ambassador to Moscow, one of the minor tasks I had was to ask the Soviet Government to accept again into the Soviet Union a number of its subjects who were illegally in the United States. We tried to deport these persons to their country of origin and the Soviet Government refused to receive them, just wouldn't take them back. Well, what are you going to do with them? You get out a deportation order against a man who is obviously an undesirable citizen of any country, and his country of origin refuses to receive him? Well, you may keep him under arrest pending deportation for a given period, but you can't keep him very long, and you just have to turn him loose again. We do not shoot people whom we dislike, as they do in the Soviet Union.

Now, in the Communist Party in the United States, according to such information as I have, approximately 60 percent of the members are of alien origin. Sixty percent of the members, I believe, are men and women who have come to the United States, and after being here a given length of time have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that one of the things that we should look into is perhaps this: That we should make, perhaps, membership in the Communist Party on the part of a naturalized citizen prima facie evidence that his citizenship was fraudulently acquired and that the immigrant in taking the oath of allegiance to support the Constitution of the United States committed perjury. That, I think, might hit 60 percent of the party.

There is a good precedent for that. We did exactly that with the German Bund, as you know, and deported from the United States—I have forgotten how many thousands of German Bundists—and I fail to see why we might not try to do that with Communists of alien origin. But when we consider doing that, let's also consider the fact that the Soviet Government will refuse to have these people sent back, and let us then try to think, before we pass any such law, what we are going to do with them.

These are some practical considerations that I am just bringing up as suggestions.

Another point which I should like to suggest to you is this: We have a requirement of the election laws that all campaign contributions made to the Democratic and Republican Parties—to all political parties—should be reported. The major parties all make returns of the names of their contributors. The Communist Party, I believe,

under that law should be required to list all its contributors and dues-paying members—because the payment of dues is just as much a contribution to a political party as the making of a campaign contribution once every 4 years, or whatever the period may be.

That is another suggestion which I should like to make, which probably will be ineffectual, but nevertheless it seems to me to point in a direction that might be useful.

And third, I should like to say this. I am perfectly certain that a time will come, and it may be close at hand, when it will be essential to our national safety to break up this criminal conspiracy, which is world-wide, break it up as far as we can in the United States.

In other words, that we shall have to take extremely severe action against the Communists, both those who are openly members of the party and those who are secretly organized in the underground, and those who are the, so to speak, unparty members, because they are too important to be jeopardized.

We will have to take action against them. The only basis upon which we can take action is the basis of knowledge, and I believe that at this moment the first thing we ought to do toward insuring the safety of the United States at a moment which may not be very far off, is greatly to increase the appropriation of the FBI for handling precisely this problem of the Communists in the United States.

I know that the FBI has done excellent work on this line. They have proved what they could do in the case of the German Bund, but in the case of the Communist Party you have many, many more, thousands and thousands more dangerous persons than you had in the German Bund; and I believe that the FBI should be given sufficient funds so that when the crisis comes it can seize all the members of the Communist Party who have any importance, just as effectively as it seized the members of the Bund.

I do think, therefore, that at the present time we are not equipped to face this issue by passing legislation making it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party. I do not believe that the people of this country are quite sufficiently aware of the danger to them involved in the existence of the party and the determination of the Soviet Union to conquer the United States, to face up to the penalties involved. The last thing we want to do is to make martyrs of anybody. The last thing we want to do is to throw away one iota of our Bill of Rights contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Our glory in the world and, indeed, our great strength, is in the fact that we stand for freedom. The Soviet Government today, in the world where it is really known, stands for just one thing, which is slavery.

It is a very old fight, an extremely old fight, which has gone on for 2,500 years at least, between the idea of freedom, exemplified at that time by the Athenian democracy, and the idea of tyranny, exemplified at that time by the great kings of Persia. This fight is on today, and the great explosive idea which we have to offer to the peoples of eastern Europe who are under the heel of the Soviet Government, to all the peoples in the world, even the peoples of the Soviet Union who are under the heel of the Soviet Government, is the idea of freedom; and in my belief while we have to devise with the utmost care a method of handling this criminal conspiracy, I think it has to be done so as to avoid, meticulously, touching one iota of our Bill of Rights and our personal freedoms.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, the committee certainly appreciates the very fine statement that you have made to us.

The committee now has some questions to ask, if you don't mind.

One thing that I would like to know from you is this: Do you consider that communism is the greatest threat to the world today?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, there is very little left of fascism, and therefore the brown fascism is out of the world, and you have left the Red fascism, which is communism; and in my opinion it is the greatest threat there is to any form of decent life on this globe.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, I have been serving on this committee now for 8 years. I was with the Dies committee when it was originally established. That committee, and later committees, built up a tremendous record against the Communist Party, but many times we wondered if our efforts weren't futile. It is all right to talk about appropriating \$25,000,000 now to investigate un-American individuals in the Government, but we can look back and see that for just a few hundred thousand dollars a committee of Congress did exactly the same thing, and yet how futile it was at times because of the lack of cooperation that we got.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to ask you this question in regard to that: Do you think now, and in the future, we are going to get real cooperation, or do you think it will be as it was over the past 8 years—the kind of thing that weakened this country just as France was weakened back in 1936?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, I think that at the present time we are beginning to have a realization in this country of the facts with regard to the threat of the Soviet Union to the United States. It is perfectly true that from the autumn of 1941 until, certainly, the spring of 1945, all the agencies of the American Government which had anything to do with the problem were employed in trying to make the Soviet Government popular in the United States. That we have to recognize—from what came out over the radio, what was gotten out by the OWI, the statements made at the State Department—in which the Soviet Government was constantly referred to as a peace-loving democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Did we know, though, that that was absolutely wrong, that it was just as much of a falsehood as anything that we might say?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question to answer unless I were to talk for 15 minutes on it. I will say this, briefly: Mr. Roosevelt was perfectly aware in 1940 of what the Soviet Union was. In his speech of February 10, 1940, to the American Youth Congress, he said:

The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the facts knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

On November 7, 1941, in decreeing the extension of the Lend-Lease Act to the Soviet Union, the President declared:

I have found that the defense of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics is vital to the defense of the United States.

Now, in my opinion, both of those statements were true. The fact is that in the last war we associated ourselves with one totalitarian

imperialism, the Soviet Union, and two or three democracies in order to defeat another totalitarian imperialism Germany, which was associated with another totalitarian imperialism—Japan, in the Pacific—and in order to make the Soviet Union more popular in this country the Government deliberately engaged in propaganda on its behalf. Of that there is no question.

The hope of President Roosevelt was that in the end, if we gave Stalin everything he asked for, if we treated him with the greatest possible generosity, if we treated him as if he were a great gentleman, that in the end Stalin would turn out to be a peace-loving democrat and all the problems of the world would be solved. In that he was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just one more question. You mentioned France.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your opinion that France will be able to stand up against the Communist influence, or that France will fall and become a Communist state?

Mr. BULLITT. My opinion is that the 72 percent of the French Parliament which is anti-Communist can form a government of national unions, leaving the 28 percent of Communists in a minority and maintain legal democratic government in France—and I trust that they will do so, and I think that we should give them every encouragement to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mundt.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Bullitt, I believe that in calling the roll of the countries which had fallen under the complete domination of the Soviet you omitted mentioning the country of Albania.

Mr. BULLITT. Albania and Yugoslavia I perhaps didn't mention. When you are mentioning a list, when you are just speaking, it is difficult to remember them all—because there are a very large number.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right. I wish you would tell the committee for the record your interpretation, from your vast knowledge of the international machinations of communism, what is entailed in this phrase which is so glibly referred to frequently by ill-advised college professors, political preachers, and other people occasionally who apologize for communism, when they say, "There is nothing to worry about any more, the Comintern has been dissolved."

Mr. BULLITT. That is pure nonsense. The Comintern is—you may recall the American Communist Party was also dissolved and it became the Communist Political Association—I believe that is what it was called—because it suited the political book of the Soviet Government at that time to try to make it appear that the Soviet Government was no longer directing the Communist Party in the United States; but just as soon as it was no longer politically useful the Communist Party was revived in full form.

The Comintern being officially abolished means almost nothing. The Soviet Government now has such mechanisms throughout the world that it doesn't need the old mechanism of the Comintern. It has the Profintern; it has its own diplomatic service; and it has also the diplomatic services of all of its satellite states. There is a Polish Embassy today in Washington. I have no hesitation in saying that the Polish Embassy in Washington is certainly directed by the puppet

government of Poland which in turn is directed by Moscow and therefore the Polish Embassy in Washington is merely another adjunct of the Soviet Government.

Now that they have so many mechanisms, now that they have spread so widely, they no longer need the Comintern as a mechanism, but I quoted you before Stalin's statement that the Comintern was the "holy of holies of the working class," and if anyone thinks that in reality that holy of holies has been abolished he is very naive.

Mr. MUNDT. As a matter of fact, some of the former members of the Comintern, such as Georgi Dimitrov in Bulgaria, have been transferred from one "holy of holies" to an operative post, as a dictator of a satellite country; is that not right?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. You mentioned the Vice President of France, I believe, who was a deserter. Who was that?

Mr. BULLITT. Maurice Thorez. He is vice president, not of France, but of the French Government. We talk about the French Prime Minister; they call him President of the Council, and then there is the Vice President of the Council, who takes the place of the President of the Council if the President of the Council is ill, or away.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you.

I am frank to say that I share your concern and skepticism as to the efficacy of outlawing the Communist Party, but I am highly desirous of taking every constitutional step that we can to restrict and restrain and repeal their activity in this country; so I was highly gratified to have the list of three or four suggestions which you made by which we could curtail, to a certain extent, these operations without making them actually an outlawed party. On the other hand, I presume that we cannot give too much credence to the theory that by outlawing them we drive them underground, because, as you have correctly pointed out, some of their most important operators are underground anyhow.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Because they do not openly admit membership in the party.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if you can give the committee any suggestions as to what can be done constitutionally, under our American Bill of Rights, to curtail the supporters of communism, who have that unfortunate habit of joining a lot of front organizations, and thus give them an atmosphere of respectability, because they are decent Americans, but are careless, and carelessly join these organizations and contribute, by their prestige and money, to the promotion.

A definite case came out in the papers this morning. A fellow by the name of Dr. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, whom I presume is a good American, was lending his name to a Communist movement, and then said, "I didn't know it was a Communist organization. Somebody called up and said will you join, and I said 'Yes.'"

Now, something should be done, it seems to me, to alert Americans against giving aid and comfort to the enemy, as it were, simply through carelessness. Such gullibles as Dr. Condon present a tragic case.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think that that might be handled very easily by, in the first place, an investigation of such Communist-front organizations so that we are perfectly certain they are Communist-front organizations, and then information being given directly—and I should not object to having it given by the American Government—to respectable persons who may have been hooked into their lists, that they were acting as screens for a Communist-front organization.

I think it might be, perhaps, worth while to go back and ask the State Department for the records of the Comintern Congress of 1935, which took place in Moscow, where American Communists were very prominent, despite all the promises made by the Soviet Government to the contrary, the promises made by Litvinov, written promises that the Comintern would cease to direct the American Communist Party.

Mr. MUNDT. Given as a condition precedent—

Mr. BULLITT. Given as a condition precedent to recognition; yes, sir.

At that time they developed the entire Trojan-horse policy and the statements are really extraordinary, the statements of the leaders of the Comintern, saying if any man thinks that it is beneath his honor to go into church organizations, into welfare organizations of every kind, in order to better undermine them, and the state in which they function, then he doesn't know what it is to be a real Communist.

Now, I think you might, perhaps, get some excerpts from that record and send them to these people who get drawn into these Communist-front organizations. That record exists, I know, because I was the Ambassador in Moscow at the time of the occurrence.

Mr. MUNDT. The record is in the State Department?

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly.

Mr. MUNDT. I have no other questions. I simply want to join with the chairman in expressing appreciation to you for your very helpful and informative and thought-provoking statement on a difficult problem. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Ambassador, for the first time, I think, in the Nation's history, America is becoming, rapidly becoming, acutely conscious of the Communist situation here and around the world.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. McDOWELL. I feel that all of the eyes of America are on this hearing today. Most certainly those things that you have said today are going to have a profound effect upon the people of America. I have attended many Communist meetings—not as a member. One of the frequent occurrences at the meetings was a comparison between living here in America and in Russia. The comparison, of course, was bad, so far as America was concerned. Would you care to make any observations on the things that occur in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, of course, statements of that kind are so fantastically distorted that is very difficult to answer them.

In the first place, life in Russia is lived under the constant fear of the knock of the secret police on the door in the middle of the night. No man when he goes to bed, and no woman, knows that in the middle of the night the secret police aren't going to arrive—and then comes disappearance. Then comes either death in a cellar with a shot

in the neck or deportation to one of the forced labor camps. We do not know exactly how many men and women are in those forced labor camps today, but there is extremely reliable testimony that there are more than 10,000,000 human slaves today in those forced labor camps working under the NKVD in the Soviet Union at this time.

It is worse than at the worst moment of Negro slavery. There were never so many slaves as there are today in the Soviet Union actually working in slavery.

That being the basis for life, whether you have more or less makes very little difference, because you can't call your soul your own; you are scared every minute. The actual scale of living of the ordinary people of the Soviet Union is fantastically low. It was certainly at the beginning of the war, in 1939, lower than that of any country in Europe, and, of course, infinitely lower than that of the United States. That is not to say that the commissars and the big leaders of one kind and another do not have everything. They do. They have their town houses, they have their country places, their automobiles, they have special shops where they get clothing, and their wives and children are clothed. They have enormous privileges. But when you get down to the great mass of the Russian people and the great mass of the other peoples in the Soviet Union—because the Soviet Union is, as you know, not populated exclusively by Russians; it contains 167 different peoples and tribes; they issue their primary schoolbooks, or did in the year 1936, if my memory is correct, in 165 different languages and dialects—the standard of life of these peoples for the most part is unbelievably low.

You can't describe it to an American because he has never seen anything like it and cannot imagine what it is.

The statement that the standard of living is higher in the Soviet Union than in the United States is, of course, the most outrageous lie possible. I don't know that it is worth while going on talking about it.

MR. McDOWELL. I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. I would like to join with the rest of the committee in extending the thanks of the United States Congress to this great patriotic American for coming here.

MR. BULLITT. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

MR. NIXON. Mr. Bullitt, I particularly noticed in your comment that this Congress must be careful not to place the Communists in the United States in a position of martyrs.

MR. BULLITT. Yes.

MR. NIXON. Would you even go so far as to say that although Communists will appear before this committee in opposition to this proposed legislation, that it might well be part of their program to welcome the passage of such legislation so that they could be placed in a position of martyrs?

MR. BULLITT. No; I don't think so. I think they are very well satisfied with their present set-up and don't want it disturbed. I think that they will oppose it and they will oppose it on different grounds—but that seems to me one step too subtle. I don't believe they will go that far.

MR. NIXON. You mean, then, that you think their opposition to this type of legislation is honest in this case?

Mr. BULLITT. I think that if they could get an outrageous bill passed, which the Supreme Court would unanimously throw out, they would be perfectly delighted, obviously, but I don't think that they would—

Mr. NIXON. They wouldn't oppose a reasonable bill which was held constitutional?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't think they would like that.

Mr. NIXON. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Bullitt, you have indicated that communism was a very definite threat to America today. I wonder whether, based on your experience, you could indicate to us the period in which that movement has gained the greatest impetus.

Mr. BULLITT. In the United States?

Mr. VAIL. In the United States.

Mr. BULLITT. Without question during the war. During the war.

Mr. VAIL. You don't think that that movement has been progressive since the war?

Mr. BULLITT. I should doubt it very much. It may have been—and I don't pretend to be a specialist on the activities of the Communist Party in the United States in the different trade-unions and in the different fields of life—but I think that there has been a very general awakening to the fact that the Soviet Union is not a peace-loving democracy and that the Communists representing it are not good American citizens, that they are serving a foreign power, and not the United States of America. I think that the Communist Party has less influence than it had during the period when it changed its name to "Communist Political Association" and was garnering a great many people of decency and good will, who were unaware of the facts.

So that I don't think it is so powerful. Nevertheless, that is not really the question. The question is, Does it occupy sufficient strategic points of importance so that it can, for example, paralyze our electrical industry by sabotage in case of an attack on the United States by the Soviet Union? That is one example. Can it operate in different fields equally effectively? For example, I understand that a very large number of all the radio operators on the merchant marine are in Communist unions. What would be the consequences of that? The question is extremely specific. Where they are; what they are doing?

Mr. VAIL. There isn't any question but what ours is a tolerant Nation. I am wondering whether you believe the framers of our Constitution and Bill of Rights had in mind the situation that has arisen today, a definite threat, an intent on the part of certain people living in our country to destroy our Government.

Mr. BULLITT. No; I certainly think they had no such thing in mind; and furthermore, when a Communist talks about free speech it is almost comic, for this reason: he has no speech that comes out of his mouth that isn't dictated to him by his rulers in Moscow. Now, the essence of free speech is that you honestly consider a subject and you develop your own opinion. You then have a right to express it. But the Communist simply follows the party line, which is laid down for him in Moscow. There is an interesting distinction there, which perhaps is not worth anything from a practical point of view, but never-



theless is a fact—that they don't think for themselves; they change their opinions en masse whenever they get an order to change them from the Soviet Union. In a book which I published last year there is an appendix in which I have recorded the different changes of line expressed in the Daily Worker in exact accordance with the changes in Soviet foreign policy.

Now, I think it is impossible to read that and believe that any American Communist thinks for himself. He gets his orders from Moscow what to think—which is something, certainly, that was not envisaged by the framers of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VAIL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Bullitt, the advocates of communism in this country keep harping on democracy. Is there any democracy in a Communist country?

Mr. BULLITT. There isn't the slightest trace of democracy.

Mr. RANKIN. A statement was made before this committee that there was no more democracy in a Communist country than there was in the penitentiary of the State of New Jersey or Mississippi or Texas. Is that statement correct?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I wouldn't put it in that form. The fact is that there is no democracy of any kind without political democracy.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the masses are the slaves of the state or the commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. That is correct. Completely the slaves of the state; and furthermore, the doctrine which is taught is the doctrine of the omnipotence of the state—that a man is good insofar as he serves the state; a man is bad insofar as he doesn't serve the state.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, were you in Moscow in the late thirties?

Mr. BULLITT. I was in Moscow, Ambassador in Moscow, from the autumn of 1933 until the autumn of 1936.

Mr. RANKIN. Did you see a large streamer across the gates of Moscow with this inscription on it: "Religion is the Opiate of the People?"

Mr. BULLITT. That streamer I saw in Moscow in 1919, and in 1932, when I was there, but it is my impression that it had been removed in 1933. I am not certain of that, but that is my impression.

Mr. RANKIN. I give you my impression. My recollection is that former President Hoover went to Moscow in 1936; is that about right?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't know. He wasn't there when I was there.

Mr. RANKIN. He made a radio speech when he returned to America, and told about seeing that streamer.

Mr. BULLITT. That is a statement which you may find all through Moscow and Leningrad, and the country, "Religion is the Opiate of the People."

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, communism is atheistic?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. Completely?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. They believe in outlawing all religion?

Mr. BULLITT. You have to qualify that now to this extent; they have an ideal, which is the state. It is a form of state worship. They

did their utmost to destroy Christianity in Russia; they conducted campaign after campaign against Christianity in Russia. When the last war, the war of 1939, came on, they found that they needed the support of a lot of religious people. Therefore, they stopped the persecution of the church in violent form; they permitted more churches to open, and they took the other course, which was of getting the leaders of the Orthodox church under their thumb, so that today they control the Orthodox church as one of the apparatuses by which they control the peoples of the Soviet Union. But they do permit it to function.

Mr. RANKIN. Also they propose to take over all property, all land, all factories, all methods of production and distribution; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, when the revolution came there they took everything over.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, a man cannot own his home or land in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. That is true, basically; but now they allow, for example, the peasants on the collective farm, they allow a peasant to get the product of an acre or a half acre that he has back of his place where he lives.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, they permit him to have what we call a garden in the South?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But the land that he tills, to make his living, is owned by the Russian Government.

Mr. BULLITT. Owned by the state.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is dominated by commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. And instead of imposing the usual amount of rental, as we impose, a certain percentage of the crop, they demand that they deliver a certain amount of production, do they not?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. In 1933, I think it was, they had a crop failure in the Ukraine. Do you remember that?

Mr. BULLITT. I do; very well.

Mr. RANKIN. And the people of the Ukraine are among the best people in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And they went down and took everything away from them and starved five or six million of the best people in Russia to death, in their own homes; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, it was, in one way, even worse than that. They set the grain quotas higher than the total grain crop. They then took the entire grain crop, but because there wasn't more, to come up to quota, the man was a criminal, and, therefore, he was treated as a criminal, in addition to being starved, and his wife and children as well.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. They managed to dispose, by systemically organized starvation, they managed to dispose of some three to five million Ukrainians.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, the people in the Ukraine are the white people of Russia, the Nordics; are they not?

Mr. BULLITT. No; that you can't say. The Ukrainians are an extremely fine people. Russians are a very fine people. Both the Russians and the Ukrainians are extremely Nordic.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, what I mean by that is that these people were Nordic people; they were not orientals?

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly not.

Mr. RANKIN. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

Mr. BULLITT. Three to five million.

Mr. RANKIN. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. BULLITT. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

Mr. RANKIN. You spoke awhile ago of there being 10,000,000 people in concentration camps.

Mr. BULLITT. I should say, at least.

Mr. RANKIN. You said that they were infinitely worse off than the slaves were in the Southern States.

Mr. BULLITT. What I said was this, sir, that there were more slaves today in the Soviet Union than there ever were at the height of slavery, not merely in the Southern States but in the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Well, in the Southern States I don't think it ever got higher than 4,000,000, and never were the slaves in the Southern States treated as brutally as the people are now treated in those concentration camps in Russia.

Mr. BULLITT. I think——

Mr. RANKIN. According to the information we get.

Now you spoke awhile ago about outlawing the Communist Party. The bill before us simply proposes to prevent men from being elected to office on the Communist ticket, to put a stop to the sending of Communist literature through the mail, and to put a stop to certain professors teaching communism in the schools and colleges of this country. Is there anything wrong in preventing those encroachments?

Mr. BULLITT. Personally I think the more people in the United States know about communism the better.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but——

Mr. BULLITT. And I would hate to see any bill passed which forbade people to tell the people of this country what communism was, right down to the last detail and very accurately.

Mr. RANKIN. You are aware of the fact that communism is much better financed than fascism was in this country. I am talking about the fifth columnists, as we call them.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Through certain foundations, alleged foundations, they are financing professors in the various colleges throughout the

country, who are continuously lecturing those students and misleading them as to what communism means.

Now, don't you think that ought to be stopped?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think if that is being done—and I have no personal knowledge of it—it is an extremely grave thing, which the Government ought to look into immediately.

Mr. RANKIN. There have been two professors in the University of Chicago—one of them is named Adler and the other one I believe is named Miller—who spouted off recently, making speeches advocating the abolition of the United States and saying boldly we must get rid of the United States. You know what that means, don't you?

Mr. BULLITT. Well—

Mr. RANKIN. Would you outlaw that kind of procedure?

Mr. BULLITT. I think anybody who chooses to advocate the abolition of the United States is taking quite a burden on his shoulders.

I may say there was a moment when most of the members of my family and probably most of the members of yours were engaged in trying to abolish the United States, by the Civil War.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad you brought that question up, because if you will get the constitution of the Confederacy and read it—

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. You will find that it was almost a duplicate of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; it was, surely. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. There was a secession over two questions—

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The spread of slavery and the right of a section of the country to secede.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But we never undertook to undermine and destroy all forms of government.

Mr. BULLITT. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Including the right to own property.

Mr. BULLITT. No; Congressman. Excuse me, I misunderstood your question in that case.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you spoke about prosecuting these fellows. You know that no Communist will tell the truth, if it suits him to prevaricate; do you not?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; that is quite true.

Mr. RANKIN. No oath will bind a Communist; will it?

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. None whatever.

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Nothing they will find will bind them; will it?

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why do we spend so much time in trying to find out whether or not we can enter into some agreement, when we know that our side will be the only one that will feel bound by it?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, Mr. Congressman, for very practical reasons.

For example, if we had come to an agreement in the year 1941, when the Soviet Union was dependent for its life on supplies from the United States—if at that time we had come to an agreement with Stalin that at the end of the war there should be set up a United

States of Europe and that he would not extend his boundaries beyond the boundaries with which he started in 1939—if we had done that we could immediately, and should have, started an immense movement for the consolidation of a western European federation or United States of Europe, in whatever terms you want to put it.

Mr. RANKIN. Speaking—

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish what I am saying, sir?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BULLITT. If we had had a formal written agreement from Stalin, he could not have objected to our starting practical measures to set that afoot, and we might have established a very great element for democracy and peace in the world if we had done that.

Now, the advantage of coming to agreements with the Soviet Union is merely that their agreement estops them from immediately making efforts, and public efforts, to prevent you from carrying out your side of the agreement. That is the practical value of any agreement with the Soviet Government.

Mr. RANKIN. When I think of the meeting of the United Nations, I am reminded that the towers of Babel have been collapsing in a confusion of tongues ever since the days of Genesis, and it is a sound warning to me that the United States had better be very careful. These professors that go out and say that we ought to abolish the United States, to become a subsidiary of a world government, in my opinion are spreading treason.

Now you spoke awhile ago of the FBI. The FBI hasn't a better friend in Congress than I am. But don't you think that we ought to make the FBI an independent agency and extend its powers and furnish it all the funds it needs to make any investigation necessary anywhere at any time?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, that is a question which I have never thought about—the question of making it an independent agency.

With the latter part of your statement I agree heartily, and that is the FBI should have very greatly increased funds and that it should be encouraged by the Government to go into all the many ramifications of Communist activity in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you said a while ago that 60 percent of the people coming over here from Russia were Communists?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir. My statement was, if I remember correctly, that 60 percent of the members of the Communist Party had come to the United States as aliens. They were immigrants. Many of them have come from other countries than Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you are aware of the fact that there is a wide breach between the Communists and the anti-Communists in the Jewish race, are you?

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think we ought to get into that question.

Mr. RANKIN. You wait. I am doing the questioning now. I am a Member of Congress. I want to ask you what percentage of those Communists, that 60 percent that you spoke of, are Jews?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't know.

Mr. RANKIN. You don't know?

Mr. BULLITT. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. RANKIN. The information we have is that 75 percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are Jews.

Mr. BULLITT. I have no knowledge of that, if that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. You say, Mr. Rankin, the information we have or you have?

Mr. RANKIN. I say we have. I don't know whether you have it or not, but we have.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think the committee has.

Mr. RANKIN. I do.

Now, they have gone down through the Southern States and all over the country and tried to line up the Negroes. They don't care anything about the Negroes, you understand, but they are using them to try to carry on their program. They have taken these Negroes to Moscow to teach them how to carry on revolutions in this country. Are you aware of that?

Mr. BULLITT. I have no personal knowledge of that. That may be entirely true, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. RANKIN. We had one before the committee the other day—

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And he said that they took him there, and had other Negroes there from the South—which we already knew—and taught them how to carry on revolutions. They taught them, as you say, how to begin, by destroying the waterworks and the light system, blow up bridges, and doing whatever is necessary to paralyze a city or a community.

Now, were you aware of the fact that they were teaching this in that Communist school over there?

Mr. BULLITT. I know that they have a school of revolution, in which they have representatives from very nearly every country in the world. I have no specific knowledge, as I just said, of the presence of American Negroes there, but, obviously, it wouldn't surprise me because they have had Chinese, Indochinese, Moroccans, Algerians, Frenchmen, Italians, Germans—everybody. It is a world school of revolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you may read the Communist Daily Worker. It is constantly maligning the anti-Communists in this country on the race question, and constantly maligning the Southern States, attempting to stir up race trouble all over the South, just as they are in other sections of the country.

Now, this Negro from the North, who was here the other day, testified that they stirred up the race riot in Detroit last year.

Of course, we finally got through the press that there were about 30 or 40 Negroes killed, and then we got the report which showed, I think, there were about 600 of them. They have been using that kind of method to stir up race trouble over this country.

Mr. BULLITT. They will try to put race against race.

Mr. RANKIN. That is it.

Mr. BULLITT. And creed against creed—

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. And I object very much, in this fight, to singling out any race or creed for special criticism.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. BULLITT. I think that this fight is one which is essentially American. After all, we have our strength in the fact that we are people who came to this country from all over the earth, to try to find free-

dom, and we learned how to work together—people of all nationalities and all races—for the common good of all. I personally don't feel that there is any racial issue whatsoever in this fight against communism.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is a very fine statement.

Mr. RANKIN. When you get along further, and if you will talk to these high-class American jews, you will find just what I am telling you.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this part of the discussion is out of order, and I would suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi confine his questions to the statement that Mr. Bullitt made, and also to pertinent matters.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Bullitt, I want to ask you about this drive against the British Empire. You realize, of course, there is a terrific drive being made now in Great Britain—

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN (continuing). By what they call the Zionists. Isn't that a Communist front?

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the difference?

Mr. BULLITT. No, no.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the difference?

Mr. BULLITT. No. Mr. Congressman, to call the Zionists a Communist front is, I think, to disregard the history of the past 40 years. I personally knew, and knew very well, the great Zionist leader of Palestine, whose name was Aaron Aaronson, who, unfortunately, was killed at the time of the Peace Conference at the end of World War I in an airplane accident. That man, who was one of the most eminent scientists in the world, being a great agronomist, the discoverer of wild wheat, was the leader of the Zionist movement in Palestine. No one could have been further from communism. No one could have been further from any Communist ideas. He was one of the finest human beings I have ever known. He started that.

I have also known Dr. Weizman, who was the leader of the Zionist movement until the most recent congress, and Dr. Weizman is almost among the most eminent men in the world, and certainly is no Communist. I do not think it is fair to say that the Zionist movement is a Communist front; emphatically "no."

Mr. RANKIN. One of the outstanding Zionists in this country, and the one who has criticized me most, boasted that some of his children were Communists, and I am just wondering how much of it is interwoven with the Communist movement throughout the world.

Now, then, they are opposing the British Empire, are they not? And if we go into Greece—I am asking this question because I want to know. I have had the white people of the South alarmed by these Reds sufficiently. I can take it and I can give it. They are asking us to go into Greece and Turkey, to stop the spread of communism, because Great Britain is no longer able to protect herself there, that is, protect the Greeks and the Turks, because she has to exhaust her efforts protecting her own Government, you might say, in Palestine; is that correct?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir; I don't think that that is correct. I have never heard that statement made, and I don't think it is correct. The British problem is a very much more serious one than that.

At the time of Napoleon there were 10,000,000 in what is now Great Britain. They achieved a population, and were able to support them, of 45,000,000 before this last war because they had coal at seaboard, quantities of the very best steam coal at seaboard. They sent that coal out in their merchant ships all over the world. They brought back, when they discharged the coal, the raw materials they needed for their factories. Following those merchant ships and that coal went British banking, British insurance, and British investments.

During this last war they had to liquidate their investments abroad, to pay for the war. At the same time their coal seams in Great Britain have become so small that they are worked down to seams of 2 and 3 feet. You know what coal mining is, and how hard it is to get coal out of a seam 2 or 3 feet wide. Our seams for the most part may be 8 or 10 feet, which makes comparatively easy mining. They no longer have sufficient coal for their own needs in Great Britain. They, therefore, cannot export coal throughout the world. They, therefore, have great difficulty maintaining their merchant marine and getting cargoes for their outgoing ships, when they have to bring large quantities of raw materials for their manufacturing industries.

The consequences of that plus their consumption of their overseas investments, are that they have a very big fundamental problem of how to keep alive this enormous population, which has increased from 10,000,000 to 45,000,000 in the past century.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand they have—

Mr. BULLITT. But that is a much larger question and a much more profoundly difficult question than the question of maintaining troops in Palestine.

Mr. RANKIN. Now I am going to say to you, while I am on that subject—

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. That one of the men who gave us the information as to the number of Jews, percentage-wise, in the Communist Party, was a Jew himself and was an anti-Communist Jew. There are plenty of them in this country that are anti-Communists and they know what these Communists are doing to them, as well as to the rest of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rankin, may I say something? Mr. Bullitt was very kind to come here today.

Mr. RANKIN. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. He has been sick for 4 months.

Mr. BULLITT. It is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. And if we could just bring the questions to a close soon, I think it will be helpful to Mr. Bullitt.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask you about the British Government as it now stands—

The CHAIRMAN. Doesn't that get into the field of foreign affairs a little bit, and isn't that a matter for the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I was just going to ask him if he was familiar with the Strachey philosophy in Great Britain, and if he could distinguish between it and the Communist philosophy in Russia.

Mr. BULLITT. That is all right. I have no objection to answering that.

Mr. RANKIN. How is that?



Mr. BULLITT. I would be very glad to answer that question.

Mr. RANKIN. I would be very glad to hear you.

Mr. BULLITT. The distinction is the following: The philosophy of the present British Government is Socialist. It is not Communist. The distinction between the Socialist and the Communist is the following: The Socialist in the first place believes in a gradual approach to the establishment of socialism, by legal and democratic means. They stand for democracy. The Communist stands for dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you ever read Strachey's book?

Mr. BULLITT. Which one? I have read several.

Mr. RANKIN. He is a member of the cabinet.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, I know him. I have known him personally for 30 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Doesn't he advocate taking over all the land, just as they do in Russia, together with all the factories and all other means of production and distribution?

Mr. BULLITT. So far as I know—and I may be entirely wrong, he may have written a new book which I haven't read, but so far as I know, what is advocated by the present labor government of Great Britain is the nationalization of certain very large industries. They have taken over the coal industry. They intend to take over, I believe, the production of electricity, the railroads, and various other large units. They do not intend to abolish private property. They do not intend to take over small businesses or small manufacturing units.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the information I wanted. They do not propose to take over the land?

Mr. BULLITT. No, I do not think so.

Mr. RANKIN. And to make slaves out of the tillers of the soil.

Mr. BULLITT. No, emphatically not. There is no government in the world that stands more firmly today for all the rights in our Bill of Rights than the present British labor government.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bonner.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Bullitt, your statement today, considering the great background you have, startles me and would startle thousands and thousands of other people in America could they be here to hear you.

The thing that interests me is what is the delusion that attracts American citizens to the Communist Party and movement?

Mr. BULLITT. I think it is largely that they have swallowed the propaganda which has been poured on this country in very, very large quantity.

There are a great many more true believers in the Communist paradise outside the Soviet Union than there are inside, because inside they have to live with the facts. They have to live with the NKVD, that is, the secret police. They have to live under absolute tyranny. Over here, people can read propaganda tracts written by Communists and imagine this beautiful world, this beautiful Utopia. Well, people have been writing books about Utopia ever since Plato's "Republic" and much later Thomas Moore's "Utopia," and so on. It is wonderfully nice to read about. It has no relation whatsoever to the truth.

I think that a great many perfectly good Americans have simply been taken in by extremely brilliantly conceived and written propaganda.

The Communists have never hesitated to spend a great deal of money over here, to send lecturers of all kinds, to send agents. There are a great many intelligent men in the American Communist Party. Their bread and butter is in it, and they have a vested interest in maintaining it.

Mr. BONNER. My first keen interest in this subject was brought about by a gentleman who appeared before this committee, who comes from one of the oldest families in America. When he first appeared before the committee, I thought the committee had made a serious mistake. On his second appearance, I knew the committee hadn't made a mistake. He is a highly intelligent man. I observe that a lot of men this committee calls before it are highly intelligent men.

Now, why do these people, who are an intelligent group, fall for this? I can understand just the run of the mine reading these stories on Utopia and falling for it, but these other people are able to read and are able to understand beyond that and read between the lines, and they contact men like you and other people who have traveled abroad and know. What is it that attracts these highly intelligent people.

Mr. BULLITT. I think, in the first place, they are men who are attracted by the ultimate idea. There is an enormous philisophy behind this thing. The theory behind it is that if you can abolish private property and establish communism everywhere, then finally the state will wither away, that there will be no state and everybody can live in sort of happy anarchy. [Laughter.] This is a fact. If it interests you, I can give you a couple of quotations on the subject.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to hear it. That is the most interesting part of this to me.

Mr. BULLITT. I hope I can find these readily, and not keep you waiting.

I am quoting my own book. I suppose it is justifiable to quote yourself:

The Soviet government believes in a Communist creed, which it teaches to all its children, for which it prepares them to live, and, if need be, to die. That is the Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed which denies God and claims to be based on scientific fact; but is based on the improbable assumption that the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production will end all war, civil and international, and so improve the nature of all men in all nations that, in Lenin's phrase, "the state will wither away" and all men will live without a state in perfect freedom and happiness. As Engels, the collaborator of Marx, envisioning a Communist world, wrote, "The machine of the state is put into the museum of antiquities, alongside of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe."

Lenin \* \* \* believed that the state, whether in his hands or in the hands of a "bourgeois government" was an instrument of violence; but that, while living under Communist dictatorship, men could be prepared for perfect freedom.

And here is another quotation from Lenin:

"While there is a state", he said, "there is no freedom.  
When there is freedom there will be no state."

And then here is perhaps the explanation that you are looking for:

The mysticism of this belief is perhaps the reason why it has evoked as great devotion and self-sacrifice as many religious creeds. The Communist true believer offers his life as gallantly as an early Christian. He believes that he is fighting for the emancipation of all humanity from all evil. He thinks he serves eternal truth. The Communist Party, to him, is a union of the faithful. His old testament is the books of Marx and Engels; his new testament the works of Lenin and Stalin. In his idolatry he is profoundly religious. The Soviet Union is to him the Church Militant.

Is that sufficient?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. Then they are going to lead us back to the Garden of Eden?

Mr. BULLITT. A very, very heavily and evilly populated Garden of Eden.

Mr. BONNER. I want to ask you one more question, and I am through. In certain substantial and reliable papers I see editorials that this committee witch hunts. Of course, I haven't got the time to do any witch hunting. From your observation of this committee, are we proceeding along the right line, in your opinion?

Mr. BULLITT. I hope so.

Mr. BONNER. You don't hope so. I am asking you.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes. I think you ought to go into this just as far as you can go into it. I think you ought to make the recommendations.

I do not believe, as I said previously, that the time is now ripe to make it a crime to belong to the—

Mr. BONNER. You wouldn't sponsor this legislation?

Mr. BULLITT. No, I should say not. I don't think the time is ripe.

Mr. BONNER. Then am I right from what you said, that the greatest good that this committee can do is just pour light on this whole subject, all over the country?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, I have made certain specific suggestions. I think you were here when I made them.

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. I made certain specific suggestions. If this committee can use its influence to go into the things which I suggested, I think it would be wise. I think, further, it would be very wise to attempt to work out legislation which at some later date, when the emergency is more acute and more felt by the country so that you could be certain of great national support, and that moment will come—

Mr. BONNER. But what you have said leads me to fear that we haven't got much time.

Mr. RANKIN. We are at war now.

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, we do have time, in this sense—

Mr. BONNER. You know, I listened very carefully to what you said about the downfall of France, and that it happened in about 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. And you compared the two periods.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Which were very similar, and it threw the fear of God into me, when I heard you say what you said.

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish this, sir?

In my belief, the Soviet Union will not dare to attack the United States until the Soviet Union has manufactured the atomic bomb in quantity and until it feels that it has an air force superior to the air force of the United States.

That gives us a certain period in which we will definitely remain stronger than the Soviet Union and during which, when we say "Stop" to Stalin, and mean it, he will stop.

But the fundamental thing which we have to realize is that Stalin, like Hitler, will not stop of his own accord. He can only be stopped.

Mr. BONNER. Yes. We are tearing down our national defense, and, according to your testimony, they are building up theirs.

Mr. BULLITT. Very much so.

Mr. BONNER. I was in France during the last war, in an infantry company, and I went back there in 1937 and visited a lot of people that I knew. I saw what was going on, and it surprised me and it shocked me that they didn't believe Germany meant anything but a big parade.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BONNER. Your statement of the short time within which France fell and your observation of what is going on today leads me to believe that we haven't got much more time.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think this, that it is utterly vital for us to support the policy of President Truman, to stop the Soviet Union where she is and not to permit her to take over a series of new peoples. The whole strategy of conquest of Stalin is to lull powerful peoples into a sense of false security, while he is securing strategic areas and additional strength with which to attack them. It is precisely the Hitler strategy all over again.

Mr. BONNER. According to your testimony, they have already got the French Government. Now, what can we do—

Mr. BULLITT. No; they haven't already got the French Government. They already are extremely powerful in it and may be able, by a general strike, to produce a revolutionary situation, but the French Parliament is an absolutely democratically elected parliament, just as democratically elected as our own Government. And 72 percent of the French deputies, that is to say representatives, today are anti-Communist. Only 28 percent are Communist. The power of the Communists in France lies in their control of the trade-unions and their infiltration through economic life.

Mr. BONNER. Isn't that rapidly developing here?

Mr. BULLITT. I trust it isn't, and I don't believe it is.

Mr. BONNER. According to the testimony we have had before this committee as to the mode which is followed in selecting the officers of certain unions, it is rapidly developing.

Mr. BULLITT. I think it is extraordinarily dangerous to have any Communist union leaders anywhere in this country.

Mr. BONNER. Since we are thinking about helping Turkey and Greece, what could we do to help France? They are so close to this borderline now. What must be done to help them?

Mr. BULLITT. A great many things. In the first place, President Truman's action the other day points the line, I think.

Mr. BONNER. You refer to the Greece situation?

Mr. BULLITT. You see, although he hooked this policy on to the action for Greece and Turkey, it had a world-wide significance, much greater than the problems of the Near East. When he said so—and I wish I had the text of his remarks here—

Mr. BONNER. I think we have already heard so much about that we know it by memory.

Mr. BULLITT. I read it enough and I ought to remember it exactly, but I am afraid I can't quote him accurately. However, what he said was, virtually, that we must support nations which were resisting conquest by outside totalitarian regimes or their inside agents. That is virtually what it amounted to.

Now, that applies to France as well as to Greece and to Turkey, and I believe we ought to do everything we can to aid the anti-Communist Parties of France to eliminate the Communists from their present threatening position and to help France get back on her feet as a great democratic nation.

Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not, it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. If she had and we didn't.

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we didn't.

Mr. BONNER. Your testimony frightens me. I am glad to have heard you, and I think you have told the American people something—if the newspapers would carry it—that would open up their eyes and maybe make them realize what a dangerous threat we have now before us, notwithstanding all that certain papers say about this committee and those who are interested in the preservation of this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Bonner, will you yield there for a question?

Mr. BONNER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mundt has another question.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking further about these restraints which possibly we could apply and stay within our constitutional confines and not take the step of outlawing the party now, it has occurred to me that we look a little bit foolish by granting passports to fellows like Foster which enable them to travel around overseas and contact directly their sources of information and direction, and then come back.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. You are a former member of the State Department?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Would there be a way in which we could somehow circumscribe the right—it isn't right, but it is a privilege—to get a passport.

Mr. BULLITT. It is a privilege.

Mr. MUNDT. To get those passports.

Mr. BULLITT. All that has to be done is for the order to be given to the Passport Division of the Department of State, to give no more passports to Communists and that ends the matter.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be a strictly constitutional matter?

Mr. BULLITT. Strictly constitutional and within the right of the Government. No one has the right to have a passport. The passport is a privilege.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, just one short question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. When you were in Moscow, you said that you knew about this revolutionary school which they have over there, to which nationals are brought in from all over the world. I just wondered, as a matter of getting the thing specifically for the record, whether it has a name.

Mr. BULLITT. I am sorry to say I have forgotten what the name is.

Mr. MUNDT. When I was in Moscow, about a year ago, several members of our Embassy staff—not the Ambassador, but some of the

staff members, said, in viewing this change in the attitude toward the church, which you have described—

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. That that might be a device by which the Soviets were attempting to supply a new emotional urge for communism, because the old promises, 5 years apart, have begun to work kind of thin, and perhaps they were utilizing the Russian Orthodox Church to supply that urge. Would you think that might be a possibility?

Mr. BULLITT. I think they will use the Orthodox Church to the greatest possible extent and they certainly have the leaders in hand now, but how far they will be able to go in really using the church for such purpose I don't know because any Christian church teaches the Gospel and it teaches God, and Christ crucified and believed in, which is contrary to every basic belief of the Communists and of the Soviet Government. If they try to use that too far, they are likely to find themselves blown up by their own bomb.

Mr. MUNDT. I like your statement in your book which, like your memory of President Truman's statement, isn't perfect, but in which you bring out the point that if they let God get his foot in the door he may shoulder himself all the way in. I think there is that danger, from their standpoint.

Now one other statement. It is not a question. The last time I heard you before a congressional committee, you were testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the lend-lease issue, and I just want to say to my colleagues that I think we have a very far-sighted witness before us today, because at that time, as I recall his testimony, he suggested that in the event lend-lease was extended to Russia, we should set up certain quid pro quo, such as he described today, which would compel her to let us have something to say about the direction of that part of the world afterward. Unfortunately that was not written into the bill, but you were certainly very prophetic in your pronouncements at that time.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bonner, you had another question?

Mr. BONNER. You interested me, in that part of your talk that Russia was refusing to permit the entry of persons we desired to deport.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Yet we are still permitting them to come into this country.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Their embassies, and other government functions, in this country are highly staffed, and overstaffed, apparently, compared to any other nation.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. You would advocate, then, putting a limit on those we permit to come into this country?

Mr. BULLITT. Oh, emphatically. I think we ought to, in so far as it is in our national interest to do so, run our relations with the Soviet Union on a complete basis of reciprocity.

Mr. BONNER. In other words—

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; excuse me.

Mr. BULLITT. For example: They will not permit us to put a consulate in Kiev. There is no earthly reason why we should permit them, then, to put a consulate, say, in Chicago. They will not permit us to have a consulate here, there, or elsewhere. There is no earthly reason why we should permit them to have any more people in the United States than they permit us to have in the Soviet Union. I think that throughout we should treat the Soviet Government on a basis of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BONNER. If they won't permit the reentry of the people that we desire to deport, then we should stop the entry of their citizens into this country. I gather that from your statement.

Mr. BULLITT. No. I think there is a very interesting question which you have raised there, but I wouldn't quite agree with the sentence in which you expressed it.

You see if you let in persons born in what is now the territory of the Soviet Union, you can deport them only to the territory of the Soviet Union, and since the Soviet Union will not permit them to come back—I am not talking about diplomatic officials, I am talking about ordinary immigrants to the United States, and not officials—you have them permanently on your hands, whether you like it or not, because there isn't any place you can send them. I think it is one of the questions that you may very well consider, one of the questions that might very well be considered by this committee, whether we should permit immigration from countries which refuse to take back their citizens if, under the law of the United States, they are condemned to be deported.

Mr. BONNER. That is the very question I asked you.

Mr. BULLITT. That is precisely it. I didn't understand you.

Mr. BONNER. Then, where a person has lost his country, by the fact that Russia has taken it over, the same rule would apply, wouldn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I should say that under no circumstances should we send back any anti-Communist Pole, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, or Rumanian.

Mr. BONNER. Though we wish to deport him?

Mr. BULLITT. I said anti-Communist.

Mr. BONNER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BULLITT. I would not send back any man to certain death at the hands of the Soviet government, and that is what it means if you send those people back. I would not deport them, either, to the Soviet Union from our zone of occupation in Germany.

Mr. BONNER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ambassador, you mentioned reciprocity. You probably read in the papers in the last 2 weeks, the reciprocity on the question of patents. I just happened to make a statement on the subject on the floor of the House, and General Marshall brought up in his conference with Mr. Molotov. I made the statement how we had given Russia all of our patents, at prices ranging from 10 cents to 25 cents apiece, and one day we gave them 60,000 patents, and how Russia hasn't given us a single patent since 1927.

The reciprocity that would apply in these other cases should also apply on the question of patents, don't you think?

Mr. BULLITT. I think it should apply throughout. There is no reason why we should permit any nation to treat us in a manner which is not that generally accepted as denoting good neighborliness in the world, without treating them in precisely the same way.

I will give you a very simple example of it. In the Soviet Union all ambassadors are spied on constantly.

Mr. BONNER. What was that?

Mr. BULLITT. In the Soviet Union, all ambassadors are spied on constantly by the Soviet secret police. They are followed everywhere they go, wherever they go, by an automobile containing the chauffeur and three additional members of the NKVD, even if they go to the country for a picnic, or anything else. They are followed every place they go, so their movements are recorded. Everyone they speak to is recorded on the books of the NKVD.

Well, the Polish Ambassador, when I was there, got a little bit angry at this, and he, five times, asked the Soviet Foreign Office to stop it. Then he asked his government to apply reciprocity. So the next time that the Soviet Ambassador in Warsaw walked out of his house, there was an automobile behind his car containing four Poles, in medieval costumes, with swords and plumes, and every place he went he was followed by these people. When he protested, they said, "This is just for your protection, the way you protect our Ambassador in Moscow."

Well, 3 days later there was no more NKVD following the Polish Ambassador in Moscow.

Now, that was a very simple and rather comic little episode of reciprocity, but the Russians understand that. If they choose to kick you, all right they must expect one back. They simply think you are no good and soft, if when they kick you you simply hand out everything they want.

So, I believe very much in reciprocity in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Mr. RANKIN. Just one question—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, we have been on this a long time. Make your question short, because the Ambassador is tired.

Mr. RANKIN. I will make them short.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you have two or three questions?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will make them short.

Mr. Bullitt, according to your statement, Russian communism is already making war on the United States?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. On the people of the United States.

Mr. BULLITT. I didn't say that, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. They are virtually in a state of war with us, so far as attempting to destroy our system of government.

Mr. BULLITT. They are engaged in an effort to seize strategic positions throughout the world, for eventual use in an attack on the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Then you would say they are preparing for war.

Now, the most important military object on earth today is the atomic bomb. You said a moment ago, in response to Mr. Bonner's question, that if Russia had the atomic bomb and we didn't she



would already have blown our cities to pieces. Was that your statement?

Mr. BULLITT. I said she would already have dropped it on us, which I believe sincerely.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. In other words, if they had the atomic bomb and we didn't she would already have blown our cities to pieces and blown our people into submission, or into eternity.

Now, don't you think, under those circumstances, that we should not only keep the atomic bomb but keep an ample supply of them on hand, and keep planes equipped to distribute them and aviators trained for that purpose?

Mr. BULLITT. I do.

Mr. RANKIN. So as to keep one step ahead of any other country in the world that would attempt to develop the atomic bomb with the intention of using it on us or on any other nation.

Mr. BULLITT. I do; emphatically.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that is our duty, for our own safety.

You have made a great statement, and I want you to know I am grateful, indeed.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ambassador, the committee deeply appreciates your coming here today, and we hope that we weren't too long and that you feel absolutely all right.

The Chair wants to announce that tomorrow we will have Mr. William Green at 10:30 and Mr. Ray Sawyer, national commander of the American Vets. World War II, at 2:30.

Mr. Ambassador. I again want to thank you, and we hope you will be with us and that we will be seeing you soon again.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you very much, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:40 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

×





