

State Department Reply Defies McCarthy Threat to Name 29

By the United Press

The State Department closed for a new battle with Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.) yesterday by sharply refusing to tell him what it has done about 29 persons he considers security risks.

McCarthy promptly announced he will name the persons and outline the charges against them in a Senate speech "within a few days."

On Monday, McCarthy sent a letter to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, listing 29 persons whose cases, he said, are "pending" before the department's loyalty-security board.

He demanded immediate "assurances" from Acheson that all have been barred from secret information, and said unless he got such assurances, he would make the names public.

The department's reply was sent to McCarthy yesterday in a

letter signed by Carlisle H. Humelsine, head of the loyalty-security division.

He accused McCarthy of attacking the department's "honest and effective" loyalty program "for purely political reasons, and without regard to the facts."

Humelsine said McCarthy's list of 29 persons "includes the names of persons who are not employees of the State Department, and employees who have been cleared by the department's loyalty-security board, as well as some employees whose cases actually are pending before the board."

"Your indiscriminate lumping together of names and threat to make them public is tantamount to holding hostage the reputation and rights of those employees who have been or may be cleared of the allegations against them," Humelsine told McCarthy.

PAGE

WASH. POST

DATE

1-26-51

NOT RECORDED

JAN 26 1951

McCarthy Promises Names of 29 Today

By the Associated Press

Senator Joseph F. McCarthy (R-Wis.) said yesterday he intended to give the Senate the names of 29 past or present employees of the State Department whose loyalty has been questioned. He told a news conference he would disclose the names in a speech on the Senate floor today.

"Some very high officials" are on the list, McCarthy said. He reported most of the employees are under investigation on

charges ranging from association with Communists to Communist affiliations.

The Wisconsin Republican said he thinks all employees whose loyalty is in doubt should be suspended, on the reasoning that "if an employee is charged with embezzling from a bank, you don't let him still have access to the till."

When he suggested suspensions to Secretary of State Dean Acheson and sought assurances that suspected employees were not being allowed to see secret papers, McCarthy said, he got a letter "saying in effect, 'go to hell'."

At the time, the department accused McCarthy of "a political stratagem." It said some of the persons involved were not in the department, while others had been cleared.

McCarthy said yesterday he believed 24 persons on his list are still with the State Department. He said his information is that two others have been suspended, two have resigned and one has been cleared. Among those involved, he said, are "a foreign affairs specialist, an editor-writer, a divisional assistant, an Ambassador at Large."

The Senator added that he knew all those on the list would be cleared in the State Department's own loyalty procedures. "In four years the State Department has never found a single individual unfit for State Department service in its loyalty proceedings," he said.

Tuesday night on a television program McCarthy offered to give out the names from his office yesterday "if any one of the three major press services will give me assurance in writing they will make those names public without my having named them on the Senate floor."

The Associated Press, United Press and International News Service refused to give him such assurance. A spokesman for the Associated Press said: "The Associated Press will make no commitments of any kind to Sen. McCarthy. The Associated Press' responsibility is to report the news if and when it happens."

This morning about 20 reporters and photographers appeared at McCarthy's office. Reporters for the Associated Press, United Press and International News Service told the Senator any statements he offered would be handled on the same basis as other news, but they would give him no advance commitments.

McCarthy then made plain that he would not give out the names at his office. He said he was not surprised that the press associations had not given him the assurances he asked. He said he recognized the danger of libel suits if names were used without the privilege of congressional immunity.

NOT RECORDED
145 JUL 6 1954

FBI

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Stacy
[Signature]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly a memorandum or letter body]

INDEXED 38

WASHINGTON CITY



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1951

No. 146

Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, at the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Gerhard E. Lenski, pastor, Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, Thou who dost rule with power in human affairs, Thou who dost give power unto men that they may rule and govern for Thee, grant, we beseech Thee, unto those to whom Thou dost commit the solemn trust of the management of this world such knowledge of Thee and such reverence that in all things they may ever seek to serve, honor, and obey Thee.

We pray for the rulers of the United States that Thou wouldest enable them to defend our world from aggression and to preserve for us and all men the sanctities of life and law and liberty. We pray for the rulers of great lands more distant, for those more hostile, that Thou wouldest turn their minds from suspicion and distrust to thoughts of understanding, cooperation, and good will. We pray for those who negotiate peace in arena and for our soldiers who carry our standards in the field of battle. We pray for our Chief Executive, that Thou wouldest strengthen and uphold him, for our Congress, for this Senate group, and for all our citizenry, that in all things we may walk the way of Thy commandments, building righteousness in the earth, serving the common good and evermore glorifying Thy holy name through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, ouraviour, and our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 6, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 7, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Martowicz and his wife, Irene; and
S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Josef Ochowski and his wife and daughter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Wilson D. Gillette, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 29. An act for the relief of Teresa E. Dwyer;
S. 236. An act for the relief of Nicholas George Strangas;
S. 250. An act for the relief of the Z. D. Gilman Co., Inc.;
S. 328. An act for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi-Feng;
S. 343. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke;
S. 591. An act for the relief of Kiyoko and Chiyoko Ishigo;
S. 595. An act for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Shunichi Fujii;
S. 674. An act for the relief of Arthur Roessler;
S. 885. An act for the relief of Wong Thew Hor;
S. 1105. An act for the relief of K. C. Be, Swannio Be, Wie Go Be, Wie Hwa Be, Wie Buiing Be, and Swie Tien Be;
S. 1281. An act for the relief of Eric Adolf Lenz;
S. 1282. An act for the relief of Cecil Lennox Elliott;
S. 1302. An act for the relief of Howard Leach;
S. 1417. An act for the relief of Lefrancois & Chamberland, Inc.;
S. 1442. An act for the relief of Marie Loure Dewulf Maquet; and
S. 1443. An act for the relief of Rev. Thomas K. Sewall.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34

to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 460), to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3795) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner;
H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertus, Agnese Cernus, Marianna Donifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edwige Gasparini;
H. R. 1232. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat;
H. R. 1265. An act for the relief of Zdenek Novacek, Daniela Novacek, and Frantisek Novacek;
H. R. 1413. An act for the relief of Franz Geyling;
H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;
H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Federal of America National Trust and Savings Association;
H. R. 1831. An act to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence;
H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Chikako Shinkura;

be given to the committee which was to be appointed, and should be given to it in private, and then, after the committee had completed its investigation, it should decide which names were to be made public.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, at this point, statements by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and myself, explaining how it happened that certain names were made public.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
EXPLAINING WHY NAMES WERE MADE PUBLIC

1. Remarks of Senator HICKENLOOPER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1950, pages 4957, 4958.

2. Remarks of Senator McCARTHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 30, 1950, pages 4434, 4435.

Senator HICKENLOOPER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1950:

"As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations now engaged in the inquiry into the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to say that on the day on which the Senator from Wisconsin made his speech at some length on the floor of the Senate, in which he referred to certain cases by number, and so forth—I think it was the 20th of February—at that time the Senator from Wisconsin repeatedly stated and restated on the floor of the Senate that he did not want to make names public, that he would not tell the names to the Senate in public; and, time after time, the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, rose to demand that he give the names in public, so the whole country would know who the people were that were suspected.

"The Senator from Wisconsin repeatedly said, 'No, I will not make them public.' The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. WITHERS, rose and said he wanted to see the list of names. The Senator from Wisconsin said, 'Come to my office in the morning and I will show you the names.' The Senator from Kentucky said, 'Can I make them public? I intend to make them public if I see them.' The Senator from Wisconsin said, 'No; if you are going to make them public, I shall not give you the names.'

"The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with such statements on the question of the publicity of the names.

"It is a matter of fact also that the junior Senator from Massachusetts and I, both at the first executive meeting of the subcommittee, suggested and proposed the procedure, that the subcommittee meet in executive session, call the Senator from Wisconsin before it, and ask him to disclose the names in private, together with whatever information he had in connection with the names; but the majority of the subcommittee said no, this must be brought out in public. So they held their first hearing, requiring the Senator from Wisconsin to come, in public, to name the names. I tell the Senator that, if he is not familiar with it, merely to keep the factual history of the publicity of these names accurate.

"I should like to say also that so far as I am concerned, while we did not have the machinery to set up a court of inquiry such as the Canadian spy-ring case called for, we did propose and urge that an inquiry in secrecy without naming names be made with the facts collected. But we were overruled, and the Senator from Wisconsin was required, or requested, to come before the committee in public hearing, with klieg lights, television, and all the rest of the farfare of

such an emotional occasion, there to bring out his cases, name names, and produce facts."

Senator McCARTHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 30, 1950:

"There has been considerable criticism by a number of well-meaning people of the naming of names in public before the individuals have an opportunity to be heard.

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

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

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

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

"Again, on page 2049, he said:

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

"Again, on page 2053, he said:

"The Senator should name names before that committee."

"Again, on page 2063, he said:

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

"Mr. Withers, also, on almost countless occasions heckled me for the names, stating, on page 2063:

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

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

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

"He informed me that the first hearings would be public and that later we would go into executive session. Later I was informed by the press that Mr. Tydings had made a statement that I could present my cases as I saw fit.

"I again contacted him and told him that, if such were the case, I thought the names should be given in executive session, but was again informed that the first hearings would be public.

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

"Senator HICKENLOOPER informed me that was nothing that he or Senator LODGE could do because Senator Tydings had made an announcement that the first hearings would be open and it was not even brought to vote, inasmuch as Senator McMAHON and Senator GREEN obviously went along with him.

"At the time of the first public hearing after I had begun to testify, and had already passed out to the members of the press the first case covering Judge Kenyon, Senator Tydings then told me that he cared to, we would go into executive session.

"He, of course, knew full well that to go into executive session, so far as the Kenyon case was concerned, would be meaningless after I had commenced the case and had the evidence thereon to the press.

"I had tried to make it clear that the Kenyon case was presented as one of a quence which I had hoped to present first morning, if I had been allowed to proceed. I felt that it was important, not much from the standpoint of Judge Kenyon, but rather as a typical case to show the complete incompetence of the Loyalty Board for the reason that in this case the files contained more than 18 documents showing membership in organizations known as subversive or Communist-front—things regardless of this, the Loyalty Board had even went through the motions of asking the judge for an explanation as to why he joined these organizations, which the Secretary of State himself had stated were evidence that an employee was a bad security risk.

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

"The chairman of the committee, I magnanimously offered that the other day which I was prepared to present the case be given in executive session. I did condemn or criticize the chairman for a maneuver. Politically, it was extremely clever. However, after presenting oneself to show how the Loyalty Board worked, case which happened to be a woman would seem unusual in the extreme, the committee retire into executive session to consider the cases of these prominent State Department officials in whose activities the public was so vitally interested.

"I might say that while at the time I thought that the Senator from Illinois was wrong in demanding the names be made public and while I originally was very disturbed by Senator Tydings' very clever maneuvering of the names into print, I am not too sure that perhaps good has not been accomplished.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, was pointed out so clearly by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), for Senator Tydings, then chairman of the subcommittee making the investigation, who is no longer with us, insisted the first sessions be held in public.

and Capt. James Clyde Waller, Jr., for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States;

Paul DeWitt Adams and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Leslie A. Kelskern and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Norman K. Gearhart and sundry other persons for appointment in the Navy; and Thomas T. Cushman and several other officers for temporary appointment to the grade of major general in the Marine Corps.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent to have the Senate consider the joint resolution to which I referred a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee first to examine the joint resolution, which he will do in any event, I am sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I am glad to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to ask the Senator to tell the Senate once again whether in this case there is such an emergency that the House joint resolution cannot at least be considered by the full membership of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason is that the Department does not have sufficient funds with which to proceed to undertake a function with which it is charged, and it must be undertaken promptly.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a very good reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the answer the Senator has given, and I respect him highly. However, sometimes that reason—a lack of money—is a good one why a measure should not be passed, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, very frequently that is so; I agree entirely with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I read from the report:

The Department of Agriculture has ruled that all cotton stalks in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas must be plowed under by September 16 in order to control the pink boll worm. Stalks in Laredo, Wink Garden, and Eagle Pass areas must be plowed under by October 1. In the Rio Grande Valley alone the crop, which is now being harvested, comprises approximately 10,000 acres, yielding about 700,000 bales. The domestic labor force will have to be augmented in these areas to prevent losses in this important crop.

Other Texas areas and the States of Arkansas, Arizona, Missouri, Louisiana, and New Mexico have requested and will require Mexican Nationals to harvest cotton, while California will require them beginning the middle of August for the fruit, vegetable, and cotton harvests, according to the testimony received by the committee.

The basic law requires that employers reimburse the Government in amounts up to \$1 per worker to cover the costs of transportation and subsistence en route and at reception centers. Of the \$950,000 recommended in this resolution \$750,000 is for a

fund to be reimbursed by these States, and \$200,000 is for

administrative expenses, including operation of migration, or recruitment centers in Mexico, reception centers in the United States, and the costs of medical examinations for the workers.

The committee in reporting this interim appropriation expects the Department to assign only the skeleton forces necessary to begin partial operations, and not build up complete personnel complements until the Congress has considered and passed upon the full supplemental request for 1932 now pending before the committee.

That is the situation, and the Department must have the funds for that purpose. The House has passed the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator refers to "the committee"—

Mr. McKELLAR. I was referring to the House committee, not the Senate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what I thought. This matter has never been before the Senate committee; has it?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, it never has; although it has been before a subcommittee of another Senate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has it been before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not.

Mr. President, the following message is from the Secretary of Labor:

The Secretary called for you, and said to tell you that you would have before you today the joint resolution for a very prompt appropriation to take care of migrant Mexican labor. He said to please tell you that if you could get it out today, he would be deeply grateful. It is in the supplemental appropriation bill, Department of Labor, governing migrant foreign labor.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] spoke to me a few minutes ago and wanted to know whether this measure applies only to Mexican labor or whether it applies to foreign labor generally. I advised him that it applies only to Mexican labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that what I object to in this case—and I think the point was raised by the distinguished minority leader—is that this measure has come to us from the House of Representatives only today. It has not even been before either a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee or before the full Senate Appropriations Committee. I do not believe there is any pressing need for the passage of this measure. It may be desirable and may have a great deal of merit, but I think the distinguished chairman of the committee will agree with me that this is not the way to legislate. Certainly this sort of high-pressure tactics by those down town to get measures enacted does not appeal to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not agree that it is high-pressure at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not mean that the Senator is engaging in high-pressure tactics, but I meant that the Department is using high-pressure tactics.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona tells me that a meeting is intended for tomorrow. I would be perfectly willing to have this measure brought up before the committee. The full committee is to meet tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; and following favorable action by the committee, the joint resolution could be taken up in the Senate on Monday. Certainly no emergency will develop in connection with this matter during the next 3 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, although I should like to see prompt action taken on the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. However, I do not think that a few days delay will do any harm. Therefore, I shall object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

MORRIS KLEINMAN (S. RES. 119) AND LOUIS ROTHKOPF (S. RES. 120)—MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is now our intention to take up the motions of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Cain] to reconsider the votes by which Senate Resolutions 119 and 120 were agreed to. I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Washington and with the distinguished Senators from Tennessee and Maryland, who tell me they have no objection to the adoption of the motions, with the express understanding that the resolutions be made the unfinished business, and disposed of immediately. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the motions be agreed to, and that the votes by which these two resolutions, Senate Resolution 119 and Senate Resolution 120, were agreed to, be reconsidered. I further ask that Senate Resolution 119 be made the unfinished business before the Senate, and that, following the disposition of Senate Resolution 119, Senate Resolution 120 be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISCLOSURE OF NAMES OF PERSONS ALLEGED TO BE SECURITY RISKS

Mr. McARTHEY. Mr. President, last year I gave the Senate the names of 81 individuals whom I considered dangerous to this country, if allowed to remain in positions of power. At the time that was done, there were constant demands upon the floor of the Senate, many of them made by the then minority leader, former Senator Lucas, who is no longer a Member of the Senate, that I make the names public on the Senate floor. As I have stated, the majority leader was joined in this demand by a number of other Senators. At that time I refused to comply with the request, and explained why. I told the Senate I felt that, of the 81 cases given the Senate, some were marginal cases, in which the parties might well prove themselves to be not so bad as they were represented to be, and that for that reason I should not disclose the names.

and (2) due regard for the rights of the individual.

2. Under this program, all departmental and Foreign Service officers receive complete security investigations. These investigations are exhaustive and are made by trained investigators, operating under the direct supervision of a former FBI agent, Mr. Donald Nicholson.

3. The Department does not permit any employee to have access to secret material when it has determined that such access might constitute a danger to the security of the United States. To do otherwise would be contrary to the established security principles of the Department.

4. Questions as to the loyalty of any employee of this Department or the Foreign Service result in an up-to-date and full-scale investigation of the individual employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The evaluation of this investigation is made by a competent Loyalty Security Board which operates under the chairmanship of Gen. Conrad E. Snow, an experienced and able lawyer of distinguished reputation and unquestioned integrity.

5. This Board is made up of men of such high qualifications and unquestioned loyalty that I doubt that even the most suspicious person could be able to challenge their credentials.

6. The work of the Board is reviewed administratively by my immediate office and by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Seth Richardson, a former Assistant Attorney General under ex-President Herbert Hoover, was formerly chairman of the Loyalty Review Board. He was succeeded by the present chairman, ex-Republican Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Hiram Bingham.

7. In the more than 4 years of operation under this procedure, the Loyalty Review Board has never reversed the Department's adjudication of a case.

8. In conducting this program, the Department has uncovered some employees who did not meet its high security standards, and these employees have been separated.

As should be perfectly clear from the foregoing, the conduct of the Department's loyalty and security programs are predicated on thoroughly tried and proven American principles. We will continue to operate this program in the same straightforward manner in the future, confident that we are taking every reasonable step to assure a completely loyal and trustworthy group of employees. But we will not abandon adherence to those concepts so carefully and deliberately laid down in the President's loyalty program, and we will not compromise our legal and ethical responsibilities under pressure of political stratagem or threat.

Sincerely yours,

CARLISLE H. HUMBLEINE.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I find an interesting passage on page 3 of the letter, which reads as follows:

In the more than 4 years of operation under this procedure, the Loyalty Review Board has never reversed the Department's adjudication of a case.

In other words, Mr. Acheson's man is telling how good their board is because it has never been reversed. In view of the fact that they have never found an individual unfit for service, there could never have been an appeal to the Loyalty Review Board. Therefore, since there was never an appeal, there could not have been a reversal.

However, the Review Board has the power to take up a case on post audit and indicate dissatisfaction with the

case. That has been done time and time again. Even though the Secretary says this is not a reversal. As an example of such a case I invite the attention of the Senate to the case of Service. I informed the late unlamented Tydings committee that the Service case had been post-audited, sent back to the Loyalty Board, and that the Review Board said it was handled so badly that it wanted to call in an entirely new board and also asked that Service be brought back from a key spot in India. The State Department immediately issued a press release or called a press conference, I don't recall which, and announced that this was untrue; that McCarthy was lying and that Service's case had not been ordered reopened. I called the Department and told them unless they would issue a true statement of the facts, I would make public the photostats of the Review Board's ruling. Within a half an hour the State Department mysteriously found that the Service case had been ordered reopened and so announced.

I merely mention it because it sheds light on how much credit we can give to the official statements from the State Department. It would seem officials of the Department, who are, like Members of the Senate, servants of the people, would have the decency and honesty to tell the American people the truth.

So much for that.

I should like to make it very clear as I refer to the loyalty board of the State Department that I am not referring to the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board. That Board, as we all know, was doing an extremely foul job until its head, Seth Richardson, was promoted, and his place was taken over by former Senator Bingham of Connecticut. I think Senator Bingham is doing the best job anyone could do under the circumstances.

I hesitate praising Senator Bingham because I know any words of praise from me for any Government official certainly endanger that person's job.

Mr. President, I very much dislike bringing in the names of these individuals, but I frankly do not think I have any other choice. I think, so long as they are being given access to secret material and have been officially charged, that they have no more right to have their names remain secret than would someone who might be charged with reckless driving, embezzlement, or with any other crime or misdemeanor.

I shall briefly run through the cases, Mr. President. The first case is that of an individual well known to all of us, John Carter Vincent. Please keep in mind that these "letters of charges" were not prepared by me; they were prepared as the result of investigations by the FBI or State Department investigators.

Vincent is charged with being a member of the Communist Party, and to the best of my knowledge he is also charged with espionage activities while in Switzerland.

I would suggest to the McCarran committee that if they can obtain the correspondence between the Central Intelligence Agency and Dean Acheson's

office they will find the correspondence very revealing. I doubt if they will be able to get it, in view of what happened in the committee this morning. A very fantastic thing occurred before the McCarran committee this morning. General Willoughby was before the committee and was asked to give information on the communistic activities of certain Government employees, and he read into the record an order which he received from the Army saying to him, "General, you must not give the Senate committee any information about any employee of this Government."

Inconceivable? Yes. But it is true. It is part of the record.

So, Mr. President, I am not too hopeful that the McCarran committee will be able to get that correspondence.

One of the members of the Loyalty Board informs us that Acheson has assured them that the Department will not call Vincent back from Africa.

Some of the additional information not contained in the letter of charges, which I commend to the attention of the McCarran committee. I refer to the activities of George Ottlik who has been working hand in glove with Vincent in Switzerland. Ottlik represented the short-lived Hungarian Communist regime of Bela Kun. He was stationed in Berne, Switzerland.

While he was Director of the Eastern Division in 1945 Vincent wrote a memorandum, which is in his State Department file, strongly urging the General Hodge establish a coalition government between North Korea and South Korea. He objected strenuously to Syngman Rhee and urged that the State Department assist a Moscow-trained Communist by the name of Kim Keosok to get the presidency of South Korea. As we also know, Vincent has been a very close associate of Owen Lattimore. Lattimore has been named by two witnesses as a Communist and an agent of the Soviet Secret Police, respectively.

On page 172 of Wallace's book it is pointed out that in 1944 a high official of the Soviet Government proposed a toast to Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent.

He proposed a toast, which was quoted by Wallace as follows:

To Owen—

Here we have the top representative of the Soviet, and here is his toast, as quoted by Wallace—

To Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent, American experts on China on whom rests great responsibility for China's future.

That is to be found on page 177 of Wallace's book. So much for John Carter Vincent.

The next case is the case of William T. Stone. Stone, a Communist activist, is a legion, and I will not attempt to describe all of them. It is of some interest to note that he was one of the editors of *Amerasia*. *Amerasia* has been described by the FBI as a "tool of Soviet espionage." It was also one of the high organs in the League of Pacific Relations.

sequently about 9 or 10 of the 31 names were made public. Since that time I have been trying to follow the progress of the individual cases which were given to the Tydings Committee, 31 in number, plus 13 additional names which were developed during the hearings. I found that a considerable number had been cleared by the State Department, 28, to be exact; and, at a later time, I intend to read into the Record the dates of their clearance. Another set of 29 names is still pending before the Loyalty Security Board. As to the remainder, nothing was done.

In the 29 cases, what is known as "letters of charges" have been filed. These letters of charges were not filed by McCarthy, they were not filed by anyone outside the Department. They were filed as the result of adverse information developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by some of the State Department investigators. How to describe letters of charges? Best I do not know, except to say that the best analogy perhaps would be that of an information filed by a district attorney, or perhaps an indictment returned by a grand jury. The fact that letters of charges have been filed against these 29 individuals does not necessarily mean that all of them are guilty of the charges. Some of them may well be able to prove their innocence.

Incidentally, Mr. President, there is no doubt that they will all be cleared. The State Department's Loyalty Board has a very unusual record. In 4 years of operation, with hundreds and hundreds of cases coming before the Board, cases which came before the Board as the result of investigations conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department's Loyalty Board has not found a single man unfit for Government service.

The Commerce Department comes next. The Commerce Department has found somewhat less than 7 percent of the cases which came before its Loyalty Board unfit for Government service. However, that record is not so bad as it may look, because Secretary Sawyer, upon his own authority, discharged a number of questionable characters before their cases even came before the Loyalty Board.

I think we can safely say that all these individuals will be cleared, as they were cleared by the Tydings committee last year.

Upon learning that these individuals were formally charged, Mr. President, I wrote to former Senator Hiram Bingham, who succeeded Seth Richardson as Chairman of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, and asked him whether he would confirm the information which I already had as to which cases were pending. Under date of June 13 he wrote me confirming the information which I had. This letter is available to any Senator who indicates a desire to see it.

I then found that all these individuals, even though they had been formally charged with communistic activities, still, as of this moment, have access to top secret and other classified material in the State Department. I accordingly

wrote the State Department and made a very, very reasonable request. I wrote them under date of July 23, 1951. I ask that this letter be printed in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks, omitting the list of names contained in the letter.

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

JULY 23, 1951.

MR. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would appreciate receiving information as to the status of the following 29 cases which I understand are pending before the State Department's loyalty board:

I would also appreciate knowing—

1. Whether the above individuals have access to classified material while their cases are pending;

2. Whether letters of charges have been filed in all of the above cases.

A short time ago when it was announced that the cases of John Paton Davies and Oliver Clubb had been reopened and they had been suspended, the State Department announced that, under the law, suspension was mandatory. I thereupon wrote the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Board and asked him why others whose cases were pending before the Loyalty Board, such as John Carter Vincent and Phillip Jessup, and so forth, were not also suspended. The Chairman wrote me under date of July 16, stating that the law does not make suspension mandatory, but leaves the question of suspension entirely within the discretion of the Secretary of State. Do you so understand the law?

If steps have been taken to deny individuals such as Vincent, Jessup, and others whom I have named above, access to secret and other classified State Department material I would appreciate being so informed. If no such steps have been taken, I would appreciate receiving your comments as to whether you consider it safe practice to give individuals being investigated for Communist activities free access to State Department material of such a secret nature that it is not available to Members of the Congress.

Unless I receive your immediate assurance that steps will be taken to deny access to secret material to those whose cases are pending before your loyalty board and those who have been formally charged with Communist activities, I shall feel forced to bring the individual cases to the attention of the public with the hope that public opinion may force sensible action on your part.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

MR. MCCARTHY. In that letter I called to the Secretary of State's attention to the very dangerous practice of giving these individuals access to secret material after they had been charged with communistic activity. To my mind, it is like a man who is indicted for embezzlement having completely free access to the funds of the bank while he is being tried.

I told the Secretary of State that unless he would assure me that these persons would be denied access to secret material until his own loyalty board would clear them, I felt I had no choice but to bring the cases to the attention of the Senate and give the Senate a résumé of the "letters of charges" filed against them, hoping that action by the

Senate or perhaps public opinion would make the Secretary change his policy and adopt a sensible, safe attitude.

I received from the Secretary's office, under date of July 25, a very arrogant letter in which he indicated that he thought it was no business of the Senate, that the State Department is his own little private kingdom where he can do what he pleases, and he refused to assure me that these men would be denied access to secret material.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the body of the Record at this point.

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

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, July 25, 1951.

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: As the officer in charge of the operation of the loyalty and security program of the Department of State, I am answering your letter to the Secretary of July 23.

You begin your letter by stating that it is your understanding that the 29 individuals whom you list are "cases . . . pending before the State Department's Loyalty Board." Your understanding is incorrect. The 29 individuals—all of whom you have cited, of course, in your former lists—fall into varying categories. Like your previous lists, this one also includes the names of persons who are not employees of the Department of State, employees who have been cleared by the Department's Loyalty Security Board, as well as individuals in process through the loyalty program. Your indiscriminate lumping together of names and the threat to make them public is tantamount to holding hostage the reputation and rights of those employees who have been, or may be cleared of the allegations against them. The President's directive of March 13, 1948 (Federal Register, March 13, 1948), precludes me from furnishing any reports, records, or files relative to the loyalty of employees. Disclosure of such information would be prejudicial both to these people as individuals and to the Government's ability to conduct a sound, just, and honorable loyalty security program.

Let me once again remind you that the Department of State is operating under the loyalty program laid down by the President in Executive Order No. 9835 as amended by Executive Order No. 10211. This Executive order, which anyone interested in our national security safeguards should feel duty-bound to study, prescribes a loyalty system which even the most critical have endorsed. This system offers as much protection to the Government as any ethical and American system which could be devised. That it is subject to attack for purely political reasons without regard for the facts is unfortunate.

The Department of State, operating under the authority of the so-called McCarthy Security Risk and Public Law 793 cases, has a total security program. When I say total, I mean total. If an individual is found to be a security risk, he is separated from the Department.

Now, the following points with regard to the Department's loyalty and security program have been said many times, but I will repeat them again for your benefit as fully and as briefly as possible.

1. Both the loyalty and security programs of the Department are under my immediate supervision and they are being carried out honestly and objectively. We are and will continue to give a priority to the maximum protection to the Government

I used the names on the floor of the Senate.

Some members of the press also asked if their newspapers could get the information. I said, "Yes; if your editor will simply tell me that he wants to use the names, he can have them." I received no calls from any editors.

That should, I hope, lay at rest once and for all the silly, asinine claim that a Senator can expose corruption or communism, somewhere other than on the Senate floor or before a committee. If he went off the Senate floor and exposed it, no one would hear about it except those within the range of his voice. If we are to have a housecleaning, the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from New Orleans to St. Paul, should have the information about these dangerous characters.

The next one is Daniel F. Markolies, one of the top security men in the State Department. Originally the appointment of this man was disapproved on the ground that he was a bad loyalty and security risk. He was hired anyway.

The next name is that of Robert Warren Barnett. This is one of the men who was brought into the State Department on the recommendation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Edward Carter testified to that the other day. He has been active in the Institute for a number of years.

The letter of charges against the Barnetts—both Robert Warren Barnett and his wife, Mrs. Robert Warren Barnett, charges them with close association and constant contact with known Soviet espionage activity.

The next is Sylvia Schimmel, an administrative analyst in the Department of State. The letter of charges in her case is briefer, but substantially the same as that in the case of the Barnetts.

The next is Philip Raine, a regional specialist in the Department of State. He is tied up, in the letter of charges, very closely with Robert T. Miller, who has been identified under oath several times as a Russian espionage agent.

The next is Gertrude Cameron, information and editorial specialist in the Department of State. I recommend this case especially to the McCarran committee.

The next is Paul A. Lifantieff-Lee, an economist in the Department of State. He was born in Russia. His file in the Navy Department, which was transmitted to the State Department, shows that he took secret State Department documents, which were found in his room and picked up by naval intelligence. That is shown by the naval intelligence report.

The next name is Franz Leopold Neumann, a consultant in the Department of State.

The next is John Tipton Fishburn, labor economist in the Department of State.

The next is Victor Myron Hunt, in the Office of Educational Exchange, Department of State.

The next is Arpad Erdos. He is an information specialist in the Department of State. For some time this man

was with the Voice of America, but he was promoted, and now has a higher-paid job.

The next is an editor-writer by the name of Frances M. Tuchscher.

The next is Nelson Chipchin, a radio information specialist. This is another case that I recommend especially to the McCarran committee.

The next is Esther Less, also known as Esther Less Kopelewich, an announcer in the Department of State.

The next is Esther Caukin Brunauer, United States representative to the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO, Department of State.

The next is John Patton Davies. Incidentally, since I wrote the State Department, Davies has been cleared, despite the vast amount of information on his communistic activities. I understand he is being promoted and sent to Berlin to act as adviser to McCloy.

One final phase, the prize of them all, against whom charges are now pending, is Philip C. Jessup. The history of this man Jessup is so unusual that I assume some day we shall look back and say: "Not it is impossible. The State Department certainly would not have given this man the top job that he had over in Paris, negotiating with the Russians even as Hiss in a less important capacity did the negotiating at Yalta."

I am not going to take much of the Senate's time on this case. I wish briefly to go through some of the material I have in my hand. Testimony was given by Jessup on two different occasions, the occasion of the first trial of Alger Hiss, and the second trial.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I notice on the list read by the Senator the name of Esther Caukin Brunauer. It seems to me that I recall reading in the newspaper that she had been removed, along with her husband, from Government employment. Am I correct in my recollection?

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that two of the individuals were suspended. They are Brunauer and Val R. Lorwin, the economist in the State Department. The information is to the effect that they are still on the payroll of the State Department, pending inquiry. Mrs. Brunauer's husband, Stephen Brunauer, was employed in the Navy Department as head of the High Explosives Section. He was named before the Tydings committee last year. The Senator will remember that I asked the Tydings committee to go into executive session and take up his case. They refused to do so. They said, "No, Brunauer has been cleared by the Loyalty Board, and we will not let you smear him."

Former Secretary Matthews did a pretty good job in the case. He took all the evidence against Brunauer and suspended Brunauer. Brunauer would not wait until his case had been decided, but resigned.

I may say, Mr. President, that Brunauer was a very close friend of Noel Field, who, since the Tydings hearing of last year, has disappeared behind the iron curtain. How many of our secrets

he has taken with him behind the iron curtain, I do not know. I am giving to the Senate a list of 26 names. Of the 26 I understand two have been suspended, but the State Department will neither admit nor deny it. My letter of June 23 gave the State Department a list of 29 names. Of the 29, 2 have resigned, and they are no longer with the State Department. The third individual, who holds an important position in the point 4 program, has been cleared. Today I am not giving the names of any of the individuals who have been cleared. Twenty-eight of the one hundred and five have been cleared. I am not giving their names to the Senate, but instead am giving them to the McCarran committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Were those cases passed upon by the new Loyalty Board under former Senator Bingham?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that if the cases of the individuals involved had been before the Bingham Board, and if former Senator Bingham had the power to deny them access to secret material, I would not have to get up on the floor of the Senate to give this information. If the case were before the Bingham Board it would certainly not be necessary to give this information. Senator Bingham's Board has no jurisdiction whatever over these cases under the State Department find a man unfit for service. In that case the individuals involved can appeal to the Bingham Board. If they do not find them unfit for Government service his case does not come before the Bingham Board. After the State Department clears an individual the Bingham Board can, however, pick up that case on what is called a post-audit and send it back to the State Department, saying, "We want this case reheard." If the State Department again clears the individual the Bingham Board I understand takes the position—which is the opposite from the position taken by the Richardson Board—that it can take up the case again and order the man removed if that Board finds him unfit. Whether he has the power to do so under the law, I am not certain. However, I am glad to hear that he is adopting that position. None of the cases covered today have been cleared by the Bingham Board.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Former Senator Bingham has publicly announced, however, that he has reversed the policy of the Richardson Board, which Board held that when there was any doubt as to whether or not a man was actually a Communist spy or a good American and they could not resolve the evidence definitely one way or another, that was their policy to give the benefit of the doubt to the individual and let it

Prior to the formation of the present Loyalty Board in the State Department there was a board—I believe it was referred to as the Security Board—and there were some good men on that board but, of course, they are no longer in the Department. In 1943 that Board recommended as follows with regard to this man Stone:

In behalf of the above mentioned it is recommended that action be instituted to terminate his services with the State Department immediately.

The date of that, incidentally, was March 22, 1946. I continue to quote from the Security Board report:

It is suggested to achieve this purpose that an appropriate officer of the Department should inform Mr. Stone that his continued employment in the Department is embarrassing to the Department, and he should be given an opportunity to resign. If he should not resign voluntarily, action should be immediately instituted under Civil Service Rule No. 3 to terminate his services with the Department.

That was ignored by Acheson, who was then Undersecretary of State, and ignored by Stone's immediate superior, who was a man from Connecticut by the name of William Benton. Stone was working immediately under Benton. As to some of Stone's additional activities—incidentally he formed a Washington branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations together with Esther Brunauer, whose husband resigned from the Navy while his loyalty case was pending, and who has been suspended, I understand, from the State Department.

Stone was also involved in innumerable Communist-front activities. It perhaps should also be mentioned that William Stone was the man who succeeded in keeping George Shaw Wheeler on in an important position in the State Department. Wheeler had been ordered discharged from a key position in the State Department on the ground that he was an active and important member of the Communist Party. William T. Stone, however, intervened in Wheeler's behalf and succeeded in keeping him in his position. Stone labeled Wheeler as the ideal State Department employee. As the Senators will recall, Wheeler left the United States and went behind the iron curtain, at which time he issued a statement viciously condemning everything America stands for and applauding communism.

On August 4, 1942—this is a matter of interest which is not in the letter of charges, but I call it to the attention of the Senate—on August 4, 1942, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, the exposed Communist spy, testified under oath that William T. Stone gave him naval-intelligence records. At that time, Stone was Assistant Director of the Board of Economic Warfare. Stone, of course, will be cleared by Acheson's loyalty board. There is no question about that.

Apparently the reason why one of my colleagues (Mr. Benton) has been squealing so loudly about McCarthy's attacks on Communists is that some of his friends, such as William T. Stone,

are going to be exposed. Stone's name has already cropped up in the McCarran hearings. As I said, the immediate superior of Stone in the State Department was the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Benton).

The next case, Mr. President, is the case of Herbert Fierst. Herbert Fierst is a foreign-affairs specialist in the Department of State. A memorandum of August 2, 1946, by Mr. Bannerman, one of the security officers in the Department of State, is to the effect that physical surveillance showed that this man Fierst was in constant contact with members of an espionage group and that he recommended Communists for State Department employment, and was engaged in a number of other Communist activities.

Incidentally the Loyalty Review Board which post-audited the Fierst case about 2½ years ago, after he had been cleared and ordered it back to the State Department and said, "We are not satisfied with this. This man is obviously either a Communist or following the line. We cannot approve having a man handling top secret material who is chumming with espionage agents."

What do you think happened to the case? The State Department said, "The case is closed."

Another is Marcia Ruth Harrison, divisional assistant, Department of State. I will not read all the charges. One is that she belonged to a vast number of Communist fronts, plus a Communist organization; that she belonged to the Young Communist League was a paid-up member of it.

Next is Robert Ross, radio information specialist, Department of State.

Mr. President, I am not going to read the letters of charges in all these cases, but I will give a few typical cases.

The next is Ella M. Montague. She was born in Russia in 1896. She worked for the Amtorg Trading Corp. The testimony before 3 different committees is that only top members of the Communist Party could work for Amtorg. The Senate will recall that 5 or 6 of the officers of Amtorg were picked up about a year ago and charged with espionage. Under pressure from the State Department they were allowed to return to Russia.

Next is the case of Olga V. Osnaich. At the time of our original investigation she was not yet a citizen of the United States. She may have gotten her papers since, but I do not know. She worked for the Russian Embassy in Turkey for 3 years. Then with the Russian Welfare Society and so forth. One of the significant things here, of course, is that the Russians do not hire people in their embassies unless they are Communists.

Another is Stella Gordon, also known as Estella Gordon, correspondent and research clerk, Department of State. Incidentally, Mr. President, I know that after I have given these cases and the summary of the letter of charges against some, there will be the usual high-pitched screaming and squealing that McCarthy has done this under senatorial immunity.

I thought that charge should be laid to rest once and for all, so the other night before I went on a television broadcast I offered the sponsors to name these individuals. The sponsors' lawyers said "No, we do not want you to do that"—and I do not blame them. I think it was good legal advice which they gave because, as Louis Budenz and some of the other top former Communists have testified, up to 1945 the orders of the party to members were "Don't under any circumstances sue. We do not want to bring the party into prominence in that way."

In 1945, according to the sworn testimony of reputable witnesses like Budenz, the party line changed, and Communists have standing orders to sue in every case in which anyone was accused of Communist activity. They were told, "Sue, even though you have no chance of winning. If you can bring 5 or 10 or 15 suits against a man you can bleed him white while he is defending them, and take up all his time, and he can spend no time in the fight against communism."

A good example was William Remington. The Senate will recall that Remington was named on a radio broadcast—Meet the Press, I believe—as a member of the Communist Party. He promptly fled suit. The radio chain and the insurance company, of course, had no access to Remington's files. They could not prove that he was the Communist he was, so they paid him \$10,000. The Senate knows that since that time Remington has been convicted. He was indicted by a New York grand jury and then convicted by a New York jury. The conviction was upheld by a court. It was a conviction based upon perjury, when he said that he was not a Communist. In other words, he was found to be a member of the Communist Party.

I mention that to show that I do not at all blame the sponsor for not wanting me to name these people on his program.

Some members of the press have been shouting that McCarthy has been giving this information under immunity, so I notified the three press services that if they would have representatives at my office at 10 o'clock the next morning I would give them all the information about these individuals, and give them their names, if I could have some assurance that they wanted to print them, knowing, of course, that they would not, because all of us have had the experience of members of the press telling us that they cannot use certain information because it might subject their papers to suits for libel or slander. Again, I do not blame them, because if 10 or 15 or 20 Communists started libel and slander actions against the newspapers it would cost them a fortune, and they would be busy defending lawsuits.

The three press services said, "No; we will take the names but we will give you no assurance that we will print them." I was assured by one of the men that he knew that under no circumstances would they print them unless

whitewash job Senator Tydings did. Of course, Mr. President, if Senator Tydings did not do a whitewash job, then I treated him very unfairly, and then I should not have helped to let the people know what a whitewash job he did do. On the other hand, if Tydings did a whitewash job and if I did not expose that to the people of Maryland, I would be almost as guilty as Tydings.

Of course one spy in the Government service is too many. In a case of this sort, when the chairman of the committee is told, "Here is a man who is a Communist spy, and here are the witnesses. Please call them," then when the chairman of the committee says, "Oh, no; I won't," it is rather difficult for me to understand why my friends criticize me for exposing Mr. Tydings. In fact, I understand that one Senator would like to see the Senator from Wisconsin expelled from the Senate because he exposed our friend, Millard Tydings.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FENDRICKSON. In fairness to the other members of the committee, inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned one of them who would like to see the Senator from Wisconsin removed, I think it is proper and in order for the Senator from Wisconsin to mention the Senator in question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BENTON) submitted the resolution. I certainly was not referring to the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. FENDRICKSON).

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the secret workings and secret minutes of the Loyalty Board, under Seth Richardson, which met in April 1950. The Senator will see in the minutes that present at that time were George W. Alger, John H. Amen, Harry W. Blair, John Kirkland Clark, Glen W. Collins, Meta Glass, Paul M. Herbert, Garrett S. Hoag, Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Brunson MacChesney, Arthur W. MacMahon, Henry L. Shattuck, Andrew Steers, Eliot Wadsworth, Leonard D. White, and Chairman Richardson was presiding. In fairness to those who were present, I should say that some of them, as the Senator from South Dakota will note, made a strong argument to the effect that they should investigate those individuals completely and thoroughly, regardless of whether the matters involved dealt with loyalty, security, or anything else which would make such persons unfit to serve. The Senator will also note that they then contacted the President and asked him whether they should make the examination, and received word to the effect that they should not, but should check only on overt acts of disloyalty—which resulted in clearance of every one of those persons, because they could not find them lighting a fuse to an H-bomb.

Mr. President, I believe I have covered all the cases now, except one, namely, the case of Philip C. Jessup.

First, let me say that if the Senator from South Dakota would care to see what has happened to a number of the

year, I shall be glad to let him examine the information which has come from the Review Board. I wish he would not give the names of any of the persons who have been cleared, however.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the testimony of Jessup in the Hiss case. Jessup was unable to be present at the trial; he was out of the country. Accordingly, he made out affidavits.

It is not too difficult to understand how someone might have testified in favor of Hiss at the first trial. However, after all the evidence was brought to the attention of the public, so that men high in the Government service certainly knew that Hiss was a Communist spy, it is rather difficult then to understand how they would come to the defense of Hiss.

Here is the testimony of Jessup during Hiss' second trial:

Question. Mr. Jessup, do you know the reputation of Alger Hiss for loyalty, integrity, and veracity?

Answer. Yes; I do.

Question. What is that reputation? What do you think of it?

Answer. Outstanding.

That is only a minor part of his record. The head of the FBI, during his testimony before one of the committees, was asked whether it was significant that an individual belonged to a Communist-front organization. He pointed out that it might or might not be. He pointed out that many fine individuals were duped into joining Communist-front organizations. Of course, that was the aim of the Communist party, to try to get some good, loyal Americans on their lists, so they could use them to deceive people. But, as he said, "If you find that a man belongs to four, five, or six of these organizations, who have been named as fronts doing the work of the Communist Party, they are either so naive that they are dangerous to this Nation in a high Government job, or you can be sure that they are loyal to the Communist Party." That is not a verbatim quote, but as best I can remember it.

One of the other men who was testifying was asked the same question, and he said this: "Well, let us put it this way. If you find that a man belongs to the Lutheran Young Men's Society, you can assume that he is most likely loyal to the principles of the Lutheran Church. If you find that he belongs to the Holy Name Society, you can assume that perhaps he is a Catholic; and," he said, "if you find that he belongs to organizations which are fronts for the Communist Party, then you can assume that he is either a Communist or that he certainly is loyal to the Communist Party."

Mr. Jessup, our Ambassador at Large, was affiliated with not one, not two, not three, not four, but with five organizations officially named as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist party. Here are photostats of official letterheads which show his affiliations.

That is not all. Mr. Jessup exercised editorial control of the publication "Far East Survey," a publication of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which has been

Communist front. While he had that editorial control, and while that publication was following the Communist line down to the last period, who do you think was supporting it? When Frederick Field, a man who proclaims himself to be one of America's leading Communists, was on the stand last year, he was asked whether he had contributed to Jessup's publication. His answer was, "I refused to answer, on the ground that it might incriminate me." With some difficulty we dug up the checks covering Communist money—believe it or not—over a short period of time, totaling \$6,000, used for the purpose of supporting the Communist-front publication run by our ambassador at large, a publication which, according to sworn testimony, employed many Communist writers. When that evidence was brought to the attention of the Tydings Committee, the State Department had to issue a press conference, which it did, at which they said, "Now, here is another example of this nasty McCarthyism." They said, "Just because poor Mr. Jessup took some Communist money, McCarthy is trying to indicate that that is why he followed the Communist line in his publication"—that theory being, apparently, that Mr. Jessup was so naive that he did not know who the Communists were paying him and were supporting that publication. We can be certain that if Mr. Jessup was that naive, the Communists were not so naive. They knew they were getting a dollar's worth, and more, for every dollar they spent. The committee refused to go into the matter, but when I, with my limited staff, could dig up checks totaling \$6,000, representing Communist money, we can be very certain that there were many more thousands of dollars which Jessup received.

Let us keep in mind, as we read the photostat I have in my hand now, that we are talking about the man who represented the United States in the Four Big Conference in Paris, in the fight, if you please, against communism, and if it is possible to find a better analogy than Hiss at Yalta, I do not know what it would be. I have in my hand a photostat of a petition which appeared in the New York Times on February 13, 1946. The Senate will recall that, at that time, the Communist Party line was that, not only the United States would destroy its atomic bombs, if we would tear down our atomic facilities, we would then convince Russia that we were peace-loving, and the result would be that there would be no danger of war. That was, of course, while Russia was obtaining secrets and frantically trying to build her own atomic bombs. It was not so surprising to find the Daily Worker saying that—but one would hardly expect that our Ambassador at Large would do it. But I have in my hand this petition, signed by Jessup, which was published in the New York Times on February 13, 1946. Let me refer to two lines in which this petition asks that the United States at once stop the production of atomic bombs and atomic materials, and that all the material which has been produced

continue to hold his security position. Former Senator Bingham announced immediately when he took over the post that in his opinion such procedure was an utterly indefensible attitude to take, either in a time of war or in a time like this, and he announced that if his board was unable to resolve definitely the question of whether or not a man was actually a Communist spy working for the Government, or a good citizen, and there was no conclusive proof either way, his board would give the benefit of the doubt to the Government and to the 130,000,000 good patriotic Americans, whose interest and future is jeopardized when Communist spies are permitted to remain in the Government service. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator from South Dakota has stated the situation very correctly. The Richardson Board apparently took the opposite position. They took the position that unless they could find a man had committed an overt act of disloyalty, they would not recommend his discharge.

Mr. MUNDT. Unless they could find a Communist membership card in his pocket with a stamp on it showing that the dues had been paid currently, they would not consider him a security risk?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not even then, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota. They would not consider that an overt act. For example Remington was proven to have been a member of the Communist Party. Seth Richardson took the position that in view of the fact that it could not be proved that Remington was a member of the Communist Party as of the moment the Board was holding its hearings, they could not discharge him.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, he was behind in his dues.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is never possible to prove a man is a Communist at any one particular moment. He can always say that he quit the party yesterday or the day before. I may say that the Board under Richardson met on April 20, 1950. President Truman had sent to the Board the list of names that I had given to the Tydings committee. The Richardson board met in secret session. I shall be glad to show the Senator from South Dakota a copy of the discussion by the Board in its secret hearing. It will show why so many unusual characters are still employed in the State Department. The discussion runs over approximately 20 pages. At first they argued whether or not they could make a finding against any of the individuals if they found he was a bad security risk, or whether they had to find that he had committed an overt act of disloyalty. Then there were some arguments as to what an overt act was. They contacted President Truman and they contacted either the Secretary of State or the Attorney General. I do not recall which one it was. In any event they asked for advice, and they were advised that they were not to check into the past of any man's character dealing with the point of whether or not a man was a bad security risk.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be surprised to find

the information should be put in the file, they finally decided against doing it on the ground that if they checked on a man as to whether or not he was a bad security risk and put that information in the file, McCARTHY or someone else might find out that they had labeled a man a bad security risk and would bring the fact to the attention of the Senate. Therefore they decided not to make such a check. Happily the new chairman of the Board, former Senator Bingham, has to a great extent reversed that procedure, although he is working under a tremendous handicap in that department.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for the explanation. I merely wished to point out that fact, so that the country could have confidence in the new Board, and know that the Board had completely reversed the Richardson philosophy. In other words, it is no longer necessary to catch a man with a bomb in his hand or with a Communist membership card in his pocket. The new Board feels that whenever there is a reasonable doubt about a man's character, and it is unable to determine whether he is a loyal American or a Communist spy, and they cannot make a positive affirmation one way or another, the new Board gives the benefit of the doubt to the Government and to the 130,000,000 Americans, whose life and future are entirely in the hands of any disloyal elements that may get into important strategic positions of the Government, whether it be in Defense, State, or any other key spot in Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think one of the cases demonstrates very well what the Senator is talking about, namely, the case of John S. Service. That case also shows the weakness of the Loyalty Board structure and its proceedings. The Service case is presently being held before the State Department's Loyalty Board, and apparently will be held there indefinitely. Some of the members of the Review Board are concerned about that, because they do not have jurisdiction until the State Department and its Loyalty Board have made their decision. The State Department thus can hold up a case for 2 or 3 years, and while it is pending, the Review Board has no power to make a post-audit or anything else of it.

To recall some of the facts in the Service case, the Senator from South Dakota will remember that representatives of the FBI testified under oath before the Tydings subcommittee that when Service was in this country, they followed him from the State Department, which he left with large brown envelopes under his arm to the hotel room of Philip Jaffe, who long has been known as a Communist, and was named as a Communist spy, and later was convicted. The representatives of the FBI said they trailed Service to Jaffe's hotel room; and trailed him away without those envelopes. They testified that they put microphones in Jaffe's room, and over those microphones they heard Service discuss top-secret military information with that Communist spy—information which he was giving to

stands that I am now referring to testimony by representatives of the FBI.

As we recall, the Tydings subcommittee met and said, in effect, "Isn't it awful, the way McCARTHY smeared this poor Mr. Service?" The State Department's Loyalty Board met and said that Service was an ideal public servant.

However, his case has been reopened, and I am rather interested in seeing, what happens when that case goes before the Senator Bingham's board.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the case of William K. Remington is an even more startling illustration of how utterly futile and ineffective the Richardson Board was.

The junior Senator from Michigan has just entered the Chamber, let me say. I recall attending hearings when the Remington case was brought into the picture. I know that when I was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities we ventilated the Remington case. By that time the Loyalty Board was in operation, and it had authority to make examinations. It sat and held sessions. Despite the fact that Remington has since then been removed from office and convicted, and I suppose is now in a Federal penitentiary, where he should be, to this late hour the Loyalty Board has never found Remington to be a loyalty risk; and according to the records of the Loyalty Board, Remington is a good and faithful public servant. So, obviously, that kind of Loyalty Board is worse than nothing, because it gives a false sense of security to the people, and makes them think that the traitors and the treasonable characters will be weeded out of the Government service.

Mr. McCARTHY. Also I should like to say that the Remington case was one of the cases I called to the attention of the Tydings subcommittee, and I pointed out that although technically Remington was not on the State Department's payroll, he was on the payroll of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; Remington had, interestingly enough, the strategic job of determining what kind of military exports would be sent to Russia.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Of course, as the Senator from South Dakota recalls, Secretary Sawyer ordered Remington discharged. However, Remington appealed to the Richardson Board, and that board ordered him reinstated. While Remington was serving in the Department of Commerce that Department did a good job of keeping him away from strategic information. However, later he cleverly got into the State Department and got hold of such information that way.

Elizabeth Bentley testified before the committee that Remington was one of the couriers for her and for other Communist spies. However the Tydings subcommittee refused to consider her testimony seriously, and the Loyalty Board found Remington to be a good American.

Incidentally, I may say that next week there will be issued a report which will damn McCARTHY from hell to be likely for all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—
Mr. LEHMAN. Once more the Senate is hearing—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the present occupant of the chair feel that inasmuch as the majority leader has made a speech of the kind we have just heard, in all fairness the Senator from Wisconsin should be recognized to respond to the speech? He was on his feet, and I think he is entitled to recognition at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize him. The Chair understands that the Senator from New York will be through in a moment. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Wisconsin. The Chair did not see the Senator from Wisconsin rise.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair. I hope the majority leader will remain on the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I did not catch the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that the Senator from New York has the floor. He is the Senator the Chair first recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Once more the Senate is hearing the names of several persons mentioned and the irresponsible charge made that they are disloyal to the United States or even traitors to their country.

I do not know anything about many of the individuals who have been named here today. I do know that the process of making charges in public against the loyalty of certain persons under the protection of congressional immunity is a form of character assassination which all of us must abhor and condemn. I shall have more to say on this subject, as we all should, at a later date.

One of the names bandied about today is that of Philip C. Jessup, Ambassador at Large, and one of the most distinguished public servants in our Government. One of the most skillful and effective spokesmen of the United States in international affairs, Philip Jessup, whom I know well, has ably served his country during the past few years in exposing, in the forums of the United Nations, the devious purposes and hypocrisy of the Soviet leaders.

He deserves much better of his fellow citizens than the shabby and dastardly treatment which is accorded him here today—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from New York is out of order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw the word "dastardly" and I substitute—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the rule be enforced.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw the word "dastardly" and I substitute therefor the word "cowardly."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the Senator from New York is out of order, and I ask that the rule be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York, under the rule, will take his seat.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from New York be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is not.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all right. I will vote to permit the Senator to proceed in order if he will do so in order. If the Senator from New York is not acquainted with rule XIX I will tell him what it provides. It does not make any difference what the Senator thinks of the Senator from Wisconsin; under rule XIX he cannot in any way, directly or indirectly, impute improper motives to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a right to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. The motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable as the Chair understands.

As the Chair understood, the Senator from New York did not refer by name specifically to any Senator. Apparently the Chair did not hear clearly what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished occupant of the chair has made mention of what he heard—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be given 5 minutes to answer the statement made by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. I call for the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has called for the regular order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senator from New York proceed in order. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish only on this occasion to offer for insertion into the Record at this point statements by three of the greatest Americans of our day. These statements say more than I can about the character and patriotism of Philip Jessup. These statements are not new, but neither are the charges that have been made here. The men whose testimony I now call upon to bear witness to the character of Mr. Philip Jessup, a citizen of the State of New York, are Gen. George C. Marshall, one of the noblest men who have ever lived, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to whom we owe an unpayable debt of gratitude, and the late venerated Henry L. Stimson, respected by every American citizen. The statements by Generals Marshall and Eisenhower are in the form of letters addressed to Ambassador Jessup. The statement by the late Sec-

retary Henry L. Stimson is in the form of a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

I wish merely to quote the last paragraph of the letter. He writes:

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

Mr. President, I not only fully agree with the words of that great statesman, that great Secretary of War and Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, but I go further and say that the time is long overdue when we should have rebuked the authors of antics reflecting on men, without supporting the charges with any real evidence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the body of the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1950.

MY DEAR JESSUP: I am shocked and distressed by the attack on your integrity as a public servant.

Throughout your intimate service with me while I was Secretary of State you were clearly outstanding as a representative of the Government both as to your masterful presentations and the firmness of your opposition to all Soviet or Communist attacks or pressures. This was conspicuously the case during your handling of the Security Council of the Berlin blockade issue.

Both the Under Secretary, Mr. Lovett, and I counted you as a great source of strength to the State Department during those hard days.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

MARCH 18, 1950.

MY DEAR JESSUP: I am writing to tell you how much your university deploras the association of your name with the current loyalty investigation in the United States Senate.

Your long and distinguished record as a scholar and a public servant has won for you the respect of your colleagues and of the American people as well. No one who has known you can for a moment question the depth or sincerity of your devotion to the principles of Americanism. Your university associates and I are confident that any impression to the contrary will be quickly dispelled as the facts become known.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LOYALTY IN WASHINGTON—METHODS AND MOTIVES OF ATTACK ON STATE DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

The present charges against the Department of State have not in my view deserved much attention. But the very widespread notice they have received prompts me to make certain comments.

First, this is most emphatically not the proper way in which to insure loyalty of Government employees. If that had been the real purpose of the accuser, he would have used the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government, under which charges are investigated and weighed by men of both parties and unimpeachable integrity. A constructive result would have even been

the ocean." That is Phillip Jessup. Some interesting information has been developed before the Tydings committee, of course, about Jessup. For example, they produced a letter at the hearing, which the Senate may or may not have seen. A letter which Jessup wrote to Vincent, talking about Frederick Field, the top Communist saying, "We have got to help Freddie all we can"—that was when he was about to head a Communist organization—"I suggest a press release as follows." Then Jessup wrote the press release and sent it to Field, a press release which was identical, almost to the last comma, with the Daily Worker's description of this Communist front.

Last year, when we were trying to dig some of the Communists out of Government, the President made a speech. As I recall, it was made over a Nation-wide hook-up. In it he said it was a great mistake to do what I was doing, that we were endangering national unity. He said, "Now, if McCarthy or anyone else has any information about Communists or anyone who is bad for this country, let him send the information to me, Harry S. Truman." He said, "I will take action. You should not do it the way McCarthy is doing it."

Mr. President, when we got this material regarding Jessup, I decided I would call the President's bluff, so we sent all of it to him. We sent him copies of the magazine which Jessup was publishing, which contained articles which followed the Communist line right down to the last period. One would think it was the Cominform's official program, and rightly so, because the articles were being written by men who have been identified under oath as Communists. We sent him photostats of the checks, showing that the Communists were supporting Jessup's publication. We sent him a copy of the petition of Jessup, saying "Let us destroy our atomic bomb." We sent him copies of Jessup's testimony praising Alger Hiss. We sent him photostats showing that Mr. Jessup was affiliated with five organizations which had been officially named as fronts for and doing the work for the Communist Party.

I said, "Now, Mr. President, take action. Here is some evidence. Certainly you cannot say this man is good for America. He has been found at every time and place where disaster has struck America and success has come to Soviet Russia."

The President took action. What do Senators think the President's action was? It consisted of giving Philip C. Jessup top secret clearance to all atomic and hydrogen-bomb information. Of all the stupidly stubborn and stubbornly stupid examples of playing with the lives of American boys, I think that tops them all.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say, again, that I very much dislike having to name these individuals who are under charges of Communist activities. I begged the Secretary of State to deny them access to secret material, and told him if he did not do so I would have to name them. He refused. Some of them may be able to prove that they are

neither security nor loyalty risks. If so, they have been hurt by this publicity, and I regret it. But if an individual is accused of reckless driving, jumping a stop sign, or embezzling from a bank, the American people get that information. So why should not the American people be informed when their servants are accused of Communist activities as a result of FBI investigations.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I find it necessary to address the Senate of the United States this afternoon. It is regrettable because the majority leader should not have to make any remarks dealing with the responsibility of a Member of this great body; it is regrettable that any Member must be reminded of the tradition of service in this body which requires the highest degree of integrity in the performance of his duty.

Mr. President, for over a century and a half the Senate has been known as a body of integrity, of honor, and of dignity. It was because of what we read when we were in school about those who preceded us that some of us had the inspiration to make membership in the United States Senate our goal; we felt it would be a distinguished honor to serve in this body.

To be a Member of the United States Senate imposes on one certain responsibilities to his fellow men, to his Government, and to his Nation. If any Senator has evidence that any man has committed a high crime, or if he has evidence that any man serving in the Government is disloyal, he has the solemn duty to place that evidence before a proper tribunal. If a court of justice does not act, he has of course the responsibility of placing the evidence before his colleagues. Mr. President, our forefathers, when they wrote the Constitution of the United States, granted us certain immunity on the floor of the Senate. Why? Because it was their opinion that the Members of this body could always be relied upon never to charge any individual unfairly or unjustly, never tear down his character, or hurt his good name unless compelling evidence against him was in their possession.

Mr. President, just as it is the duty of a Member of the Senate to lay before the proper tribunal or to lay before a court or before this body evidence, he has a like responsibility never to say one word against the good name of an individual unless he has the evidence to support the charge. If he has such evidence, it is his duty to lay it before the Senate at the time he makes the charge against the individual.

When I was a small boy my mother taught me that when one takes from an individual his good name, that individual has been stripped of his most valuable possession.

I have sat on the floor of the Senate and heard men charged, by innuendo and inference, with disloyalty, and even with high crimes and misdemeanors, without any substantial evidence of the charge being laid before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I have sat on this floor and heard one Senator, by innuendo and insinuation, charge a high official of this

Government, a man who had served his country for a lifetime with distinction and honor, with being a traitor or a near traitor. Tragically there seems to be no easy way to cope with a situation like that, since to attempt to refute such charges merely dignifies the assertion. There is only one way to meet that kind of conduct and it is to remind Members of their duty and responsibility.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) is on the floor. I want to congratulate her on a statement which she made in the Senate on June 18, 1951, a statement we all may take to heart. I should like to read the last two paragraphs of her remarks:

As an American I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of confuse, divide, and conquer.

As an American I do not want a Democratic administration whitewash or cover-up any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.

As an American I condemn a Republican Fascist just as much as I condemn a Democrat Communist. I condemn a Democrat Fascist just as much as I condemn a Republican Communist. They are equally dangerous to you and me and to our country. As an American I want to see our Nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves.

Mr. President, I emphasize that when a man's good name is taken away by insinuations and innuendoes he has been done a great injustice. I desire to add, Mr. President—

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

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not think the Senator would. [Laughter in the galleries]

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to emphasize, Mr. President, that when one is unjustly accused of disloyalty to his country an equally great injustice is being done our country and our free institutions. Ah, Mr. President, our enemy, the Kremlin, would like very much to have those charged with responsibility for our Government unjustly brought under suspicion and distrust, to have us distrust each other and fight among ourselves and accuse each other. When we do that we serve their purpose just as effectively as one of their paid agents.

Mr. President, it is beneath the dignity of Members of the Senate to smear any individual. It behooves us to have valid and substantial evidence when an individual is mentioned by us as being disloyal to his country. No Senator should become a character assassin.

I suggest, Mr. President, that when the name of any Member of the Senate becomes an adjective for mud-slinging, we have come a far way from the tradition of those great men who preceded us here, we have torn down the dignity and standing and respect that this body should enjoy; we have come to a time when a halt must be called.

I hope we may reexamine the speech of the junior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), and that we will all be by the principles which that distinguished Senator enunciated.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY.

clear." He wrote back and said, "No; we will not do that."

I am surprised to think that the majority leader feels that it is unfair of me to try to force the Secretary of State to do what any loyal American would do. I suggest that the majority leader, together with members of his party who did considerable crying about the smearing of Owen Lattimore, go over and listen to the testimony given before the McCarran committee.

I suggest also that my friends on the other side of the aisle who are doing everything possible to label their party as a party of Communists and crooks, go over and see some good Democrats sitting on the McCarran committee, men who are Americans first and Democrats second.

Today on the floor of the Senate I saw the Senator from Nevada (Mr. McCARRAN), who was celebrating his seventy-fifth birthday, a really star-spangled American and a credit to my party. I am sure he represents the loyal Democrats of this Nation rather than those who get up and scream to high heaven and say, "Joe McCarthy, you are smearing the poor, innocent Communists." [Manifestations of applause from galleries.]

SALE BY MARSHALL PLAN NATIONS OF STRATEGIC WAR MATERIALS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. WHERRY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. MALONE), and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend section 1302, Public Law 45, Eighty-second Congress, the so-called Kem amendment.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1987) providing for the termination of assistance to foreign countries exporting war materials to Russia or her satellites, introduced by Mr. Kem for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this bill would make the following changes in the present law:

First, It would make its provisions applicable to military as well as economic and financial assistance. This would bring within the coverage of the amendment Marshall plan nations who are now engaged in selling strategic war materials to the Reds, and who are now receiving military but not economic assistance from the United States.

Second, It would make its provisions apply regardless of whether the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities.

Third, It would strike out the proviso that exceptions to the provisions of the amendment may be made at the discretion of the National Security Council.

When the Kem amendment was adopted by the Senate the Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN) said:

My criticism is that the amendment does not go far enough, in that it would be effective only while the United States is actually engaged in hostilities.

Another criticism is that it denies economic assistance, but it does not deny mili-

tary assistance. I cannot understand why we should allow any kind of military assistance to any country to which we are denying economic assistance.

We have learned from experience that if we are to stop arming the Communists through our allies, Congress must pass an iron-clad, escape-proof law, that is mandatory upon the President. Two laws with built-in loopholes have failed to accomplish their objective.

Section 1304, Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950, provided that no economic or financial assistance was to be provided by the United States to any foreign country whose trade with Russia or its satellites, including Red China, was found by the United States National Security Council to be "contrary to the security interests of the United States."

Under this law, the National Security Council, of which President Truman is Chairman, took no effective action to halt the shocking sale of strategic materials by Marshall-plan countries to the very enemy now killing and maiming our boys in Korea. No action was taken despite the fact that the late Admiral Forrest Sherman told the Senate committees investigating the MacArthur dismissal that the Joint Chiefs of Staff on March 28, 1951, advised the Secretary of Defense that growing military assistance to Communist China by non-Communist countries other than the United States constituted "a direct threat to the security interests of the United States."

The failure of the National Security Council to act constituted a callous disregard of the safety and welfare of the American boys in Korea. It was contrary to the express will of the Congress.

On May 9, 1951, I introduced, on behalf of myself and other Senators, an amendment to the third supplemental appropriations bill providing that economic or financial assistance would be automatically shut off to any country which continues to sell war materials to the Communists. The Senate approved this amendment unanimously. After the conference committee had made certain changes, including the addition of the ill-fated and misused exception clause, both Houses of Congress approved the bill as amended.

In taking this action, the Congress made clear that it was dissatisfied with the steps which had been taken to halt the flow of war goods to the enemy.

On June 16, 1951, Congress and the American people were shocked and amazed to learn that the National Security Council had suspended entirely the operation of the war-goods-ban amendment for 90 days.

The amendment provides "that exceptions to those provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States."

To except is defined by Webster as "to leave out from a number or a whole."

The National Security Council suspended the whole amendment. This meat-ax approach is entirely unjustified and unjustifiable. This action has no

moral, legal, or constitutional basis. It is a flagrant disregard of the express intent of the elected representatives of the people.

Since the National Security Council suspended the amendment more than 5,000 American boys have been killed or wounded in Korea. The shipment of strategic war materials—and I do not mean women's bathing suits—to the Reds who killed or wounded those boys has gone on.

I have obtained fresh evidence that Marshall-plan countries are continuing their vicious sales of strategic materials to the Communists, including the Chinese Reds and North Koreans.

Department of Commerce officials tell us that during the first 3 months of 1951 alone Italy exported \$1,151,000 worth of ball and roller bearings to countries behind the iron curtain. When asked specifically if these shipments are continuing at the present time the answer Department of Commerce officials give is these shipments are continuing.

During May 1951 the British Socialist Government permitted \$275,968 worth of machine tools to be exported to the Soviet Union, compared with only \$54,406 during May 1950. During the 5 months ending May 31, 1951, \$1,559,865 worth of machine tools were sold by the British to the U. S. S. R. and \$1,632,943 worth of electrical generating sets and generators.

I offer the proposed changes in the present law as a way to halt this shameful business.

The Battle bill recently passed by the House will not, in my judgment, meet the situation. It is another discretionary law. We have had experience with two discretionary laws, and the traffic between Marshall-plan countries and the Russian bloc in strategic war materials has gone on unabated. What we need is a mandatory law with teeth in it.

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What the distinguished Senator from Missouri is expressing is that under the so-called escape clause, as it is interpreted by ECA, there is permitted to continue in the law a loophole by means of which countries are enabled to engage in the damnable traffic, regardless of the fact that the Senate intended, as I believe it intends now, to have on the books a mandatory statute which would prohibit such traffic. Am I correct?

Mr. KEM. That is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Missouri, who has taken an interest in the subject, is now asking the Senate to amend the legislation sponsored by him so as to delete the escape clause and make the provisions of the legislation mandatory, just as the Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN) said it should be made mandatory when the Senate adopted the so-called Kem amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. That is correct. However, I do not believe that the Senator from Arizona touched on that point. The escape clause had not been inserted when the bill passed the Senate. The escape clause was put into the bill in conference.

from the present charges would have been achieved far more surely and effectively by use of the existing procedures. The fact that the accuser has wholly ignored this well-established method indicates that his intention is of a different character.

Second, no matter what else may occur, the present charges have already spattered mud upon individuals of the highest integrity, and in the present state of the world the denial cannot always overtake the accusation. It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations of this sort are doubly offensive: they damage the innocent, and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?

REACTION ABROAD

Third, and more important by far, the method of the present charges directly and dangerously impedes the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. It creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention, at home, from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it tells our many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver such extensive replies as that of Mr. Jessup. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employees; each of them is the direct result of the manner in which these charges have been made.

Fourth, it seems to me quite clear that the real motive of the accuser in this case is to cast discredit upon the Secretary of State of the United States. This man is not trying to get rid of known Communists in the State Department; he is hoping against hope that he will find some. Fortunately, the Secretary of State needs no defense from me. No one who knows his extraordinary record of able and disinterested public service can believe that he is in any danger from these lies. It is already obvious that in any test of personal confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary.

But there is more at stake in this matter than the rise or fall of individuals. What is at stake is the effective conduct of our foreign policy.

RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Every Secretary of State, second only to the President, and alone among appointive officers of the Government, stands before the world as the representative of the United States of America. No man who holds this office can fail to feel the extraordinary responsibility he carries for service to the country and its peace. No man has a greater right to ask the sympathetic support and the cooperation of his fellow citizens, and none is more properly exempt from the ordinary trials of politics. The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country.

The American Government, led by the President and the Secretary of State, is currently engaged in a major effort to give leadership to the country in a time of changing international conditions and grave world tension. This effort will require as part of our democratic process widespread and earnest public consideration of the great problems now before us, so that the ultimate decision will surely reflect the basic sentiments and faith of our people. In such public consideration there is always room for honest differences, but now, as for many years past, the formulation of foreign policy most urgently demands an adjournment of mere partisanship.

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country

or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

HUNTINGTON, LONG ISLAND, March 24, 1950.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I further acknowledge unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Utica post of the American Legion, of Utica, N. Y., in tribute to Mr. Philip C. Jessup, and in his defense against the unfounded charges which have been leveled against him. This resolution pays tribute to the man who is a past commander of that post, the same Philip C. Jessup.

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

RESOLUTION CONCERNING ATTACK UPON PAST COMMANDER PHILIP C. JESSUP ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF UTICA POST, NO. 219, AMERICAN LEGION, HELD ON APRIL 6, 1950

Whereas, Utica Post, No. 219, American Legion, is proud to number among the list of its past commanders a distinguished comrade, friend, and charter member, Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, whose record of patriotic devotion and continued helpfulness to our country over a period of many years is a source of great satisfaction, pride, and distinction to Utica post and to its entire membership; and

Whereas the sterling character, splendid reputation, and unquestionable loyalty and patriotism of Past Commander Philip C. Jessup, both privately and in his public capacity as United States Ambassador at Large, have recently been subjected to malicious, unprincipled, and wholly unjustified attack by one JOSEPH McCARTHY, who in so doing has sullied the office of United States Senator which he presently holds; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Utica Post, No. 219, American Legion, and its entire membership shall and do strongly resent, condemn, and denounce the unprincipled, unjustified, unpatriotic, like, un-American, and intolerable conduct of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY in his wanton attempt without proof or reason to smear and destroy the good reputation and high standing of so devoted and patriotic a citizen as our esteemed and valued friend and comrade, the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, United States Ambassador at Large; and be it further

Resolved, That Utica Post, No. 219, American Legion, and its members in meeting duly assembled feel privileged at this time to reaffirm their continued trust and confidence in, their esteem and devotion to, and their lasting friendship for a distinguished public servant, a loyal patriot, and a great citizen, the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, a past commander of this post; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of this meeting, that a copy thereof be delivered to our comrade, Ambassador Jessup; that a second copy be delivered to the public press; and that a third copy be mailed to Senator McCARTHY with the admonition that his reckless and despicable conduct in this instance cannot be condoned by any right-thinking American and should never be repeated if he hopes to retain a shred of public respect.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Philip Jessup is a great American who has served, and is serving, his country with unsurpassed devotion, unselfishness, and loyalty. By character, by patriotism, by ability, and by useful service he belongs

in the galaxy of those other outstanding American statesmen—Cordell Hull, Warren Austin, George C. Marshall, Henry L. Stimson, Averell Harriman, and John G. Winant.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the majority leader surrendered the floor before I could ask him any questions.

This is a very serious matter. The majority leader has a very important position. I am sure that he does not want to do what so many in his party have been doing—just labeling a once great party as a party which stands for the protection of Communists and crooks in Government.

I ask unanimous consent that, without leaving the floor, I may direct some questions to the majority leader. I think perhaps we can use his advice in this—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure that the majority leader is not afraid to answer questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to be goaded into a colloquy with the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I have been discussing a principle of conduct for gentlemen. I did not mention any Senator by name in my remarks. Evidently the Senator from Wisconsin must have taken the facts as stated by me to fit him or he would not have replied.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am rather surprised at the majority leader. In view of the fact that he is the leader of the Democratic Party, I should like to ask him now if he thinks it was terribly unfair to have "smeared" Mr. Remington last year. Last year I rose on the floor of the Senate and cited the case of William Remington. We offered the witnesses in that case. The Tydings committee said, "No, we will not hear them." He has been cleared by the Loyalty Board. Let us leave Mr. Remington in a position of importance. Thank God we had a good grand jury in New York. They considered the evidence against Remington and indicted him. Thank God there was a good jury and a good judge to try him. They found that man guilty.

From what the majority leader says today, apparently he feels that it was very unfair to name Remington. Some of the other individuals whom we are naming will also be convicted, even as Remington was.

I should like to ask the majority leader another question. The question is, What would he do if he saw the "letters of charges" against these individuals, charging them with Communist activities, one of them being charged with being an espionage agent? What would he do if he knew they had access to top-secret material? What would he do if he had Naval Intelligence reports showing that certain individuals are stealing secret documents? But the majority leader refuses to make a move.

We wrote to the Secretary of State and said, "Mr. Secretary, the best you can do, if you are interested in this country, is to deny those people access to secret material while they are under

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias;

H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of Carl Weltanner;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulio Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 2921. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4263. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 4473. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslop;

H. R. 4774. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Herve J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing September 1, 1951;

H. R. 4793. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a special period for intensified voluntary contributions of clothing and kindred supplies in connection with the collection effort of American Relief for Korea, Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1246. An act to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes;

H. R. 400. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy;

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to make restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Young was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for all of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTIONED-TO BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the transaction of routine business the calendar be called for unobjectioned-to bills, beginning where the last call ended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 225)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, August 9, 1951.

The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing to ask that the Congress authorize a contribution of \$12,000,000 by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund. This sum would be authorized for the current fiscal year.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, on December 1, 1950, extended the operations of the Children's Fund for a period of 3 years. Since the authorization to make financial contributions to the fund expired last June 30, we can now make no further contribution without this new authority from the Congress.

The United States has a long tradition of participation in, and financial support for, international children's welfare work. Nothing is more consistent with our basic interests or more representative of our humanitarian ideals.

The Children's Fund has done a most constructive job over the last 4 years. In Europe, it has helped more than 15,000,000 children. The main work of the fund has now shifted from Europe to the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Latin America. Here the fund will bring supplies and services to help meet the needs of children and to strengthen permanent child welfare programs in the countries themselves.

I know that the Congress is aware of the many past accomplishments of the Children's Fund. I am confident that the people of this country want to continue to support the great work the fund is doing. There is real need to carry this work. Millions of children will be helped.

I have asked the Secretary of State to prepare draft legislation to carry out my recommendation. It is my hope that the Congress will find it possible to give consideration to this measure.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS. DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (H. DOC. NO. 225)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the year 1952 in the amount of \$21,800,000, the Department of Defense for Civil Functions, Department of the Army, in the form of amendments to the budget for said year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT RELATING TO SUBSCRIPTIONS TO CAPITAL OF FEDERAL LAND BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, amended, to relate to the provisions thereof additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Agriculture Department, for the period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISION OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for the purpose of performing certain alien seamen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE REPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on furnishing transportation certain Government and other personnel of the Department of the Air Force.

Sen. M'Carthy Lists 26 Under Loyalty Quiz

Jessup and Vincent
Accused of Red Ties

By PHILIP DODD

Sen. McCarthy (R) of Wisconsin yesterday gave the Senate the names of 26 State department employees who, he said, had been charged with communistic activities but were kept on the department's payroll and had access to secret material.

Heading McCarthy's list were Ambassador-at-large Philip C. Jessup and John Carter Vincent, former minister to Switzerland and now consul general at Tangiers. Others on the list ranged from a clerk-typist to a divisional assistant.

McCarthy's Senate speech was another chapter in his running fight with the Administration over charges of communism in the State department. He said he made yesterday's list public because the department would not assure him the accused individuals would be denied access to secret data while their cases were pending.

Galleries Applaud Him

McCarthy was angrily denounced by the only Democrats on the floor—majority leader McFarland of Arizona and Sen. Lehman of New York. But he was loudly applauded by the packed galleries.

The Wisconsin senator said he originally had a list of 29 names and had given them to the State department. Three of them have been cleared by the department loyalty board, he said, so he kept them off the list he made public yesterday.

One of those on his latest list, John Patton Davies, also has been cleared, McCarthy said. Davies, he said, had been sent to Germany as an adviser to the occupation authorities.

McCarthy said he "understood" two others have been suspended by the department. They were Mrs. Esther Cautkin Brunauer, an American representative to the United Nations economic and social council, and Val R. Lorwin, an economist.

Smear Tactics Charged

The State department issued a statement charging McCarthy had used "smear tactics" and had made public a "misleading" list of names. Deputy State Undersecretary Humelsine said McCarthy's list included the names of persons not employed by the State department, employees who have been cleared by the loyalty board, and others in the process of being cleared.

"I can only hope," Humelsine said, "that the men and women who have been or may be cleared realize they have become the victims of a bitter attack not subscribed to by responsible citizens."

McCarthy told the Senate "letters of charges" based on "adverse information" developed by the FBI have been filed against the persons on his list.

The Wisconsin senator said chairman Hiram Bingham of the

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Pag.

Times-Herald 1

Wash. Post _____

Wash. News _____

Wash. Star _____

N.Y. Mirror _____

N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

1950

government's loyalty review board had confirmed his information.

In addition to Jessup, Vincent, Mrs. Brunauer, Davies, and Loris, McCarthy said charges had been filed against:

Herbert Pierst, foreign affairs specialist; Frances M. Tuchscher, editor-writer; Marcia Ruth Harrison, divisional assistant; Nelson Chipchin, radio information specialist; Esther Less (also known as Esther Less Kopelwich), announcer; Robert Ross, radio information specialist;

Others Are Named

Ella M. Montague, clerk-stenographer; Olga V. Osnatch, clerk-typist; Stella Gordon, correspondent and research; Daniel F. Margolies, assistant chief; William T. Stone, information and editorial specialist; Robert Warren Barnett, assistant adviser on Japanese economic affairs; Mrs. Robert Warren Barnett, consultant and foreign affairs specialist; Sylvia Schimmel, administrative analyst; Philip Raine, regional specialist; Gertrude G. Cameron, information and editorial specialist; Paul A. Lifantseff-Lee, economist; Franz Leopold Neumann, consultant; John Tipton Fishburn, labor economist; Victor Myron-Hunt, office of educational exchange, and Arpad Erdos, information specialist.

McCarthy said he had no doubt that all 26 would be cleared because of the "very unusual record" of the State department's loyalty board.

"In four years of operation," McCarthy said, "with hundreds and hundreds of cases coming before the board—cases which came up as the result of investigations conducted by the FBI—the board has not found a single man unfit for government service."

Charges Arrogant Reply

McCarthy said he wrote State Secretary Acheson July 23, after learning of the cases he listed yesterday, stating that unless he were assured the 29 employees would be denied access to secret data, he would have no choice but to call the Senate's attention to the list.

"I received from the Secretary's office, under date of July 25," McCarthy said, "a very arrogant

letter in which he indicated he thought it was no business of the Senate, that within his own little private kingdom he can do what he pleases, and he refused to assure me that these men would be denied access to secret material."

Jessup has been one of McCarthy's principal targets since he started his campaign against the State department early in 1950. McCarthy recalled yesterday that Jessup had termed as "outstanding" the integrity, loyalty, and veracity of Alger Hiss, convicted perjurer-spy and former high State department official.

McCarthy said Jessup had been affiliated with at least five organizations "officially named as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist party" and had been active in the Institute of Pacific Relations. The activities of which are being investigated by the Senate internal security subcommittee.

Senate Given 26 Names By McCarthy

By the Associated Press

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy listed for the Senate yesterday what he said were the names of over 20 State Department officials and employees whose loyalty is under question. He topped his roll call with Ambassador Philip C. Jessup as "the prize of them all."

The State Department shortly afterwards got out a statement in which it said the Wisconsin Republican had used "smear tactics" and was deliberately violating the fundamental tenet of "freedom from intimidation."

The statement said McCarthy's list includes the names of "persons who are not employees of the Department of State, employees who have been cleared by the Department's Loyalty Security Board, as well as individuals in process through the loyalty program."

No names were mentioned in the statement.

In his Senate speech, McCarthy declared that Jessup, ambassador-at-large, has "negotiated with the Russians much as Hiss negotiated with them at Yalta."

This was a reference to Alger Hiss, former State Department official now serving a prison term on conviction of lying when he swore he never gave secret papers to a Communist spy ring courier.

McCarthy said he had turned over a total of 106 names of Government employees suspected for loyalty but that 23 of them had been cleared.

McCarthy delivered his speech before crowded galleries but only about half the Senators were at their desks.

He twitted the Democrats by noting that former Senate Democratic Leader Scott W. Lucas (Ill.), who challenged McCarthy last year to make names public "is no longer with us," and that Sen. Millard E. Tydings (D-Md.) "also is no longer with us."

Tydings conducted an investigation last year of McCarthy's

nomination of the State Department and was one of a Democratic majority which charged McCarthy with "fraud." Both Lucas and Tydings were defeated for reelection.

McCarthy took a personal hand in helping John Marshall Butler, Republican, in his campaign against Tydings. A Senate investigating committee has criticized McCarthy's conduct in the campaign.

Alluding to that, McCarthy said that if he had not gone into Maryland to "expose the white-wash job I'd be as guilty as Tydings."

Most of those McCarthy named as under loyalty investigation hold relatively minor posts in the Government.

At the outset, McCarthy said he had "no doubt" that all would be cleared by the State Department's own loyalty board.

But he said the persons face "letters of charges" and their cases are under review by the board.

The first name he mentioned was that of John Carter Vincent, consul general at Tangiers and former minister to Switzerland.

The second person named by McCarthy was "William T. Stone, information and editorial specialist, Department of State."

McCarthy said Stone formerly was associated with the magazine "Amerasia" and that the FBI classed this as a "tool of espionage."

He added that Stone also was a former officer in the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization now being investigated by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, headed by Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nev.).

McCarthy next named Robert Warren Barnett, assistant advisor on Japanese economic affairs, and Mrs. Barnett, consultant, foreign affairs specialist. He said Barnett was "brought into the State Department" by the Institute of Pacific Relations.

McCarthy said the Barnetts had "constant contacts with Soviet espionage activities."

He described the case of Sylvia Schimmel, whom he listed as an administrative analyst, as "similar" to that of the Barnetts.

McCarthy said Philip Raine, listed as a regional specialist, was "closely connected with Robert G. Miller," whom he identified as a "Communist agent."

He said Gertrude G. Cameron, listed as an information and editorial specialist, had "contacts with a subject presently under investigation."

McCarthy said Paul A. Lifentz, listed as an economist, had been recommended for his State Department job by "three individuals who appear in the FBI files as known Communists." He added that a naval intelligence report turned over to the State Department said secret State Department documents

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

McCarthy named without comment Franz Leopold Hermann, consultant; John Tipton, Fishburn, labor economist, and Victor Myron Hunt, Office of Educational Exchange.

He said Arpad Erdos, listed as an information specialist, was "really a prize one," but did not elaborate.

McCarthy said John Patton Davies had been cleared by the State Department and now was being "promoted" and sent to Berlin to become an adviser there to High Commissioner John J. McCloy.

Without comment, McCarthy also named Francis V. Tuchscher, editor-writer; Nelson Chipchlin, radio information specialist, and Esther Lee, an announcer.

NOT RECORDED

INDEXED - 48

Page

Times-Herald

Wash. Post

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N.Y. Mirror

N.Y. Compass

Date:

He said Esther Caukin, Bau-
nauer, United States representa-
tive, to the preparatory commis-
sion of the United Nations Eco-
nomic, Scientific and Cultural
Organization, also was on the
list. McCarthy then named these
others:

Herbert Fierst, foreign affairs
specialist. He said Fierst for a
period "was in constant contact
with members of an espionage
ring."

Marcia Ruth Harrison, divi-
sional assistant, whom he de-
scribed as a member of the
Young Communist League.

Robert Ross, radio information
specialist. McCarthy said Ross
once worked for Amtorg Trading
Co., Russian government trading
firm.

Ella M. Montague, a clerk-
stenographer.

Olga V. Osnatch, clerk-typist
who, he said, worked for the Rus-
sian Embassy in Turkey for
three years.

Stella Gordon, correspondence
and research employee.

Daniel F. Margolies, "assistant
chief, Department of State."

McCarthy said the "letters of
charges" against the State De-
partment employees were based
upon information gathered by
the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He did not tell the Senate
how he learned about them or
the charges involved.

He said he regarded them as
similar to indictments by a grand
jury, or informations filed by a
prosecuting attorney.

McCarthy said the "letters of
charges" did "not mean all are
guilty."

The State Department defini-
tion of "letters of charges" was
this:

They are letters sent to indi-
viduals after the loyalty board
has decided to investigate.

The worker is advised in the
letter, the department said, of
the nature of the charges and
is invited to appear before the
board.

[In some of the cases which
McCarthy named, his own pre-
vious charges are responsible for
loyalty questions being raised in
the first instance, and also in
later "reviews."

[McCarthy failed to point out
that the State Department has
previously announced that all of
its loyalty cases "cleared" since

1947 are now being reviewed.
This is the result of the depart-
ment's cautious interpretation of
a Review Board order to all agen-
cies to review all "doubtful"
cases.

[Nearly 500 State Departmen-
cases are presently involved in
this reviewing process.

[The department announced
in June that:

["Out of fairness to the
people concerned, this (review)
included all persons whose cases
came to the board's attention
because they had been attacked
by Senator McCarthy.

["Among these cases were
those of Ambassador Philip C.
Jessup and John Carter Vin-
cent."—Editor's Note.]

When McCarthy concluded,
Democratic Leader Ernest W.
McFarland (Ariz.), his face
flushed, took the Senate floor
and said: "It does not behoove
the dignity of this Senate to
smear any individual."

Without naming McCarthy, the
Democratic leader said attacks
upon individuals, without full
evidence and proper hearings
"tear down the dignity of the
Senate."

Senator Herbert H. Lehman
(D-N.Y.), said the Senate had
again been forced to listen to
"irresponsible charges." He
called this a "form of character
assassination we all should ab-
hor."

Lehman said Jessup "whom I

know well" was one of the Na-
tion's most distinguished public
servants and said McCarthy had
subjected Jessup to "shabby and
dastardly treatment."

Republican leader Kenneth S.
Wherry (Neb.), protested that
Lehman had violated the Senate
rule against making improper re-
marks about a fellow Senator.

"I move to amend my remarks
by striking out dastardly and
substituting cowardly," Lehman
shouted.

McCarran May Pass On McCarthy Charges

By The Associated Press
Senator McCarran (D-Nev.) said yesterday his Internal Security Subcommittee might be willing to act as referee in the quarrel between Senator McCarthy (R-Wis.) and the State Department over the loyalty of department employees.

On the Senate floor Thursday McCarthy named 26 persons, including Ambassador-at-Large Philip Jessup, whose loyalty he said had been challenged. The Wisconsin Senator accused Jessup and others of Communist sympathies.

When some fellow Senators accused him of smearing and called him "a character assassin," McCarthy offered to let a "committee headed by a good Democrat" decide whether his charges are justified. He mentioned McCarran as the type of Democrat he had in mind.

"We don't crave it and are not asking for it," McCarran said in referring to the possibility that his Senate group might make an inquiry. "But it might be our staff could analyze it and present it."

Among those named by McCarthy Thursday was John Carter Vincent, former Minister to Switzerland and now chief of the American mission in Tangiers.

Vincent said at Tangiers yesterday he is disgusted with McCarthy's "nefarious campaign of attack against State Department officials."

"As for myself," his statement said in part, "the fact that the loyalty board may be conducting an investigation on my behalf causes me no—emphasis on the no—concern whatsoever. I am proud of my 27 years of service. It will stand the test of malicious misrepresentation regardless of source or character."

Jessup's office said he had no comment on McCarthy's charges.

Another man named by McCarthy was Herbert Fierst, who is a special aide to Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson, director of United Nations Affairs.

Fierst telephoned a reply to the State Department yesterday. Department officials said Fierst was on vacation.

"I have just received word of Senator McCarthy's charges against me yesterday," Fierst said. "The charges are entirely false. I am not and have never been a Communist, pro-Communist or fellow-traveler. I am a loyal American in every sense of the word."

Fierst said that in 1946 State Department security officers reported to the department "certain of my activities about which they were not fully informed." He said they investigated further and "learned that these activities were actually part of my official duties, designed to further our national interests."

"What Senator McCarthy has done," Fierst said, "is to repeat a distorted version of the original 1946 reports as justification to include my name again on his most recent list."

"He has produced no information to support his charges. To repeat these same charges, which have been shown to be false, over and over again, is to use the big lie technique."

Fierst said that his case illustrates a problem "we have not yet worked out in this country which he described as being 'how to protect an innocent man against McCarthyism.' McCarthy also pointed a finger at Sylvia Schimmel, an official in the Division of International Information and Educational Exchange of the State Department. Twice Cleared. She Says

Miss Schimmel declared yesterday that she has been cleared twice by the State Department's loyalty security board.

She told a reporter: "During my various employment I was associated with certain individuals who had been involved in recent charges and as a result of that I was asked to explain the nature of my acquaintance with them. The loyalty board accepted my explanation."

She said there is no case against her now pending before the board. She declined to give the dates of the two clearances given her by the board.

Another of those listed, Robert Voss, Voice of America radio information specialist, issued a statement in New York denying the charges.

"Senator McCarthy's accusation has no basis in fact," he said. "He is quoted as saying that I was employed by the Amtorg Trading Company. I have no knowledge of this company and certainly have never been connected with it."

4-19
Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

NOT RECORDED
145 OCT 6 1951

Page

Times-Herald _____

Wash. Post 5

Wash. News _____

Wash. Star _____

N.Y. Mirror _____

N. J. Compass _____

Date: 8-11-51

7 OCT 10 1951

You Could Be on McCarthy's List

In closing his Senate speech in which he gave the names of State Department employees who, he says, are suspected of disloyalty, Senator McCarthy made this statement in the form of a rhetorical question addressed to himself:

If an individual is accused of reckless driving, jumping a stop sign, or embezzling from a bank, the American people get that information. So why should not the American people be informed when their servants are accused of Communist activities as a result of FBI investigations?

Senator McCarthy knows the answer to his own question.

When laws are violated in this country—such as laws against reckless driving, disobeying traffic regulations, embezzlement, etc.—the accused person has a right to a public trial. The charges must be proved in court beyond a reasonable doubt. The accusers must face the accused. The accused has the right of counsel, the right of appeal, the right to a jury and all the other rights a free people have secured to prevent the tyranny of injustice by Government or anybody else.

A charge of disloyalty, based on information furnished to a Government department by the FBI or by other sources—other sources including Senator McCarthy—does not necessarily mean that the person so charged has violated any law. If there is valid reason to believe a law has been violated, the accused is prosecuted in open court, with resulting publicity.

There is no law against membership in the Communist Party, unless such membership involves a charge of conspiracy against the Government. There is no law against membership in the subversive organizations listed by the Attorney General. Such membership, in itself, involves no violation of law.

But the Government has wisely decided against employment of Communists, those who are affiliated with subversive organizations or those whose associations with such organizations cast doubt on an employee's loyalty. If the evidence against such an employee is not complete, yet a doubt remains, that doubt is resolved in favor of the employing Government—not, as in a court of law, in favor of the defendant.

When the FBI obtains information which reflects on the loyalty of an employee, that information is forwarded to the Government department concerned. As Senator McCarthy knows, and as FBI Director Hoover has taken pains to point out time and again, that information is not evaluated by the FBI. In other words, the FBI does not undertake to say that the information is to be accepted on its face as evidence of disloyalty or other guilt. The evaluation is left to others, such as the loyalty boards, which investigate the nature of the information, hear the accused, and attempt to reach a fair conclusion. If doubt remains, the employee is fired or permitted to resign.

Folson____
Ladd____
Clegg____
Glavin____
Nichols____
Rosen____
Tracy____
Harbo____
Alden____
Belmont____
Laughlin____
Mohr____
Tele. Rm____
Nease____
Gandy____

In Senator McCarthy's list of State Department employees, about half of them have already been cleared after investigation. Some are awaiting hearings. Some of them are going through the business twice. The question posed by Senator McCarthy is why they should be protected by secrecy during this process.

The Government's position is that it is unfair to subject an employee to the opprobrium of publicity, linking his name with an unproved allegation of disloyalty and thus condemning him, without the benefit of any semblance of trial, to the resulting stigma.

Is that right or is it wrong?

Would you, a citizen convinced of your own loyalty to your Government, welcome publicity if the FBI turned in a report to your employer based on the unevaluated information of anonymous informers to the effect that you were a Communist, and if it were publicly announced that you were under investigation for disloyalty on the strength of "FBI investigation"?

If you believe that this would be fair to you, you agree with Senator McCarthy in making public the names of people who may be entirely innocent of any disloyalty yet, in Senator McCarthy's own words, "are accused of Communist activities as a result of FBI investigations."

But if you do agree that in your own case this would be unjust, you cannot agree with Senator McCarthy.

Times-Herald

Wash. Post

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N.Y. Mirror

Date

Security Group May Referee In McCarthy Fight

By Associated Press

McCarran (D) of Nevada said yesterday his internal security subcommittee might be willing to act as referee in the quarrel between Sen. McCarthy (R) of Wisconsin and the State department over the loyalty of department employees.

On the Senate floor Thursday McCarthy named 26 persons, including Ambassador at large Philip Jessup, whose loyalty he said had been challenged. The Wisconsin senator accused Jessup and others of Communist sympathies.

Willing To Be Judged

When some fellow senators accused him of smearing and called him "a character assassin," McCarthy offered to let a "committee headed by a good Democrat" decide whether his charges are justified. He mentioned McCarran as the type of Democrat he had in mind.

"We don't crave it and are not asking for it," McCarran said in referring to the possibility that his Senate group might make an inquiry. "But it might be our staff could analyze it and present it."

Among those named by McCarthy was John Carter Vincent, former minister to Switzerland and now chief of the American mission in Tangiers.

Vincent said at Tangiers he is disgusted with McCarthy's "nefarious campaign of attack against State department officials."

Proud of His Service

"As for myself," his statement said in part, "the fact that the loyalty board may be conducting an investigation on my behalf causes me no—emphasis on the no—concern whatsoever. I am proud of my 27 years of service. It will stand the test of malicious misrepresentation regardless of source or character."

Another man named by McCarthy was Herbert Fierst, who is a special aide to Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson, director of United Nations affairs.

Fierst, on vacation, telephoned a reply to the State department.

"I have just received word of Sen. McCarthy's charges against me Thursday," Fierst said. "The charges are entirely false. I am not and have never been a Communist, pro-Communist or fellow-traveler. I am a loyal American in every sense of the word."

Once Was Investigated

Fierst said that in 1946 State department security officers reported to the department "certain of my activities about which they were not fully informed." He said they investigated further and "learned that these activities were actually part of my official duties, designed to further our national interests."

"What Sen. McCarthy has done," Fierst said, "is to repeat a distorted version of the original 1946 reports as justification to include my name again on his most recent list."

McCarthy also pointed a finger at Sylvia Schimmel, an official in the division of international information and educational exchange of the State department.

Miss Schimmel declared that she has been cleared twice by the State department's loyalty security board.

She said there is no case against her now pending before the board. She declined to give the dates of the two clearances given her by the board.

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Page

Times-Herald

Wash. Post

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N.Y. Mirror

N. Y. Compass

Date: 8-1-55

U-10
Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

In the State Department

McCarthy Is Declared 'Riding Piggy Back' On Disproved Charges

Acheson and Humelsine
Fire Double-Barreled
Blast at Senator

Senator McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin today stood accused of lying and "riding piggy back" on rehashed, old and completely disproved charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department, as the department loosed a double-barreled blast at critics in the controversial issues of personnel loyalty and foreign policy.

The attack on Senator McCarthy, long-time foe of the department, came from Deputy Undersecretary Carl Humelsine, in charge of the department's loyalty-security program, who discussed the Senator's charges in a television interview. He said that they are disrupting the department's work to some extent, and added that if he finds any one in the department feeding information to Senator McCarthy they will be fired.

The other rebuttal came from Secretary Acheson, who denounced as "either entirely incorrect or distortions of the truth" 12 accusations made against him by Lt. Gov. Goodwin Knight of California. The criticism ranged from Mr. Acheson's handling of Formosa policy, through State Department security questions, to the Alger Hiss case.

G.I.R.

Detailed Answer Asked.

They were formulated by Mr. Knight, a Republican, after he had been challenged by John P. Elliott, Los Angeles civic leader and Democrat, to back up criticisms of Mr. Acheson he made in speech at Chico, Calif., April 17.

The Knight complaints were sent to the State Department by Mr. Elliott with a request that they be answered in detail.

The Humelsine slap at Senator McCarthy brought a prompt reply from the Senator, who said that if the offices charge of rehashing means that the State Department employees in question "have not newly joined the Communist Party, he's right. I have submitted cases with long records of Communist activity, but the State Department still has refused to fire them."

He also said that his charges "are not interfering with the work of any honest American" in the department.

Statement Declared Untrue.

Mr. Humelsine disclosed that of 28,000 department employees, "several thousand" have access to secret papers.

In connection with the department's loyalty program, he said

200 employees have been under such suspicion that "detailed, serious" investigations were made, and 15 have been found unfit. File 188 quit while under scrutiny.

This is one of the points on which Mr. Humelsine directly charged Senator McCarthy with making a statement that "isn't true." The Senator has contended the department's loyalty board has never found one of its employees unfit for government service, because of Communist activity.

The department official was asked about charges that the State Department has cleared employees, who would not have been passed "if the FBI had its way."

Decisions Up to Department.

Mr. Humelsine said, "that couldn't be true" because the FBI makes the investigations for the department in all major cases. In answer to further queries, howev-



—AP Wirephoto
MR. GOV. GOODWIN KNIGHT

er, he said the FBI doesn't evaluate its reports—the evaluations and the decisions are made by the State Department.

INDEXED - 139

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N.Y. Mirror _____
N. Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

Asked how many new leads Senator McCarthy had given on possible subversive employees, Mr. Humelsine replied "very few indeed." He said the Senator has been picking up old lists of employees already cleared. He added that Senator McCarthy provided "a couple of new names" but each of these cases was carefully investigated and the employees were cleared.

Mr. Humelsine said it's true that because of Senator McCarthy's repeated charges, some employees—even high officials—"are becoming afraid to make candid reports to the State Department."

He said in some cases, "it depends on circumstances," employees mentioned by Senator McCarthy and others as possibly subversive, who have been cleared, have access to secret papers.

Aid to Nationalist China.

At one point in the Acheson-Knight exchange the State Department said approximately \$90,000,000 in arms and ordnance has been given Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa, and \$300,000,000 more is scheduled this year.

In addition, the department mentioned a "600-man" United States military mission on Formosa "assisting in the reorganization of Chiang's forces."

On June 24, Maj. Gen. William C. Chase, head of the mission, said in Taipei, Formosa, the United States group had 1,250 members.

Apparently the State Department information was based on figures obtained several weeks or months earlier, indicating a rapid increase in size of the United States mission.

Propaganda Directive Cited.

Here is a summary of the charges and replies:

1. Charge—"on December 23, Acheson sent out instructions to diplomatic and consular personnel in Asia that Formosa was doomed and expendable."

The reply is that what the department sent out was a propaganda directive designed to minimize the unfavorable reaction in case Formosa should fall.

2. Charge—Mr. Acheson approved a \$90 million loan to "Communist Poland" in 1946 against the advice of United States Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane. Counsel in the deal was Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss and a member of Mr. Acheson's law firm, and the firm got a \$50,000 fee.

The State Department said the

"inferences" of this charge were "false" and based upon a "distortion of the public record."

Denies Reds Are on Staff.

3. Charge—Mr. Acheson said July 20 there were no Communists in the State Department and "this statement has since proved to be completely false and untrue."

The State Department replied that Mr. Acheson said only that he "knew of no Communists" in the State Department. Furthermore, the department said a security investigation staff of 100 persons which has operated with the FBI also does not know of any Reds in the Department.

4. Charge—Mr. Acheson "has never repudiated his support of Alger Hiss."

The State Department said Mr. Acheson's answers to questions about Hiss, now in prison on a perjury conviction, had been "widely misinterpreted."

5. Charge—Mr. Acheson "recommended the abandonment of Formosa" after the Chinese nationalist government had fled there.

The State Department said that charge "is entirely false."

References to Lattimore.

6. — Charge — Mr. Acheson joined with friends "including Owen Lattimore" to encourage a Communist rebellion in China and they referred to the Communists as "agrarian reformers."

The State Department reviewed American aid to Chiang Kai-shek from the end of World War II. It said Mr. Acheson has testified that he does not remember even meeting Owen Lattimore; also that a check of his speech shows he does not refer to the Chinese Reds as agrarian reformers.

7. — Charge — Mr. Acheson acted as counsel to Laughlin Currie when Mr. Currie appeared before a congressional committee looking into Communist espionage charges.

The State Department said Mr. Acheson was retained by Mr. Currie in connection with a volunteer appearance the latter made before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August, 1948, to discuss statements made about him by Elizabeth Bentley. The department added: "The committee unanimously observed that no charge of Communist Party affiliation was made against Mr. Currie. . . . It is a fact that since Mr. Currie's testimony . . . no further action has been taken" on the Bentley charges.

Views on Japan Cited.

8. Charge—Mr. Acheson told a Senate committee before he was confirmed as Undersecretary of State that Russia should share in the administration of Japan.

The State Department answered that the records showed no such statement by Mr. Acheson. It said he had testified in September, 1945, that the United States was trying to "go forward with the job" in Japan and had "no disposition . . . to exclude anybody."

The department added that the fact is the machinery for administration of Japan "completely recognized the major role of the United States."

9. Charge—Mr. Acheson insisted on a veto in UNRRA organization to please Russia and supported all Soviet demands "thus leaving the United States impotent to control UNRRA although the United States put up all the money."

The State Department replied that "this allegation is false." They said there was no veto in UNRRA decision making except for a few specific matters such as amending the charter and nominating a director general.

Hiss Appointment Denied.

10. Charge—Mr. Acheson obtained appointment of Alger Hiss "to Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta."

Asserting that Mr. Acheson never recommended Hiss for either of these missions to international conferences, the department said "this statement is false."

11. Charge—On December 16, 1945, Mr. Acheson "received Juan Negrin, head of the Spanish Communists, while he refused at the same time to meet Fernando de Los Rios, head of the anti-Communist group in Spain."

The State Department said Mr. Acheson did receive De Los Rios on December 21, and both the opposing Spanish leaders talked to him "in a private capacity."

12. Charge—Mr. Acheson gave an interview to "Milton Wolff," commander of subversive Abraham Lincoln brigade and pro-Communist Vito Marcantonio, promising them to intervene with Franco on behalf of two condemned Communists in Spain.

To this the State Department said that Mr. Acheson had received a delegation of three House members—Representatives Healy of California, Savage of Washington and Marcantonio of New York—and five other persons, including Wolff but that he "made no special promises of intervention to the group."

The State Department said Mr. Acheson explained that the two men were Argentine and Cuban confirmed as Undersecretary of State that Russia should share in the administration of Japan. The State Department answered that the records showed no such statement by Mr. Acheson. It said he had testified in September, 1945, that the United States was trying to "go forward with the job" in Japan and had "no disposition . . . to exclude anybody."

Tolson____
 Ladd____
 Clegg____
 Glavin____
 Nichols____
 Rosen____
 Tracy____
 Harbo____
 Alden____
 Belmont____
 Laughlin____
 Mohr____
 Tele. Rm.____
 Nease____
 Gandy____

No Names



Carlisle H. Humelsine, above, deputy Undersecretary of State for security, said on a TV show last night that 13 of 26 department officials recently brought under a new investigation have been cleared by the department's loyalty-security board. Recently, Sen. Joseph McCarthy (R., Wis.) gave 26 names to the Senate and said they included Ambassador-at-Large Philip Jessup, but Mr. Humelsine declined to give any names because of the 13 cases still under scrutiny.

Times-Herald
 Wash. Post
 Wash. News
 Wash. Star
 N.Y. Mirror
 N. Y. Compass

Date: _____

David Lawrence:

'Official Reply' Called Misleading

Records of Testimony Made Before Congressional Committees Contradict Snow's Statement on State Department Reds

To what extent have Communists and Communist sympathizers infiltrated the United States Government and particularly the State Department in recent years?

An answer to this question is attempted in a speech by Chairman Conrad E. Snow of the Loyalty Security Board of the State Department. He has made some very significant statements which unquestionably will attract the attention of Congressional Committees as they examine further what appears to be an official reply to various charges leveled in recent months.

The first point that strikes the eye is the argument that, even if there were Communists or sympathizers in the State Department, they did very little harm at most. Here is the exact language by Chairman Snow on this point:

"I can say confidently that there are no known Communists in Government. If there are any secret Communists—Communists who join no Communist fronts and speak no Communist sentiments—of course I cannot say, for they are not known.

"The Hiss case and the case of Judith Coplon in the Justice Department have done more harm in terms of public confidence than any harm Hiss or Coplon ever did in the delivery of classified papers. Both worked in absolute secrecy—their best friends were ignorant of their acts. Neither would have been employed by Government for a day after their acts were discovered. But a swallow does not make a summer—neither do these two cases make out an infiltration of Government by Communists."

The foregoing assertion will be challenged, and, in fact, is contradicted by records of the testimony made before congressional committees.

Thus, the declaration that Alger Hiss, for example, would never have been kept in Gov-

ernment employ for a day after his acts were discovered, is not borne out by the testimony given by Whittaker Chambers, a confessed Russian spy, who has told congressional committees that as early as 1939 he notified the State Department that Hiss had given him secret papers. The record shows that Hiss not only continued in the State Department for years afterward, but that he played a very important part in the preparations for and in the discussions which went on at the Yalta conference as recently as 1945.

The statement by chairman Snow says also:

"Since December 17, 1947, when the President's loyalty program was implemented by directive of the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, the Loyalty Security Board of the State Department has had before it over 500 cases of State Department employees who have been investigated for loyalty by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI—and not one case has been found of a present Communist working in the State Department.

"Over that period eight employees have been held to be security risks, but not one of those admitted present membership in the Communist Party, nor was there evidence of present membership."

A reading of the foregoing statement by those who have not followed closely the controversy over the loyalty program would lead to the impression that infiltration in the State Department hasn't occurred because no "present" Communist can be found. The strongest argument of the anti-Communist group in America has been that former Communists either stayed on in Government employ or were permitted to resign without an explanation of what harm they had done while in Government employ.

In the statement above quoted, the words "present Communist" or "present membership" were not underlined by the speaker, but there are many observers who insist that the presence of former Communists today in highly confidential posts is bad security.

Chairman Snow reveals that since 1947 "about 40 other employees have elected to resign during the process of investigation and adjudication of loyalty." He adds:

"What might have been found in their cases, had they gone to hearing, of course, I do not know. But this small number—less than 50 in all—out of a department of 94,000 employees—who have either been held to be security risks or who have for one reason or another desired not to face investigation, does not indicate any noticeable infiltration of Communists in Government."

What is the importance of the word "noticeable"? It will be noted that Klaus Fuchs who was cleared through a faulty system in which the State Department shares responsibility, stole American atom-bomb secrets. Yet it can be said he is just one employee out of the thousands of employees of our own and foreign governments who have dealt with classified information in recent years. To use 50 in ratio to 94,000 is misleading in itself. Not all the 94,000 employees of the State Department have anything to do with confidential information. It is a rather small group which has access to secrets, and there is no way of knowing whether the 50 who have either been dismissed or resigned had such access. The public is entitled to information on this point as well as to information as to just what part was played by Alger Hiss and others who are admitted now to have been bad security risks.

(Reproduction Rights Reserved)

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alder _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Page

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N.Y. Mirror _____

149 19

White House Aide Accused As Ex-Red

BY WILLARD EDWARDS

Charges of communism in both the White House and the State department seized the Senate's attention yesterday. The twin developments:

1. Sen. McCarthy (R) of Wisconsin, in a Senate speech, revealed loyalty board files on Philip Nash, 42, a \$17,500 adviser to President Truman, which showed that Nash had been accused of membership in the Communist party "in close contact with the Communist underground in Washington" and whose former home in Toronto, had been used by a Canadian spy ring in the early 40s as a rendezvous.

Rosinger Testifies

2. The Senate internal security subcommittee heard Lawrence K. Rosinger, one of State Secretary Acheson's China policy advisers in 1949, refuse to answer the testimony of three previous witnesses that he was a Communist party member. Rosinger pleaded possible self-incrimination. He also refused to discuss his relationships with a number of individuals, in the government and out, on the ground that he might involve himself in trouble with the law.

Nash, McCarthy's White House target, succeeded David K. Niles as an assistant to the President in charge of advising on "minority problems."

He was a lecturer on anthropology at the University of Toronto from 1937 to 1941, then came to Washington as special assistant to the director of the domestic branch of the office of war information. He was assigned to the White House on June 7, 1941, from the OWI.

The White House loyalty board cleared Nash some time ago," McCarthy declared. "Thereafter, the FBI conducted a thorough investigation. Ten separate reports were made and sent to the White House loyalty review board.

Called Friend of Reds

"After the White House cleared Nash, the review board asked for a new hearing. Shortly thereafter, Donald Dawson (White House administrative assistant on personnel) called for the complete files which were sent to the White House and never have been returned to the review board."

The FBI reports, said McCarthy, reading from documents, said Nash had been a close friend and

[Continued on page 2, col. 2]

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Harbo _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Page

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N.Y. Mirror _____
N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

NOT RECORDED

FEB 1952

EX-61

5 FEB 18 1952

White House Aide Accused As Commie

[Continued from first page]

close associate of one of the convicted Canadian Communists.

"During the early 40s," he continued, "parts of the Communist spy ring in Toronto were using his home as a rendezvous and some of them were living there. Nash was attending Communist meetings and had officially joined the Communist party. The reports also show that he had been in close contact with the Communist underground in Washington."

McCarthy said he "assumed" Mr. Truman had never seen the BIF reports. He suggested that the President call upon Dawson for the file and after reading it get rid of Nash.

From Nash in the White House came a denunciation of the charges as "a contemptible lie." He denied ever having been a Communist party member and blamed his sister's anti-McCarthy activities for the senator's blast.

The Senate subcommittee's questioning of Rosinger, 36, now a freelance writer, was featured by his sparring with acting chairman Ferguson (R) of Michigan. At the end, Ferguson said pending legislation, compelling witnesses to testify before congressional committees by granting them immunity from future prosecution, must be approved quickly if the investigating processes are to continue.

Rosinger was confronted by subcommittee counsel Robert Morris with earlier testimony of William Cannino, Karl Wittfogel and Louis Budenz that Rosinger had been a Communist party member and was known to them as such. He asked if he was now or ever had been a Communist.

"I respectfully decline to answer, relying on my privileges under the fifth amendment to the Constitution," he answered.

Admits Knowing Some

Rosinger was asked concerning his relationships with persons identified as Communists before the subcommittee and with other persons not thus identified. He pleaded possible self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions about a number of persons, but freely conceded his acquaintance with others.

Among those about whom he refused to testify were Alger Hiss, State department official serving a five-year sentence for perjury to conceal espionage; Frederick V. Field, financial sponsor of Communist movements; Andrew Ross, a Navy lieutenant involved in the Amerasia espionage case of 1945; Julian Wadleigh, a State department officer who confessed espionage during the Hiss trial, and many others of lesser note.

The witness said he knew Ambassador Jessup only slightly. He at first denied knowing John S. Service, diplomat recently fired after a loyalty board hearing, but later admitted having met him once or twice.

Tolson ☒
 Ladd ☒
 Nichols ☒
 Belmont ☒
 Clegg ☒
 Glavin ☒
 Harbo ☒
 Rosen ☒
 Tracy ☒
 Laughlin ☒
 Mohr ☒
 Tele. Room ☒
 Nease ☒
 Gandy ☒

McCarthy Charges White House Aide

Philleo Nash Was a Communist

Page

Times-Herald

Wash. Post

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N.Y. Mirror

N.Y. Compass

Date:

NOT RECORDED

45 FEB 8 1952

88 FEB 12 1952

By Murrey Marder
Post Reporter

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.), charged yesterday that FBI reports show Philipco Nash, a White House aide, was a Communist.

McCarthy said they disclose that Nash "had been in close contact with the Communist underground in Washington and in the early 1940s befriended his home in Toronto to be used by members of a Canadian spy ring."

Nash, a special assistant to the President on minority problems, immediately branded the accusation "a contemptible lie."

He flatly denied that he is or was a Communist or had "anything to do with the Communist movement."

Nash, who is 42, and a native of Wisconsin, said McCarthy apparently "has been stung" by an anti-McCarthy advertisement signed by Nash's sister, Jean, and 12 other Democrats and Republicans.

The advertisement last Monday in the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune dealt with "the menace of McCarthyism" under the heading, "Citizens vs. McCarthy."

Nash, a former lecturer on anthropology at the University of Toronto, worked for the Office of War Information during World War II. In 1945 he came to the White House as assistant to David K. Niles. When Niles resigned, Nash succeeded to his job.

"I have absolutely nothing to hide and never have had," Nash said last night.

McCarthy referred to him as a \$17,500-a-year aide, while the White House said Nash's salary is \$10,300.

The Wisconsin Senator, whose "advice" is anathema to the President, said yesterday that he was speaking "principally for the ear of President Harry Truman." He said "I assume" the President is unaware of the reports on Nash.

McCarthy also had some advice for the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, from whose confidential files he has repeatedly disclosed excerpts that have resulted in an investigation of the board's own security.

"I may say for the benefit of the Loyalty Review Board," said McCarthy, that they need not investigate their staff to find out how I got this material." All reports on it went to the White House, he said.

McCarthy said Nash was cleared by the White House

Loyalty Review Board and the FBI subsequently turned in "10 separate reports" on Nash.

Although the Review Board then ordered a new hearing for Nash, McCarthy said, Presidential Aide Donald S. Dawson "asked that the complete files be sent to the White House." They were, said McCarthy, and were never returned to the board.

McCarthy, on January 13, similarly charged the White House with intervening to obtain loyalty files on Aide David Demarest Lloyd. Lloyd replied that he was ready to answer all questions at all times, and had done so.

There were nine points in the FBI reports on Nash, McCarthy said. For reasons he did not disclose, he said, he would not read four of them into the record.

They show, said McCarthy, that Nash in the "early 40s was attending Communist meetings and had officially joined the Communist Party." "That during the early '40s parts of the Communist spy ring in Canada

were using his home in Toronto as a point of rendezvous, and some of them were living there."

McCarthy said they also show Nash was "a close associate of one of the convicted Canadian Communists" and had "financially contributed to the support of the Canadian Tribune, the official organ of the Communist Party in Canada."

He said he will "assume President Truman does know that, but when he does he should 'get rid of' Nash."

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Nichols _____
 Belmont _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Harbo _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Laughlin _____
 Mohr _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Nease _____
 Gandy _____

McCarthy Passes Up Tydings' \$25,000 Bid

Senator McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin has passed up the chance to collect the \$25,000 reward offered him by former Senator Tydings, Democrat of Maryland if he would go before a grand jury before February 9 and prove there were either 205 or 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. Today is the deadline on the offer.

From his home at Havre de Grace, Md., Mr. Tydings said the Senator has not accepted "and he isn't going to, and he hasn't proved a single State Department official is a Communist." The Senator said he fixed February 9 as the deadline because it is the second anniversary of the original McCarthy charge.

Meanwhile, Senator McCarthy is back today in Wheeling, W. Va., where he made the original speech two years ago charging Communist infiltration of the State Department.

A member of the Senator's office staff here said the Senator turned his information over to the FBI and that it is the administration's job to present evidence to grand juries.

Page

Times-Herald _____

Wash. Post _____

Wash. News _____

Wash. Star _____

N.Y. Mirror _____

N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

INDEXED - 87

NOT RECORDED

136 MAR 17 1951

MAR 1951

Monroney Will See

Senate Decision on McCarthy Inquiry

To Suggest Move
At Subcommittee's
Meeting Next Week

By the Associated Press

Senator Monroney, Democrat of Oklahoma, said today he will press for a Senate vote on whether to continue an inquiry into demands that Senator McCarthy be ousted from Congress.

Senator Monroney said he plans to propose at a meeting of a Senate Elections subcommittee next week that the Senate be given a chance to decide on the investigation. The Oklahoman, a member of the subcommittee, added that he wants the inquiry continued.

Demands that Senator McCarthy be expelled have come from Senator Benton, Democrat of Connecticut, sponsor of a resolution aimed at ousting the Wisconsin Republican.

Investigation Conducted.

The resolution has been before the Elections subcommittee for study since last August. In October, the group instructed its staff to conduct an independent investigation of the Benton contentions, which included charges that Senator McCarthy had committed perjury and fraud and had engaged in "calculated deceit" of the American people.

During the staff inquiry, Senator McCarthy challenged the subcommittee's jurisdiction and said it was spending "tens of thousands of dollars" without authorization in an effort to dig up material for the Democrats to use against him.

Challenged to Make Move.

Alluding today to those charges, Senator Monroney told a reporter: "Senator McCarthy has challenged the inquiry."

19
Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Alden _____
Belmont _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

Handwritten signatures and initials:
O'Brien
Felt
Walters
Bishop

100-13619-1
NOT RECORDED
APR 25 1952

12

FINAL
ALL SALES

M

49 Rayon Crepe Slips
slightly short
135 Pairs Rayon Jersey Panties
32 Ladies' Handbags
15 Satin Girdles, sizes 24-26
128 Famous Make Bros.
41 Fascinators, all colors
89 Pairs Women's Gloves
62 White Rayon Neck Scarfs
23 Navy Nite Polos

Quantity

APR 25 1952

Page

Time-Herald _____
Bus. Post _____
Bus. News _____
Bus. Star _____
N.Y. Mirror _____

Truman Bans Release Of Data on Employees In State Department

Cites 'Public Interest'
In Order to Acheson;
Tightens Information Rules

By Joseph A. Fox

President Truman today told Secretary of State Acheson not to turn over requested departmental loyalty-security data to a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, declaring that such action "would be clearly contrary to the public interest."

At the same time, the President tightened the rules under which loyalty or security information may be given to Congressional investigators.

In a long letter to the Secretary of State, the President stood on a four-year-old order safeguarding employee loyalty data against unrestricted circulation, declaring that to do otherwise would mean "the reputations of hundreds of loyal Government employees would be pilloried, and the entire civil service would be severely demoralized."

Detailed Data Asked.

The State Department, long under fire by Capitol Hill loyalty probes, received a request from the Appropriations Subcommittee for detailed information on the departmental loyalty-security program, which fell into four categories:

1. Complete files on specified cases. Detailed information concerning the substance of investigative reports in certain additional cases and the procedural steps taken in the handling of various individual cases.

2. The names of all present and former State Department employees who have been investigated under the Federal employees' loyalty program or the department's security program, along with the status or disposition of the respective cases.

3. Names of all employees who resigned or retired from the Department while under investiga-

(See LOYALTY, Page A-3.)

Loyalty

(Continued From First Page.)

tion or during processing of their loyalty-security cases.

Asked Loyalty Boards Votes.

4. The names of State Department officers who sat as members of the loyalty-security board on a particular case and the way each officer voted.

The President ruled out response to the first three questions entirely, and while he said there was no objection to giving the names of officers who have sat as members of the loyalty-security board, it would be "entirely improper" to disclose individual votes.

"If this type of information were divulged freely," the President said, "the danger of intimidation would be great and the objectivity, fairness and impartiality of board members would be seriously prejudiced."

Permits Two Queries.

In tightening up the regulations, the President said: "Hereafter no information regarding individual loyalty or security cases shall be provided in response to inquiries from outside the executive branch unless such inquiries are made in writing. Where proper inquiries are made in writing, replies will

be confined to two categories of information as follows:

"(1) If an employee has been separated on loyalty grounds, advice to the effect may be given in response to a specific request for information concerning the particular individual, and (2) if an employee has been separated as a security risk, replies to request for information about that individual may state only that he was separated for reason relating to suitability for employment in the particular agency."

NOT RECORDED

136 APR 23 1954

Times-Herald

Wash. Post

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N.Y. Mirror

N.Y. Compass

Date: 4-25-54

Tolson

Ladd

Nichols

Belmont

Clegg

Glavin

Harbo

Rosen

Tracy

Laughlin

Mohr

Tele. Rm.

Holloman

Gandy

(LOYALTY)

PRESIDENT TRUMAN TOLD SECRETARY ACHESON NOT TO TURN OVER DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S LOYALTY-SECURITY PROGRAM TO A SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE.

MR. TRUMAN SAID THAT IF THE STATE DEPARTMENT WERE TO COMPLY WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S REQUEST, "THE OVER-ALL RESULT WOULD BE TO WRECK THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES LOYALTY PROGRAM."

THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAD ASKED ACHESON FOR THE FILES IN SPECIFIED LOYALTY-SECURITY CASES, NAMES OF ALL PRESENT AND FORMER EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATED UNDER THE LOYALTY PROGRAM, AND THE DISPOSITION OF THE CASES; NAMES OF ALL STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES WHO RESIGNED OR RETIRED WHILE BEING INVESTIGATED, AND THE NAMES OF STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS WHO SAT AS MEMBERS OF THE LOYALTY SECURITY BOARD OF A PARTICULAR CASE AND THE WAY EACH OFFICER VOTED.

THE PRESIDENT SAID THAT IF THE REQUEST WERE GRANTED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT ALL OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES EVENTUALLY WOULD HAVE TO RESPOND TO SIMILAR DEMANDS.

"IN THE PROCESS," MR. TRUMAN WROTE ACHESON, "THE REPUTATIONS OF HUNDREDS OF LOYAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WOULD BE PILLORIED AND THE ENTIRE CIVIL SERVICE WOULD BE SEVERELY DEMORALIZED. ACCORDINGLY, I MUST ADVISE YOU NOT TO FURNISH THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE, FOR TO DO SO WOULD BE CLEARLY CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST."

4/3--EG208P

NOT RECORDED

136 APR 23 1952

SECRET

WASHINGTON CITY NEWS SERVICE

Tolson ✓
 Ladd ✓
 Nichols ✓
 Belmont ✓
 Clegg ✓
 Glavin ✓
 Harbo ✓
 Rosen ✓
 Tracy ✓
 Laughlin ✓
 Mohr ✓
 Tele. Rm. ✓
 Holloman ✓
 Gandy ✓

D 1 LOYALTY (208P)
 MR. TRUMAN OBJECTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S EFFORT TO MAKE PUBLIC THE NAMES OF INDIVIDUALS DETERMINED TO BE SECURITY RISKS MIGHT BE USEFUL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN LESS SENSITIVE POSITIONS.
 "THE REPUTATIONS OF THESE PERSONS SHOULD NOT BE BESMIRCHED UNNECESSARILY BY MAKING THEIR NAMES PUBLIC," MR. TRUMAN SAID.
 HE SAID THE SAME POLICY DICTATED AGAINST PUBLICIZING THE NAMES OF PERSONS WHO LEFT THE DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF THEIR LOYALTY-SECURITY PROCESSING. THE PRESIDENT POINTED OUT THAT SOME EMPLOYEES WERE DRAFTED, SOME GOT PREGNANT AND SOME WENT INTO PRIVATE BUSINESS.
 "TO PROTECT THE INNOCENT FROM GROUNDLESS ACCUSATIONS AND UNWARRANTED INFERENCES, THEREFORE, IT IS CLEAR THAT THESE NAMES SHOULD NOT BE RELEASED IN RESPONSE TO BLANKET REQUESTS," THE PRESIDENT SAID.
 MR. TRUMAN HAD NO OBJECTION TO MAKING AVAILABLE THE NAMES OF THE AGENCY'S LOYALTY BOARD MEMBERS BUT OBJECTED TO SAYING HOW THEY VOTED IN PARTICULAR CASES ON GROUNDS THAT IT MIGHT LEAD TO INTIMIDATION.
 4/3--N228P

NOT RECORDED
 136 APR 23 1954

Tolson ☒
 Ladd ☒
 Nichols ☒
 Belmont ☒
 Clegg ☒
 Glavin ☒
 Harbo ☒
 Rosen ☒
 Tracy ☒
 Laughlin ☒
 Mohr ☒
 Tele. Rm. ☒
 Holloman ☒
 Gandy ☒

0 Comm. to Mr. Tolson

ADD 2 LOYALTY (228P)

SEN. HOMER FERGUSON (R-MICH.), A SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER WHO HAS BEEN PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN OBTAINING THE REQUESTED INFORMATION, SAID MR. TRUMAN'S DIRECTIVE IS "THE SAME OLD STORY."

"THE PRESIDENT IS SAYING THAT THE BODY DEALING WITH THE FUNDS FOR THIS (LOYALTY) PROGRAM IS NOT ENTITLED TO THE FACTS OR TO KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT HOW IT IS RUN," HE SAID. "I DON'T THINK THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT THAT TYPE OF GOVERNMENT FOR THEIR TAX DOLLAR."

4/3--W0410P

101-22779-7
 NOT RECORDED
 136 APR 28 1952

63 MAY 1 1952

WASHINGTON CITY NEWS SERVICE

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Nichols _____
 Belmont _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Harbo _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Laughlin _____
 Mohr _____
 Tele. Rm. _____
 Holloman _____
 Gandy _____

State Dept. Loyalty Files Denied Senate

By the Associated Press

President Truman yesterday ordered Secretary of State Dean Acheson to turn down a Senate committee request for detailed information and complete files on the State Department's loyalty-security cases.

The President told Acheson in a letter that granting the request would be "clearly contrary" to the public interest and mean:

"The reputations of hundreds of loyal Government employees would be pilloried and the entire Civil Service would be severely demoralized."

He also said that if all Government agencies were to release such information, "the overall result would be to wreck the Federal employees loyalty program."

The request for the files came from a Senate appropriations subcommittee.

NOT RECORDED
 12 APR 18 1952

Times-Herald _____
 Wash. Post _____
 Wash. News _____
 Wash. Star _____
 N.Y. Mirror _____
 N.Y. Compass _____

 Date _____

68 APR 21 1952

Benton Says Ouster Of McCarthy Would Be Blow at Red Cause

By W. H. Shippen

Senators McCarthy and Benton were back in the ring today, after a wordy exchange which bruised tempers on both sides.

The Wisconsin Republican still was firing the questions. Once he opened a line of attack, however, he appeared to take at least as much punishment as he handed out.

The hearing room in the Senate Office Building was crowded with spectators for the second, pre-trial phase of Senator McCarthy's \$2 million suit against the Democrat from Connecticut.

Sees Blow to Reds.

The opponents sought to score these points in the opening bout:

1. Senator Benton said Senator McCarthy's removal from public life would be a blow at the Communist cause. He added he doubted if the Politburo would trade the Senator for a billion dollars worth of propaganda.

2. Senator McCarthy tried to show that the case against him was prepared by Senator Benton with the aid of the Democratic National Committee. He declared the move had the backing of the Communist press and party.

3. Senator Benton said he began his fight on communism long before Senator McCarthy entered the field. He pointed out that the Daily Worker was attacking him years before the Red mouthpiece ever heard of Senator McCarthy.

4. Senator McCarthy declared he would ask District Court to compel Senator Benton to name the friends who offered to help raise \$50,000 to defend him from the suit for damages.

5. Senator Benton said Senator McCarthy's "loaded" questions were part of a "pattern of fraud and deceit," which he had charged in his statement to the investigating subcommittee.

6. Senator McCarthy brought out that Senator Benton had conferred with Columnist Drew Pearson in recent months. Mr. Pearson is suing Senator McCarthy and others for \$5.1 million on charges of assault and conspiracy to run him out of business.

"What Would You Do?"

Senator McCarthy kept asking his opponent a hypothetical question. He asked Senator Benton to assume that he had learned of "dangerous" employees from a loyalty standpoint in the Government and had been unable to obtain action, either from the proper Federal agencies or the President.

"What would you have done in my case?" he demanded.

The Senator was referring to his statement in the Senate that he had the names of 57 card-carrying Communists employed in the State Department.

Senator Benton replied he would have reported the matter to the Loyalty Board or to the FBI. He said he would have sought action from those delegated to investigate such cases. If no action was taken, he added, he could "imagine a case" that might have compelled him to report to the Senate.

Cites John S. Service Case

Senator Benton refused, however, to comment on a specific case Senator McCarthy mentioned—that of John S. Service, who has been dismissed from the State Department.

Senator McCarthy said that here was a case where a man was known to be living with a Chinese spy in the employ of the Soviets.

"If you could not get rid of that man by any means, what would you have done?" Senator McCarthy asked.

Senator Benton pointed out this was a problem for the Loyalty Board and not to be decided on "casual," one-sided statements.

He raised the possibility that a Foreign Service employee might be instructed to go and live with a Chinese, under certain circumstances.

Senator Benton added he was "not prepared to defend the State Department" at the pre-trial hearing. He said that while he could visualize circumstances that would force him to take a case to the floor of the Senate, he would do so with extreme reluctance after exhausting every other remedy.

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Harbo _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Rm. _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

C.I.R.-2

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
Mirror _____
Y. Compass _____

INDEXED - 65

101 - 72-A -
JUL 7 1952

EX-47

JUL 10 1952

Date: _____

Warns of Reds' Benefit.

"This is a time of great danger to the country, because of Communist imperialism," Senator Benton said. "When a Senator goes on the floor with that kind of a charge, he adds immeasurably to the danger."

Such an action, he said, would make headlines all over the world, which would be used by the Reds to undermine confidence in the leadership of the United States.

"These matters are seized by our enemies and turned against us," he said. "We should recognize the menace."

"I know of no way to further Red propaganda more effectively than to take such cases to the Senate in an attack on our leaders. The first Red objective is to destroy the faith of our people in their leaders."

Under questioning, Senator Benton said Kenneth Burkhead helped provide him with some of the material he used in a statement before the subcommittee inquiring into Senator McCarthy's fitness to hold his seat.

The witness explained Mr. Burkhead's primary work was in behalf of the election of Democratic Senators. He said Mr. Burkhead "did some leg work" and collected material "wholly from the public records."

Senator Benton explained he rewrote the statement he submitted to the subcommittee four times and took sole responsibility for it.

Says No One Helped Him.

"Who on the Democratic National Committee aided you in preparation of material for the statement?" Senator McCarthy asked.

Senator Benton said no one

from the committee had helped him, but that he regretted having mentioned casually to a publicity man on the committee that he was introducing a resolution last August looking toward the ouster of Senator McCarthy.

He said he felt this was unfortunate because the impression was given that someone had advised him on his plan to seek the expulsion of Senator McCarthy. Senator Benton claimed responsibility for this idea without assistance from anybody.

Senator McCarthy asked who had promised Senator Benton they would help to raise \$50,000 to defend him against the suit.

Senator Benton's attorney, Theodore Kiendl, instructed him not to answer the question.

Senator Benton said, however, he hoped the money would be contributed. He explained he already had received many offerings in small sums from well-wishers, none except one over \$10. He refused to say if farmers' union leaders and others had offered to help raise the \$50,000.

Was at Pearson Home.

Asked about his association with Mr. Pearson, Senator Benton said he talked with the columnist at the latter's home last fall and they had lunch at a local hotel several months ago.

He denied, however, he had ever seen the record of the pre-trial hearings in the Pearson vs. McCarthy suit.

At the conclusion of yesterday's all-day session, Senator McCarthy remarked that he could finish the proceedings over with in a few hours if Mr. Benton would stop giving such long answers to his questions.

Senator Benton's lawyer reported the hearing would be expedited if Senator McCarthy would quit asking such lengthy questions.

Mr. Kiendl stated he wanted the record to show that when Senator McCarthy had announced he would represent himself at the hearings he was flanked by two attorneys.

Senator McCarthy replied that Attorney Edward Bennett Williams represented him in the Pearson suit, and that Attorney Warren Magee was his lawyer in a \$500,000 suit he has brought against a Syracuse (N. Y.) newspaper.

M'CARTHY SAYS KEFAUVER WOODS PINKO SUPPORT

Charges Bribe Offerer Was Protected

Sen. McCarthy (R) of Wisconsin started another political uproar yesterday with publication in magazine form of a documented report on the fight he has waged since February 1950, against communism in the government.

McCarthy accuses Sen. Kefauver (D) of Tennessee, a Democratic Presidential aspirant, of bidding for the support of "left wing and Communist-controlled elements of press and radio" by attacking the McCarthy exposure of Red bureaucrats.

He followed up with a charge that Kefauver has suppressed the identity of the man who offered him a bribe of \$100,000 or more to protect "certain racketeering activities" when the Tennesseean was chairman of a crime investigation committee.

The McCarthy report, published by Devin-Adair Co. to sell at 50 cents a copy, is entitled "McCarthyism—The Fight for America." It contains the answers to hundreds of hostile questions flung at McCarthy during the last two years as he named federal officials who were either Communists or supporters of Communist objectives.

Names 10 Officials

In this review the Wisconsin senator names ten officials, originally accused by him, who have since been removed from the government on the grounds that they were either disloyal or bad security risks. He includes a sizing section on Owen Lattimore, the State department consultant whom he labeled a Soviet agent, and who has just been barred by the State department from leaving the country.

McCarthy leveled his guns on Kefauver in a discussion of congressional immunity. He noted that Kefauver used congressional immunity to charge people with being crooks, gamblers and racketeers but attacked McCarthy for using the same immunity to expose Communists in government.

Noting that his latest publication was not immune from libel action, McCarthy wrote:

"Sen. Kefauver in his bid for the support of the left-wing and Communist-controlled press and radio in his campaign for the Presidential nomination, has conducted a running public attack on my exposure. He has been unable to find one single thing good for America in my fight against Communists. He has parroted the stock left-wing phrases about 'smearing innocent people' without of course being able to name a single innocent person who has been smeared. No mention is made of the fact that a sizable number of the 'innocent' people have since either gone to jail or have been gotten rid of under the loyalty program."

Recalls Bribe Offer

McCarthy then recalled that in a magazine article in April, 1951, Kefauver declared he had been offered a bribe "in six figures" to prevent a committee investigation. "Offering to pay a public official a huge bribe is a serious crime," McCarthy wrote. "Unless the criminal who makes the offer is exposed and prosecuted, he and other criminals and racketeers will rightly understand this is a green light to attempt to buy protection from other public officers."

McCarthy asked if the bribe offerer got the protection from the Kefauver committee which he tried to buy or was investigated.

"Only Kefauver can answer that question," he remarked, "and he has refused to disclose either the name of the individual or the racket in which he was involved. Kefauver's story merely shows that this racketeer was worried about being exposed and that he tried to buy Kefauver off by offering to contribute \$100,000 or more to the Democratic National committee or to hire workers for Kefauver or to send out campaign material for him."

"Obviously, Communist traitors would pay a much higher price to have their activities covered up and whitewashed. Why does Kefauver so bitterly condemn McCarthy for refusing where Communist traitors are concerned, to follow the same cover-up rule that he followed where this cheap racketeer was concerned? I would prefer not to speculate as to Kefauver's motives."

In an introduction to the McCarthy booklet, Prof. William M. McGovern of Northwestern university asserts that McCarthy "has been able to awaken the American public out of its complacent slumber and make it realize that there was something radically wrong with the caliber of our leadership in international affairs."

0-19
Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Harbo _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Rm. _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

NOT RECORDED
JUL 21 1952

INDEXED 66

Times-Herald 5

Wash. Post _____

Wash. News _____

Wash. Star _____

N.Y. Mirror _____

N.Y. Compass _____

Date _____

65 JUL 21 1952

Wisconsin Voters Get Choice Of Two 'Records' of McCarthy

By Murrey Marder
Post Reporter

Pro and anti-McCarthy forces in Wisconsin are each now aimed with diametrically opposed "records" of Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's (R-Wisc.) Communists-in-Government campaign.

The "records," in the form of booklets, are likely to be a significant factor in the current primary campaign in which McCarthy is seeking reelection for a second term.

McCarthy's defense of his record is in a 101-page volume he recently published, bearing the McCarthyesque title, "McCarthyism: The Fight for America."

His publication, in question and answer form, has a sales price of 50 cents. In it, McCarthy contends that his picture of a Government rampant with Communists has been borne out by the fact that 10 persons he named at various times have either been dismissed, suspended pending investigation, or, as he says, "allowed to resign."

The list, he states, "is growing month by month."

McCarthy's volume contains some of the most bitter attacks he has ever directed at sections of the American press which he accuses of engaging in a "viciously intense smear attack against him."

A completely different version of McCarthy's activities is contained in a new 134-page booklet entitled, "The McCarthy Record."

Published by the Wisconsin Citizens Committee on McCarthy's Record, this volume, in pocket-magazine form, sells for \$1. This committee describes itself as a nonpartisan group composed of Republicans, Democrats and "some independents."

It presents a relatively detailed and illustrated study which includes McCarthy's political beginnings, his controversial status as a Wisconsin judge, his tax records, and

"The record shows," it states, that McCarthy "has failed to produce a single Communist although he has been given countless opportunities to name names and prove his case."

"Even now, when pressed for names, he either lists those who were exposed by other agencies, or cites cases which the FBI and other investigating bodies are totally unable, on the evidence, to classify as Communists."

Head of the Wisconsin committee which compiled the book is Carlisle P. Runge, member of the University of Wisconsin Law School faculty. Treasurer is Francis H. Wendt, former mayor of Racine.

The booklet bears the indorsement of Oliver S. Rundell, dean of the Wisconsin law school; Sverre Roang, former commander of the Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars; Nathan M. Pusey, president of Lawrence College at Appleton, Wis.; Ellis H. Dana, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Churches; Herman Steffes, president of the Wisconsin State CIO; and others.

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Harbo _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Rm. _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N.Y. Herald Tribune _____
N.Y. Mirror _____
N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

NOT RECORDED
AUG 1 1952

AUG 7 1952

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Nichols _____
 Belmont _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Harbo _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Laughlin _____
 Mohr _____
 Tele. Rm. _____
 Holloman _____
 Gandy _____

More McCarthy Suit Data Due Friday

Additional pre-trial testimony in Senator McCarthy's libel suit against Senator Benton, Democrat, of Connecticut, will be heard Friday in the Senate Office Building.

Four witnesses will appear for Senator Benton in connection with the 10 "case histories" of fraud and deceit which Senator Benton cited before the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections last September.

Two witnesses will be officials of a Wheeling, W. Va., radio station which presented a speech by Senator McCarthy on February 9, 1950.

Senator Benton has charged the Wisconsin Republican with making false charges during this address to the effect that many known Communists were in the employ of the State Department.

The other witnesses will be ex-Senator Millard E. Tydings of Maryland and Edward P. Morgan, Washington attorney and counsel of the Tydings subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950.

Senator McCarthy has charged that this committee "white-washed" his claims that the Reds had infiltrated sensitive departments of the Government.

Times-Herald _____
 Wash. Post _____
 Wash. News _____
 Wash. Star _____
 N.Y. Herald Tribune _____
 N.Y. Mirror _____
 N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

RECORDED - 100

RECORDED

93 JUL 31 1952

1952
 AUG 11 1952

McGranery Charges McCarthy Distorted Justice Brief on Reds

By the Associated Press

Attorney General McGranery last night challenged a quotation read by Senator McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, from a Justice Department document in an effort to support Senator McCarthy's contention that the State Department harbors Communists.

In a formal reply, Mr. McGranery said in effect that Senator McCarthy had lifted the quotation out of context so that its meaning was distorted.

Senator McCarthy said in a speech at Milwaukee that a Justice Department brief made reference to Soviet plans for obtaining blank American passports "from Communists employed in the State Department."

Mr. McGranery said there had been testimony that Russian secret police in 1928 worked on a plan to have Communists employed in the State Department so it would be easier to obtain illegal passports. But there has been no testimony that the plan was put into effect, he said, and so the sentence did not mean there were Reds in the State Department.

Paragraph Quoted.

The prepared text of Senator McCarthy's Milwaukee address contained this paragraph:

"There are those who say there are no longer Communists in Government. I am not going to ask you to take my word for that. I have in my hand the brief prepared by seven lawyers of the Justice Department dated July 28, 1952. Let me read to you from it. 'Illegal passports have been used to expedite travel in foreign countries by members of the Communist Party. Plans have been discussed by leading members of the party and agents of Soviet secret police to obtain blank American passports from Communists employed in the State Department.'"

Mr. McGranery's formal reply said in part:

"The 'brief' to which the Senator referred was the Government's proposed findings of fact submitted to the Subversive Activities Control Board in the case against the Communist Party. The department is pressing proceedings before the board in an effort to force the party to register as a foreign-controlled organization.

"The proposed findings to which the Senator referred were based on testimony of witnesses which appeared before the board. His reference to 'plans' discussed to obtain blank American passports from Communists employed in the State Department does not mean that there were Communists employed in the State Department."

Mr. McGranery then said Paul Crouch, an acknowledged former Communist, had testified that in 1928 he was introduced to a man identified as the head of the Russian secret police in the United States.

Mr. McGranery said Crouch testified in part:

"Then this official . . . proceeded to ask a number of questions, primarily about the employment of Communists in Washington, in the State Department, asking if any members of the Young Communist League had jobs in the State Department, where it might be possible for them to secretly obtain possession of blank passports, which, he stated, were needed very much by the Soviet government, and I replied there were no such members, and he directed me if it were possible to try to get such members employed with the State Department and they would be very, very important if the Soviet government could obtain American blank passports."

Mr. McGranery added:

"Nowhere in the entire hearing is there any testimony that the plan was put into effect."

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Nichols _____
Belmont _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Harbo _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Laughlin _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Rm. _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

INDEXED - 19

NOT RECORDED

104 SEP 17 1952

Times-Herald _____
Wash. Post _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N.Y. Herald Tribune _____
N.Y. Mirror _____
N.Y. Compass _____

Date: SEP 5 1952

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Nichols _____
 Belmont _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Harbo _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Laughlin _____
 Mohr _____
 Winterrowd _____
 Tele. Rm. _____
 Holloman _____
 Gandy _____

Benton Refusal to Give Communists' Names To McCarthy Upheld

By the Associated Press

A Federal judge ruled yesterday that Senator Benton, Democrat of Connecticut, need not tell Senator McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin, the names of Communists in the State Department when Mr. Benton served as an assistant secretary.

Judge Matthew McGuire also ruled that Mr. Benton need not tell Senator McCarthy what persons have contributed, or have offered to contribute, to a fund to aid Senator Benton in defending a \$2 million libel-slander suit filed by Senator McCarthy.

Senator Benton refused to answer the questions during the taking of depositions in connection with Senator McCarthy's suit. The suit accuses Senator Benton of unlawfully seeking to oust Senator McCarthy from the Senate.

Senator McCarthy contended the questions were relevant, but Judge McGuire disagreed.

Senator Benton has testified he knew there were Communists in the State Department when he was assistant secretary in 1945-47, that he fought them and had some of them fired.

But he refused to name names. He suggested that Senator McCarthy get in touch with State Department officials and "do this on an authoritative basis, rather than by naming names in public hearings on the basis of a recollection many years back."

Senator McCarthy has let it be known that he will go ahead with the suit against Senator Benton despite the latter's defeat in the recent election.

INDEXED - 82

NOV 20 1952

Times-Herald _____
 Wash. Post _____
 Wash. News _____
 Wash. Star _____
 N.Y. Herald Tribune _____
 N.Y. Mirror _____
 N.Y. Compass _____

Date: _____

6-1010 1 40

State Dept. Finds No Red In Lists by McCarthy

Sen. Johnston Says
Check of Records
Verifies Report of
Tydings Committee

By Murray Marder
Staff Reporter

Senator Olin D. Johnston (D-S.C.) yesterday said the State Department has informed him that "not one" of its employees named in Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's original 1950 Red charges has been found to be "a Communist or disloyal to our Government."

This check of the records by "the present Republican Administration," said Johnston, "should clear up this matter for all time."

The report "further verifies the findings of the Tyding Committee" whose Democratic majority in 1950 declared that McCarthy's charges of widespread communism in the State Department were untrue, said Johnston. McCarthy had assailed that report as a "white wash."

Johnston is chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which is about to launch an investigation of the Eisenhower Administration's security risk program. He has charged the Administration with playing a "numbers racket" with statistics in that program.

He said the report which the State Department prepared at his request shows that 12 of the employees accused by McCarthy in 1950 are still working in the State Department.

Johnston said he asked for this information in order to get the facts on alleged communism in Government.

"In order to proceed in an orderly manner," he said, "I thought it desirable to start at the very beginning."

Therefore, he said, he started with the highly publicized report that McCarthy, at Wheeling, W. Va., in February, 1950, said he had "the names of 205 members of the Communist Party now employed in the State Department," and the subsequent McCarthy charge that he had "the names of 57 card-carrying Communists" in State.

(McCarthy later denied he had said "205" Communists; he then said, in effect, he didn't mean "57 card-carrying Communists" either, because Communists at that time did not carry cards. But he persisted in his charges of widespread communism and disloyalty in the Department and said he could supply the names.)

Johnston said he started with the files of the Subcommittee headed by the then Sen. Millard E. Tydings. See JOHNSTON, Pg. 2, Col. 2

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

121-23278
f. le 6-11-55

Wash. Post and Times Herald ☒
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N. Y. Herald Tribune _____
N. Y. Mirror _____
Date: 1/12/55

JAN 20 1955

Not a Red Found by State Department From McCarthy List, Johnston Says

JOHNSTON—From P. I.

E. Tydings (D-Md.), whom McCarthy helped defeat for reelection in 1952.

He said, "I secured from the committee files the names of the employees of the State Department against whom the Wisconsin Senator had made charges—there being some 80 in number—as well as the names of 10 other individuals whom he had publicly charged."

"I sent these names to the State Department in December, 1954," said Johnston, "and asked the department to inform me, first, if any of these employees had been found to be Communists or disloyal to our Government."

"By letter the State Department has now informed me that not one of these persons who were investigated by the Tydings Committee in 1950 has been proved to be or found to be a Communist or disloyal to our Government," he said.

"In that letter to me," Johnston continued, "the State Department stated that three of the persons the Wisconsin Senator had originally charged had resigned or been dropped from the State Department rolls, but that none of these three was found to be Communists or disloyal to our Government . . ."

"The State Department . . . further verifies the findings of the Tydings Committee by stating that, of the 80-odd names given to the Tydings Committee by the Wisconsin Senator as persons then employed, only 40 were in fact employed in the State Department in 1950; 33 had resigned or left the State Department prior to that year and seven of the (persons) . . . had never been employed by the State Department."

"The State Department further reports that 12 of the 40 who were working in the

State Department in 1950 are still employed in the State Department in 1955 and that 10 others who were working for the State Department in 1950 have been transferred to other United States Governmental agencies . . .

This information, said the South Carolina Senator, should resolve the "great deal of doubt and confusion in the public mind as to the true facts in the case . . ."

"It is gratifying," he said, "to have confirmed that the charges of widespread communism in the State Department, put out in 1950 when the Democrats were in control of our national Government, has now been contradicted by the letter to me from the present Republican Administration."

"I hope in due time," Johnston concluded, "to look into charges in other departments and agencies of the Government to ascertain what the facts are in such cases as I have already done in this case."

Johnston did not release the text of the State Department letter, which was reportedly signed by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations.

The three cases of persons accused by McCarthy in his original series of charges, and referred to having resigned or "been dropped," are understood to have been diplomats John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies.

In Service's case, a final board in 1951 found no evidence that he was a Communist or a member of any subversive group, but found "a reasonable doubt" of his loyalty because he made "unauthorized disclosures of documents" in the Amerasia case. The board said, however, "We are not required to find Service guilty of

disloyalty, and we do not do so . . ."

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in March, 1954, cleared Vincent of any suspicion of disloyalty, but forced him out of the Foreign Service on grounds that his work had fallen below its standards.

Davies, in the most recent and controversial of these cases, last November was cleared by Dulles on all charges of disloyalty or Communist leanings, but fired on grounds he lacked "judgment, discretion and reliability."

Tydings Report 'Whitewash' Upheld

State Found No Reds Among 80 Joe Named

Not a single one of the State Department's employees involved in Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's celebrated numbers game back in 1950 turned out to be a communist, Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D., S. C.) has revealed today.

Sen. Johnston recently asked the Department for a report on the group that launched the Wisconsin fire-eater in the Red-hunting business.

CONFUSION

Sen. McCarthy had originally accused 205 State Department workers, but later changed the figure a number of times, finally resolving on 57. As a result a Senate committee, headed by Maryland Democrat Millard Tydings, undertook an investigation of 80 employees. The committee found no communist affiliation.

Sen. McCarthy called the Tydings Committee report a "whitewash."

The State Department now has informed Sen. Johnston that 40 of the 80 named were not working for the department in 1950-53 had resigned or left before then and 7 had never worked there at all.

Of the remaining 40, 12 are still with the Department, 10 have transferred to other Government agencies and 18 have left. State Department officials told Sen. Johnston that communist charges were never proved against a single one.

"It is gratifying," Sen. Johnston said, "to have confirmed that the charges . . . put out when the Democrats were in control of our National Government, has now been contradicted by a letter to me from the present Republican Administration.

"Realizing that the 1950 investigation by the Tydings Committee of the accused State Department employees and the publicity follow-

ing that investigation has left a great deal of doubt and confusion in the public mind as to the true facts in the case, the letter to me from the State Department, stating that none of the employees have been found to be communists or disloyal to our Government, should clear up this matter for all time," Sen. Johnston said.

Sen. Johnston is chairman of the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

SPANISH

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten: file 71-23378]

NO ORDER
10 JAN 25 1955

[Handwritten signature]

Wash. Post and Times Herald _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N. Y. Herald Tribune _____
N. Y. Mirror _____
Date: _____

3.4 JAN 25 1955

State Department Clears 80 Accused By McCarthy in '50

By L. Edgar Prina

The State Department has informed Senator Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina, that none of the 80 persons investigated in 1950 by the Tydings subcommittee, following charges by Senator McCarthy, has been found to be a Communist or disloyal.

Senator Johnston, who is chairman of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, said the finding by "this present Republican administration" . . . should "clear up this matter for all time."

Former Senator Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, was chairman of the Foreign Relations subcommittee which investigated Senator McCarthy's charges of Communists in the State Department.

Cleared by Tydings.

The Democratic majority of the Tydings group reported the charges were false and accused the Wisconsin Republican of engaging in a hoax. Senator McCarthy called the report a "whitewash." He helped Senator Butler in his campaign to unseat Senator Tydings in 1950.

Senator Johnston, whose committee is planning a broad inquiry into the Eisenhower administration's employee security program, said he asked the State Department to check their records on the 80 individuals. The department's reply was signed by Thurston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and a former Congressman.

According to Senator Johnston, Mr. Morton informed him that 12 of the employees accused by Senator McCarthy were still working in the State Department and that 10 others had transferred to other Government agencies where they were now employed. He added:

"The State Department . . . further verifies the findings of the Tydings Committee by stating that, of the 80-odd names given to the Tydings Committee by the Wisconsin Senator as persons then employed, only 40 were in fact employed in the State Department in 1950; 32 had resigned or left the State

Department prior to that year and seven . . . had never been employed by the State Department."

Clears Ex-Workers.

The Senator said that three of the persons accused by Senator McCarthy had resigned or been dropped from the Government rolls, "but that none of these three was found to be Communists or disloyal to our Government."

The State Department letter to the South Carolinian was not released, but it is understood the three persons referred to above were the diplomats John Paton Davies, Jr., John Carter Vincent and John Stewart Service.

A hearing board found that there was a "reasonable doubt" as to Mr. Service's loyalty because he made unauthorized disclosures of classified documents in the famous Amerasia case, but emphasized that it was not required to find him disloyal and "we do not do so."

Mr. Vincent was ousted in 1953 after Secretary of State Dulles found that his work had been below standard, and Mr. Davies was released last November on grounds that he lacked "judgment, discretion and reliability."

Start at Beginning.

Senator Johnston said he went back to the original McCarthy charges because "in order to proceed in an orderly manner, I thought it desirable to start at the very beginning."

He said he sent the names of the 80 individuals to the State Department for a check last month.

"By letter the State Department has now informed me that not one of these persons who were investigated by the Tydings Committee in 1950 has been proved to be or found to be a Communist or disloyal to our Government," he asserted.

Senator Johnston said that he hoped "in due time" to look into "charges in other departments and agencies to ascertain what the facts are in such cases as I have already done in this case."

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

BRANTON

[Handwritten signatures and initials]

NOT

161 JAN 25 1955

Wash Post and
Times Herald

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N. Y. Herald Tribune

N. Y. Mirror

Date: _____

[Handwritten signature]

McCarthy Ridicules Johnston's Report

By Murrey Marder
Staff Reporter

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, before he may be discharged (R-Wis.) yesterday accused Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D-S. C.) of "torturing the truth" by claiming that McCarthy's 1950 charges of Communists in the State Department failed to disclose a single Red.

Johnston, in a weekend statement, said the Republican-directed State Department has informed him that "not one" of its employees named in McCarthy's "Reds-in-Government" charges was found to be "a Communist or disloyal."

Old Dispute Revived

As chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which is about to launch an investigation of the current Federal security program, Johnston said that report "should clear up this matter for all time."

McCarthy told newsmen yesterday that Johnston had "garbled and misstated the facts" and "stretched and tortured the truth."

The dispute brought back into the news the controversy which first plunged McCarthy into the headlines five years ago with a shower of figures over "205," "81," and "57" alleged Communists, or Communist supporters.

McCarthy charged that the Johnston action was an attempt to "bring back to life" former Sen. Millard E. Tydings (D-Md.) for the next election. Tydings headed a 1950 subcommittee which called McCarthy's charges a "hoax." McCarthy called that report a "whitewash."

In the State Department's report, which was made public yesterday, the Department said it is not required to find that a person is a Communist

before he may be discharged. The report made no findings to that effect, and the Department said that its records also show no present or former employee has been indicted or found guilty of charges that he accepted Government pay while advocating the overthrow of the Government.

McCarthy's contention was that his effectiveness cannot be measured by such a yardstick. He said he had no dispute with the report, but believed it could have been more detailed. He said he will seek additional information on it.

Johnston, who originally released his own statement on the report but not the report itself, was in South Carolina last night. There was no immediate additional comment from him.

None Held Communists

The State Department report, Johnston had said, showed that only three of the persons whom McCarthy had "originally charged" had resigned or been dropped by State, and that none was found to be a Communist or disloyal employee. Johnston said the report also showed that out of a McCarthy list of 80 persons, only 40 were employed at State in 1950 and today there are still 12 working there.

The report, which contains no names, is a four-page letter signed by Assistant Secretary Thurston B. Morton. Not included with the version given to newsmen was a list of 80 names referred to in it.

It answers Johnston's inquiries in two portions. First it refers to action in the cases of "10 persons publicly accused" by McCarthy.

One of these employees, the report said, was discharged under a general security law (Public Law 733, now used as the legal authority for the present Federal Employees Security Program); one was discharged under the old Truman loyalty program, and one was dropped for failing to meet Foreign Service standards. Two of the eight were not State Department employees, the letter said, and the other three of the eight were transferred, resigned or retired.

The following breakdown is then given on "80 other alleged employees," who Johnston said were on a list which McCarthy gave to the Tydings Subcommittee:

Removed under Public Law 733—2.

Removed for suitability under personnel regulations—1.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 9835 (the old loyalty program)—2.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 10450 (the present security program)—1.

Resigned (other reasons)—3.

Transferred to other agencies—10.

Termination of limited appointments—4.

Separated by reduction-in-force—8.

Retired—1; Died—1; Never employed—7.

Principle Explained

Morton stated in the letter that in the two cases of discharges referred to in the "publicly accused" group of 10, the law does not require "that it be proved that a person is a Communist before he may be discharged, and no findings to this effect were made in either of the two cases."

The same principle, said Morton, applies to the two removals listed under the "80" cases, where "the Department has the responsibility of separating from the rolls of the Department those persons whose continued employment is deemed to be not clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

If there is no overlapping between the two lists, it would mean that four persons were removed under laws or executive orders and two others were removed on "suitability" grounds, in addition to three who resigned while being investigated.

State Department officials declined to make any comment on that, or on Johnston's or McCarthy's interpretations of the figures.

All of those he named, McCarthy insisted yesterday, were "employed" by the State Department—despite its report to the contrary. He contended, as he has in the past, that some were "advisers" such as Owen Lattimore and that others, such as the late William Remington, were "working in State Department matters" in other agencies.

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

Wash. Post and Times Herald _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N. Y. Herald Tribune _____
N. Y. Mirror _____

Date: 1/18/55

NOT RECORDED
JAN 20 1955

Mr. Tolson _____
 Mr. Boardman _____
 Mr. Nichols _____
 Mr. Belmont _____
 Mr. Harbo _____
 Mr. Mohr _____
 Mr. Parsons _____
 Mr. Rosen _____
 Mr. Tamm _____
 Mr. Sizoo _____
 Mr. Winterrowd _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Mr. Holloman _____
 Miss Gandy _____

Spending

Up

(V)

STATE DEPT. 'REDS'
 Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy accused Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D., S. C.) of "twisting and distorting facts" about what has happened to 90 State Department employees Sen. McCarthy accused of being communists or communist supporters in 1950. Sen. Johnston, after receiving a report from the State Department, said "not one (of the 90) has been found to be a communist or disloyal to the U. S." (UP)

66-23278
6-10-55

1-11-55
 NOV 20 1955
 101 JAN 20 1956

Wash. Post and Times Herald
 Wash. News
 Wash. Star
 N. Y. Herald Tribune
 N. Y. Mirror

Date: *1-19-55*

'More Funds Should Be Appropriated'

Hill Unit Chairman Threatens to Scuttle Super-Carriers

For other budget stories see Mr. Cramer on Page 2, stories on Page 21, Editorial and Mr. Othman on Page 22.)

The House Appropriations Committee chairman called the Navy's supercarriers outdated weapons today and said no more funds should be appropriated to build them.

Chairman Clarence Cannon (D., Mo.) revived the long debate over the place of gigantic aircraft carriers in atomic wars as the Democrats prepared to scrutinize the Administration's defense budget.

"Very careful scrutiny," were the words of Senate Democratic leader Lyndon B. Johnson (Tex.). He said Democrats, starting with hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday, will try to find out whether future Administration defense policy is going to show the "off again, on again, gone again" approach of the past two wars.

Indications were that the Democrats will concentrate their attack on budget cutbacks for the Army. The Administration has ordered a sharp cutback in the size of the Army in a move toward greater reliance on air power and atomic bombs.

Rep. Cannon, whose committee will have a lot to say about funds for the Navy, said the \$180,000,000 for the new budget for a fifth supercarrier ought to be eliminated. He cited unnamed authorities as saying "not one carrier will be afloat more than 10 hours after war is declared." (UP)

Other Congressional news:

BUDGET

Democrats attacked President Eisenhower's \$62,400,000,000 budget on both flanks today—for his failure to get the Treasury out of the lull and for some economies he recommended. Many Democrats and Republicans who still hoped to balance the budget were pointing to an expanded foreign aid program—totaling \$4,700,000,000—as the top priority target for Hill budget cuts.

TARIFFS

Four more Cabinet officers present their views today to try to persuade Congress to approve President Eisenhower's three-year tariff-cutting program. Scheduled to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee were Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, and Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell. (UP)

STATE DEPT. 'REDS'

Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy accused Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D., S. C.) of "twisting and distorting facts" about what has happened to 90 State Department employees Sen. McCarthy accused of being communists or communist supporters in 1950. Sen. Johnston, after receiving a report from the State Department, said "not one (of the 90) has been found to be a communist or disloyal to the U. S." (UP)

MILITARY

The Defense Department formally asked Congress to raise the pay of military men who have two or more years of service. The pay boosts, designed to make military careers more attractive, would cost a total of \$729,700,000 annually. (UP)

MAIL

A reliable source said the Administration will ask Congress to raise by 1 cent the price of mailing letters locally as well as those sent out of town. (UP)

DIXON-YATES

Opponents of the proposed Dixon-Yates power project disclosed they will try to block appropriations for a transmission line linking the Government-owned TVA with the privately owned power plant. (UP)

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

Wash. Post and Times Herald _____

Wash. News _____

Wash. Star _____

N. Y. Herald Tribune _____

N. Y. Mirror _____

Date: _____

NOT RECORDED
161 JAN 21 1955

Dulles Tiesteps Johnston McCarthy Tiff on Communists

0-19

Secretary of State Dulles today fled from a senatorial dispute over whether the State Department has discharged any Communists.

The tiff started Sunday when Senator Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina reported that the State Department had informed him that it had found no Communists among some 80 persons accused by Senator McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Senator McCarthy replied last night that Senator Johnston "twisted and distorted the facts."

Everybody agreed that "the facts" were contained in a letter which Assistant Secretary of State Thurston B. Morton wrote to Senator Johnston. The State Department and Senator McCarthy made the text of the letter public.

Quizzed by Press.

Mr. Dulles was asked at a news conference today whether Senator Johnston or Senator McCarthy was right. Mr. Dulles replied that the full facts were in the State Department letter. The dispute, he said, was a question of individual judgment.

A reporter asked whether Mr. Dulles could state, without regard to the letter, whether the State Department has discharged any one because of Communist affiliation.

Mr. Dulles told the reporter sharply to read the letter.

The reporter replied that he had read the letter and that was exactly why he was asking the Secretary the question.

Mr. Dulles ended the exchange by stating that he was afraid he could not clarify the letter.

McCarthy on Tydings.

Senator McCarthy said that behind Senator Johnston's statement there appeared to be "an attempt to exhume" former Senator Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, and "bring him back to life for the next campaign."

Senator Tydings, who was chairman of the subcommittee that investigated in 1950 the McCarthy charge of communism in the State Department, was defeated for re-election later that year. The Tydings investigation, described by Senator McCarthy as a "whitewash," found there was nothing to the McCarthy charges.

The letter listed what had happened to 69 of the 80 individuals whose names originally were turned over by Senator McCarthy to the Tydings subcommittee. It made no mention of 11 others, presumed still to be on department personnel rolls.

Breakdown Given.

In the letter, Mr. Morton said that it was not up to the department to find whether any of the persons were (A) Communists or (B) disloyal to the United States.

The letter to Senator Johnston gave the following breakdown.

Removed as security risks—2; removed for "suitability reasons" under personnel regulations—1; resigned during proceedings instituted against them under presidential security orders—3; resigned (other persons)—32; transferred to other agencies—10; termination of limited appointment—4; separated by reduction in force—8; retired—1; died—1 and never employed—7.

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

Handwritten notes and signatures:
P. H. B.
R. J. B.
R. J. B.
W. J. B.

NOT RECORDED
161 JAN 25 1955

Handwritten signature:
J. W. B.

Wash. Post and Times Herald _____
Wash. News _____
Wash. Star _____
N. Y. Herald Tribune _____
N. Y. Mirror _____

Date: Jan. 18, 1955

Mr. Tolson
Mr. Boardman
Mr. Nichols
Mr. Belmont
Mr. Harbo
Mr. Mohr
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Tamm
Mr. Sizoo
Mr. Winterrowd
Tele. Room
Mr. Holloman
Miss Gandy

(MCCARTHY)

SEN. OLIN D. JOHNSTON (D-S.C.) STOOD FAST, IN THE FACE OF A BLAST FROM SEN. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, IN HIS CONTENTION THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD DISPROVEN MCCARTHY'S CHARGES OF WIDESPREAD COMMUNISM IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

JOHNSTON CALLED UPON MCCARTHY TO NAME ONE STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE WHO HAS BEEN CONVICTED OR PROVEN TO BE A COMMUNIST AFTER BEING CITED BY MCCARTHY AS A COMMUNIST OR COMMUNIST SUPPORTER.

THE JOHNSTON-MCCARTHY WRANGLE STARTED OVER THE WEEKEND WHEN JOHNSTON SAID A STATE DEPARTMENT LETTER TO HIM MADE CLEAR THAT "NOT ONE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES CHARGED (BY MCCARTHY) IN 1950... HAS BEEN FOUND TO BE A COMMUNIST OR DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES."

MCCARTHY IN TURN CHARGED THAT JOHNSTON "TWISTED AND DISTORTED THE FACTS" IN INTERPRETING THE STATE DEPARTMENT LETTER ABOUT ACTIONS TAKEN AGAINST 90 EMPLOYEES CITED BY MCCARTHY IN 1950.

MCCARTHY BRANDED JOHNSTON'S INTERPRETATION OF THE LETTER AS "AN ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT THE FIGHT TO EXPOSE COMMUNISTS."

JOHNSTON AT FIRST DISMISSED MCCARTHY'S BLAST WITH THE COMMENT: "HE HASN'T SAID A THING." BUT THEN HE ADDED:

"ASK MCCARTHY TO NAME ONE PERSON (ON HIS LIST) THAT HAS BEEN CONVICTED AND PROVEN TO BE A COMMUNIST IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS."

MCCARTHY CONTENDED THAT IT WAS NOT THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S JOB TO PROVE THAT A SUSPECTED EMPLOYEE ACTUALLY IS A COMMUNIST BUT ONLY TO DECIDE WHETHER HE IS A SECURITY RISK--A FACT WHICH HE SAID WAS EMPHASIZED IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT LETTER SIGNED BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE THURSTON B. MORTON.

1/18--EG1233P

NOT RECORDED
161 JAN 25 1955

WASHINGTON CITY NEWS SERVICE

Mr. Tolson _
Mr. Boardman _
Mr. Nichols _
Mr. Belmont _
Mr. Harbo _
Mr. Mohr _
Mr. Parsons _
Mr. Rosen _
Mr. Tamm _
Mr. Sizoo _
Mr. Winterrowd _
Tele. Room _
Mr. Holloman _
Miss Gandy _

ADD 1 MCCARTHY (1233P)

MEANWHILE, MCCARTHY DEMANDED THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT CLARIFY HOW MANY EMPLOYEES IT STILL RETAINS OF THE 90 HE ACCUSED OF BEING COMMUNISTS OR COMMUNIST SUPPORTERS IN 1950.

FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT BREAKDOWN, MCCARTHY SAID IT IS APPARENT THAT MOST OF THE 90 ARE NO LONGER EMPLOYED AT THE STATE DEPARTMENT. BUT MCCARTHY SAID THE STATE DEPARTMENT LEFT THE FATE OF 11 UNACCOUNTED FOR, AND APPARENTLY THEY ARE STILL WORKING AT THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

1/18--JE1245P

Johnston 'Tortured' Facts of Letter on Reds, McCarthy Says

By James Y. Newton

Senator McCarthy said last night that a senatorial colleague "twisted and distorted the facts" in reporting what the State Department said they had found out about 80 employes whose names were sent them five years ago by the Wisconsin Republican.

Senator Olin Johnston had said that the State Department wrote him that none of the 80 persons named by Senator McCarthy was found to be a Communist or disloyal.

Senator McCarthy released the department's letter to Senator Johnston as he accused the South Carolinian of "torturing" the truth.

The Wisconsin Republican said that behind Senator Johnston's statement there appeared to be "an attempt to exhume" former Senator Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, and "bring him back to life for the next campaign."

Probe Called "Whitewash."

Senator Tydings, who was chairman of the subcommittee that investigated in 1950 the McCarthy charge of communism in the State Department, was defeated for re-election later that year. The Tydings investigation, described by Senator McCarthy as a "whitewash," found there was nothing to the McCarthy charges.

Shortly after Senator McCarthy released the department's letter to Senator Johnston, dated January 10, the department released other copies to reporters.

The letter listed what had happened to 69 of the 80 individuals whose names originally were turned over by Senator McCarthy to the Tydings subcommittee. It made no mention of 11 others, presumed still to be on department personnel roles.

Breakdown Given.

In the letter, Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton said that it was not up to the department to find whether any of the persons were (A) Communists or (B) disloyal to the United States.

The letter to Senator Johnston gave the following breakdown:

Removed as security risks—2; removed for "suitability reasons" under personnel regulations—1; resigned during proceedings instituted against them under presidential security orders—3; resigned (other persons)—32; transferred to other agencies—10; termination of limited appointment—4; separated by reduction in force—8; retired—1; died—1 and never employed—7.

Charges Deception.

Saying that Senator Johnston made a "completely deceptive statement," Senator McCarthy said that some of the 32 who had resigned were under investigation at the time. He added that the seven who were listed as "never employed" included Owen Lattimore, one-time State Department consultant under indictment on perjury charges, and William Remington, who was recently murdered in prison, where he was serving a term for perjury.

The Wisconsin Republican said that in addition to the original list of 80 names sent to Senator Tydings, he later sent two other lists totaling 35 names of other State Department employes.

The Senator said that he was asking the department for additional information concerning what happened to the other 35 employes and also requesting the names of those on his three lists who are still employed.

He claimed that the State Department's letter confirmed the correctness of his charges in 1950. Senator McCarthy said that he had never accused the persons of being Communists or even necessarily of being disloyal. He said the names he gave the Tydings Committee were of those persons against whom he had evidence that they belonged to the party or Communist front groups. He said the evidence "all the way from extremely damaging to less damaging" and he presumed that some of them were not guilty of any Communist tinge.

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. Boardman _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Belmont _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Mohr _____
Mr. Parsons _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tamm _____
Mr. Sizoo _____
Mr. Winterrowd _____
Tele. Room _____
Mr. Holloman _____
Miss Gandy _____

Wash. Post and
Times Herald

Wash. News

Wash. Star

N. Y. Herald Tribune

N. Y. Mirror

Date: _____

Mr. Tolson _____
 Mr. Boardman _____
 Mr. Nichols _____
 Mr. Belmont _____
 Mr. Harbo _____
 Mr. Mohr _____
 Mr. Parsons _____
 Mr. Rosen _____
 Mr. Tamm _____
 Mr. Sizoo _____
 Mr. Winterrowd _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Mr. Holloman _____
 Miss Gandy _____

Johnston, McCarthy Again Clash On Alleged State Dept. Subversives

By Herbert Foster
United Press

Senator Olin D. Johnston (D-S.C.) said yesterday a "great man" of the State Department employees named by Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy as subversives in 1950 are "still working for the Government."

"And not one has been convicted," Johnston added.

McCarthy retorted that Johnston's statement was a "complete contradiction" of a State Department letter listing the action taken on 80 security cases McCarthy had cited.

McCarthy said the letter showed that 69 of the employees left the Department while under investigation or after formal charges had been filed against them. He said that was a "fairly good" average.

[According to Johnston, who received an additional non-publicized report from the State Department, the report showed "only 40 (of the main group of 80 persons) were in fact employed in the State Department in 1950," most of the remainder having resigned earlier.

In another list of 10 additional names, the State Department letter said, only six were on the Department's rolls

at the time of McCarthy's question of individual judgment charges.

In reaching his figure of 69 employees dropped out of the main group of 80, McCarthy included the employees which the Department listed as under investigation, removed, transferred, retired, died, separated by reduction-in-force, seven persons "never employed," and 32 who resigned for "other reasons."

Johnston and McCarthy have been wrangling for three days over whether the letter disproved or substantiated McCarthy's charges that subversives had infiltrated the State Department under Democratic administrations. They renewed the argument on the Senate floor yesterday.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles refused to take sides in the controversy at his news conference yesterday. He told reporters the full facts are in the letter to Johnston and that interpretation is a

Later, Johnston and Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.) got into a discussion over whether Johnston should put the 80 names in the Congressional Record. Dirksen said if the accused persons had faith in their own cases they should put them before Congress.

"Unless we get down to specific cases, we are chasing windmills," he said.

Johnston said the names were confidential and "I don't want an innocent person's name read out and his character besmirched when he's as innocent as a newborn babe."

file
121-23278
6-100

NOT RECORDED
JAN 20 1955

Wash. Post and Times Herald ✓
 Wash. News _____
 Wash. Star _____
 N. Y. Herald Tribune _____
 N. Y. Mirror _____
 Date: *pg 2* 1/19/55

For The Record, It's Still .000

SEN. OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina recently sent the State Department the names of some 80 persons said by Sen. Joe McCarthy in 1950 to be Communist employes of that department. Johnston asked what these persons' employment and security status was. Here is what he learned, from Assistant Secretary of State Thurston Morton, and announced this week:

Only 40 of the more than 80 were employed by the State Department in 1950.

Seven had never been employed by it.

Twelve are still working for it.

Ten have transferred to other agencies.

How many of the total were Communists? "Not one," said the Department spokesman, of the employes named by McCarthy in those charges was found to be "a Communist or disloyal to our government."

In other words, despite his more than 80 times at bat, and numerous fouls, the Wisconsin senator's batting average is still .000. The monicker "Triple O Joe" still fits. As Sen. Johnston observed, this check of the records by a Republican administration "should clear up this matter for all time."

TO: CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Charlotte News

1-19-55

F. S. Griffith, Executive Editor

NOT RECORDED
131 FEB 23 1955

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JAN 19 1955	
FBI - CH. ROUTE	

Mr. Boardman
Mr. Nichols
Mr. Belmont
Mr. Harbo
Mr. Mohr
Mr. Parsons
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Tamm
Mr. Sizoo
Mr. Winterrowd
Tele. Room
Mr. Holloman
Miss Gandy

Five Years And 80 Investigations Later

At Wheeling, West Virginia in the year 1950 a relatively unknown freshman senator named McCarthy shocked the nation by announcing that he had a list of 205 card-carrying Communists in the Department of State. Later he changed this figure to 81, still later to 57, and after much debate, he finally handed to the old Tydings Committee of the Senate a list of 80. No matter what figure he used, the shock didn't grow less. One Communist in the Department of State, card-carrying or not, is one too many.

Five years have passed, McCarthy has become a national figure, all the people he named on his list have been subjected to fear, and anguish, and scorn, and endless investigation, and now it appears to be finally and definitely established that there were no Communists in the Department of State in 1950, and that none of the people McCarthy named were disloyal. The determination has been made by a Republican administration, acting through its assistant secretary of state, Thurston B. Morton.

Here are the facts as Mr. Morton has given them in his letter to Senator Olin D. Johnston (D) of South Carolina:

Of the 80 employees charged by McCarthy, four have been removed from office

finding of Communism or disloyalty; one was removed for "unsuitability," a personnel action not connected with security; three resigned while their cases were being investigated but the investigation concluded with the finding that they were not Communists or disloyal; 32 resigned after investigation but for other reasons; ten are still working for the government in other agencies; four had limited appointments for which time has now expired; eight were separated from the Department when it reduced its forces early in the new administration; one retired honorably; one is now dead; seven were never employed by the State Department, and the rest are still employed.

To give McCarthy his greatest due, it seems probable that the government might have been better off without some of the people McCarthy named as Communists. McCarthy adherents have always argued that they didn't mind his exaggerations so long as there was some truth in what he said. This argument has always seemed to us to be dangerous—would the same people teach a child to tell the truth part of the time?—but it is not pertinent anyhow.

The Republican administration has now revealed that there was no truth in what he said.

Sunder the security program but with no
San Diego Evening Tribune
Peoples Daily World
La Mesa Pictorial
Oceanside Daily Glade Tribune 1-24-55
Santa Ana Register
Imperial Valley Outlook
Calxico Chronical
Corona Daily Independent
Perris Progress
Riverside Daily Press
Riverside Enterprise
Radio Date Palm
Escondido Daily Times Advocate

NOT RECORDED

126 FEB 17 1955

60 FEB 18 1955

- Mr. Tolson _____
- Mr. Boardman _____
- Mr. Nichols _____
- Mr. Belmont _____
- Mr. Harbo _____
- Mr. Mohr _____
- Mr. Parsons _____
- Mr. Rosen _____
- Mr. Tamm _____
- Mr. Sizoo _____
- Mr. Winterrowd _____
- Tele. Room _____
- Mr. Holloman _____
- Miss Gandy _____

His Old Admirers Rumble and Old Critics Cheer

Scott McLeod Is Satisfied With State Dept. Security

by ANTHONY LEWIS

When Scott McLeod took over as the State Department's security chief two years ago, he was denounced variously as "a spy for Joe McCarthy" and a ruthless Red-hunter who was using security for political ends and wrecking department morale.

This year some of Mr. McLeod's actions have brought him cheers from former critics and discontented rumormongers from his old admirers. He cleared Wolf Abdejinsky for State Department work, for example, and bucked by the clearance even under Agriculture Department pressure.

Last week Mr. McLeod startled his old critics even more by telling a Senate committee that he would be a communist if necessary to get a State job done. A reporter scribbled after the hearing: "Scott, Joe McCarthy will have a subpoena out for you in the morning."

BETTER UNDERSTOOD

Mr. McLeod has noted the shifting opinions, but he doesn't think he is responsible. He believes he has stayed essentially the same since he took office, but people just understand him better.

"The apprehensions of two years ago about me just haven't worked out," he said today in an interview. "The actual record has alleviated fears."

"Remember that it was a change of administration anyway. (Mr. McLeod took over March 3, 1953.) There was bound to be concern."

EASY CHANGEOVER

"Except for some propaganda, I think this would have been the easiest changeover in history. We have made fewer changes in personnel than in 1933 . . ."

"The State Department had two difficult problems. It mushroomed in size just after World War II. Then suddenly security was thrown in, and into the political arena."

"Politicians always exaggerate. The political boys made it appear



MR. McLEOD

that everybody was suspect."

Mr. McLeod said the lack of criticism of State's security program recently showed it must be working well—"We were in the spotlight, so if we didn't do things right we'd have heard about it."

He added that he had no personal objection to a broad study of security programs by a special bipartisan body if such a group had enough authority behind it to get the complete picture, including the official Government side. The Administration thus far has opposed such a study.

Mr. McLeod said his reinvestigation of State personnel is now complete for all practical purposes. There will be a continuing recheck of employe files, tho, with about 5 per cent of the staff being reinvestigated at a time.

KIND WORDS

He has not found any unusual number of security risks in the de-

partment, Mr. McLeod said. And he added specific praise for the "dedication" of Foreign Service officers, who he said work "in conditions overseas that the average American could not put up with."

Mr. McLeod conceded that none of the people who have been described as his good friends on Capitol Hill have raised some eyebrows about him lately.

"There was a period," he said, "when they were saying: 'McLeod has been taken over by the domes.'" **NOT RECORDED**

SEEKS MIDDLE COURSE

Mr. McLeod insisted he has not been taken over by anybody and just wants to steer a middle course.

He has never had the working relationship with Capitol Hill that used to be charged to him, he said, and he believes State should be allowed to run its own security affairs. But he added that he would not get into a public fight with any congressman.

Some of Mr. McLeod's old critics do not agree with his view of himself as a constant in a changing landscape. They say he formerly used security for political purposes in political speeches himself and fed facts to attacking congressmen, whether innocently or not.

These old critics feel strongly that Mr. McLeod has changed, and for the better—toward a more understanding, sympathetic and sophisticated view of security.

Mr. McLeod would agree only to a small change, and then with a joke.

"You'd be a pretty stultified person if you didn't grow in two years of this kind of experience," he said. "But I don't know if I've grown bigger or smaller."

NOT RECORDED
126 MAR 23 1955

12-2327

6-117

st and
Herald

ws

rald Tribune

ror

APR 23 1955

MAR 23 1955

Date: _____