

No. 9336. v. A 165 A

pts. 9-11



Blue book

9335.7 A 10 51

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

pts. 9-11

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

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

U.S. Congress Senate OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS**

SECOND SESSION

ON

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

PART 9

FEBRUARY 26, 27, 28, 29, MARCH 1, AND 3, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



~~Library of Congress~~

DEC 24 1952

6815
5

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

88345



1 vol. Cont
January 26, '53

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

PAT McCARRAN, Nevada, *Chairman*

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington	HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan
HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, Maryland	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
WILLIS SMITH, North Carolina	ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

PAT McCARRAN, Nevada, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi	HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan
HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, Maryland	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
WILLIS SMITH, North Carolina	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

PAT McCARRAN, Nevada

HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan

ROBERT MORRIS, *Special Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Pages
Owen Lattimore -----	2897-3275

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 2:30 p. m., pursuant to notice, in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Pat McCarran (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran (presiding), O'Connor, Smith, Ferguson, Jenner, and Watkins.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; and Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

The witness will please rise and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are to give before this subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. LATTIMORE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say at the outset as I have said before, that pictures might be taken before the hearings but not during the hearings. We do not think it is best to annoy or interrupt the witnesses in their testimony.

When the Members of the Senate became members of this committee, both the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee individually and collectively fully realized that we were to be and would be the targets of invective and disparaging remarks and statements. Our anticipation in that regard has been fully carried out. The Daily Worker has devoted many columns to its condemnation of this committee, its members, and the manner in which it has operated. Every Communist in America has taken opportunity to cast invective and discouraging and disparaging remarks with reference to this committee and its membership. We were fully advised before we undertook this task that such would be the course and procedure. It is not at all out of line with the general procedure of the Communist Party and Communists generally in the world.

For many months one of the great jurists of America, Judge Medina, sat in trial during all kinds of condemnatory remarks and insulting expressions. He dealt with the matter at the close of that great trial.

A statement has been filed today by the witness. The ticker shortly after noon announced that that statement was available to those who

saw fit to read it and it was at the office of the attorney for the witness. The press has that statement now. Of course, that statement and its remarks are no longer privileged, as that term is known in the law. The witness must be responsible for the full gravity of his remarks produced in that statement. In that statement there is carried out the same policy as has been carried out against this committee. Intemperate and provocative expressions are there set out and elaborated upon.

This committee could exercise its rights. We could deny that statement the right to become a part of the record. We realize that this is a country of free speech, that that is one of our great heritages, and we propose to see to it that it is carried out here today. Notwithstanding the insulting and offensive remarks that appear in the record, the statement made by the witness now under oath, he may proceed with his statement with the understanding that from time to time as he goes along counsel for the committee will interrogate him.

You may proceed, sir.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, before the witness proceeds, may I identify myself on the record. I am Abe Fortas, of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, here as counsel for Owen Lattimore. Our address is 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., of this city.

Senator, I should like to ask you to advise me of the rights and privileges of attorneys. I have examined your record of these hearings and I find that you yourself made the following statement on July 25, 1951—

The CHAIRMAN. What I said is not necessary. I can tell you in a minute, Mr. Fortas.

I did tell you privately and I will tell you now on the record that you will be permitted to remain here. You will not be permitted to testify and you will not be permitted to suggest answers to questions. When the witness seeks your counsel he will have opportunity to obtain your counsel.

Mr. FORTAS. Thank you, Senator. May I ask whether I am permitted to object to questions?

The CHAIRMAN. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I ask counsel if this press release was issued from your office?

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, I was out of town yesterday, and my knowledge of it is that Mrs. Lattimore delivered copies to counsel to the committee at 1 o'clock on yesterday, that thereafter copies were made available to the press and copies were available in my office for members of the press.

Senator FERGUSON. So that your office in effect circulated this statement?

Mr. FORTAS. Well, you are using a term with legal connotations.

Senator FERGUSON. You are a lawyer.

Mr. FORTAS. Yes, but I have not considered that question, and I would not be prepared to answer it at this moment.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you read the statement?

Mr. FORTAS. I have.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you prepare it or help to prepare it?

Mr. FORTAS. I consulted with Mr. Lattimore while it was being prepared; yes, sir; and I consulted extensively.

Senator FERGUSON. You knew it was to be used and circulated prior to the reading of it in this hearing?

Mr. FORTAS. I certainly did, and I see nothing improper about it and nothing unconventional about it.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you have any knowledge about the facts?

Mr. FORTAS. I have no personal knowledge aside from the usual sources that a lawyer knows, of course, Senator. As you know, Senator, a lawyer never vouches for statements when he has no personal knowledge of the facts.

Senator FERGUSON. That is the next question, as to whether or not you approved the statement.

Mr. FORTAS. You know what a lawyer does, and you are a distinguished lawyer yourself.

The CHAIRMAN. You could answer that question, Mr. Fortas.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you or did you not approve the statement?

Mr. FORTAS. From a legal point of view, absolutely; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. SOURWINE. If I might intervene for just a moment before Mr. Lattimore starts reading his statement, I have, I think, just three or four preliminary questions. Have you identified yourself for this record, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I did in executive session.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you for the purpose of this public session just give your name and address to the reporter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My name is Owen Lattimore, and my address is Ruxton 4, Md.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think we can dispense with the other formalities, Mr. Chairman, and let the witness begin with his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, Mr. Lattimore; you may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senators, I have asked for this public hearing because your proceedings have resulted in serious damage to my reputation as an objective scholar and patriotic citizen, to the Institute of Pacific Relations with which I have been connected, and to our Government's Foreign Service personnel and the conduct of its foreign policy.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Chair will excuse me, please, we have here the letter by which Mr. Lattimore asked for a hearing, the chairman's reply, Mr. Lattimore's subsequent request for a postponement, and the chairman's reply; and if the witness will identify these two letters I suggest that those should go into the record at this point, as supplementary to the statement of the witness that he asked to be heard.

(Whereupon the documents were shown to the witness.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That letter of November 6 is your original request to be heard; is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think so; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. May those go into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Those may be in the record.
 (The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits 459A, B, C, D,"
 and are as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 459A

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
 THE WALTER HINES PAGE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
 OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Baltimore, Md., November 6, 1951.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: It has repeatedly been reported in the press that your subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has promised that I will be given an opportunity to refute publicly the false and slanderous allegations that have been made about me before your subcommittee. Months have now gone by without my being given this opportunity, and I am now informed that your subcommittee will hold no more public hearings until January. This long delay greatly increases the injury done to me.

I trust that you will notify me at an early date when I can expect to have a public hearing. It will, of course, take me at least a week to make arrangements and preparation for the hearing, and I should therefore appreciate as much advance notice as possible.

Yours sincerely,

[S] Owen Lattimore.
 OWEN LATTIMORE.

OL: c.

EXHIBIT No. 459B

NOVEMBER 10, 1951.

MR. OWEN LATTIMORE,
*Walter Hines Page School of International Relations,
 The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR MR. LATTIMORE: Your letter of November 6 has been forwarded to me here.

The committee had been planning to call you as a witness at the convenience of the committee. Now that you have, in the letter above referred to, requested an opportunity to be heard, an effort will be made to hear you at your convenience. You are, however, quite correct in your understanding that there will be no more public hearings until January.

You will be given, as you request, at least a week's advance notice of the date at which you will be called to appear before the committee.

Sincerely,

[S] PAT McCARRAN.

EXHIBIT No. 459 C

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
 THE WALTER HINES PAGE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
 OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Baltimore, Md., December 20, 1951.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security,
 Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: On November 6, I wrote you to inquire as to the date when your subcommittee might afford me a public hearing, and on November 10, you replied stating that an effort would be made to hear me at my convenience, but that there would be no more public hearings until January. You also stated that I would be given at least a week's advance notice of the date on which I would be called to appear.

You may remember that I appeared before your subcommittee on July 13 in response to your subpoena.

I have been invited to lecture in London before the Royal Geographical Society and the Royal Central Asian Society. The lecture before the Royal Geographical

Society has been scheduled for January 14. The lecture before the Royal Central Asian Society was scheduled to commence on December 19, but this date has been postponed because of a delay in my date of departure from the United States.

Mrs. Lattimore and I plan to proceed to London by air, leaving here on December 27, and to return about January 20. I shall be available to your committee at any time thereafter, but I should like, as I indicated in my letter of November 6, to have a week's notice of the exact time when I am to be called so that I may complete preparations for my appearance. This would mean that I could appear before your committee at any time beginning January 28.

I continue to be eager to testify at a public session of your committee, and I hope that my trip to England will not inconvenience you.

Yours sincerely,

[S] Owen Lattimore.
OWEN LATTIMORE.

EXHIBIT No. 459 D

DECEMBER 28, 1951.

Mr. OWEN LATTIMORE,
*The Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.*

DEAR MR. LATTIMORE: This will acknowledge your letter of December 20 in which you informed me of your invitation to lecture in London before the Royal Geographical Society and the Royal Central Asian Society.

Your trip to England will not inconvenience the subcommittee in any way, and you may complete your plans as scheduled.

I appreciate your desire to testify at public sessions of our committee as your testimony will be very interesting. We will schedule your appearance sometime after your return to this country.

Sincerely,

[S] PAT McCARRAN.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the opening paragraph of your statement, have you expressed the four points which give you concern with regard to the conduct of these hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. These are four introductory points, and I don't know whether you would consider some of the supplementary material that comes later to be separate points or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you expressed those points in the order of their primary interest to you—that is first yourself, second the IPR, and third the Foreign Service, and fourth the United States foreign policy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I don't think I thought of it that way when I drafted it. On the whole I can say "No," it is rather the reverse order.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The impression has been assiduously conveyed in your proceedings—

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean by "assiduously conveyed" to make the charge that the committee has intended to convey a certain impression?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean that witness after witness before this committee has attempted to convey this impression and that no witnesses have been asked any question that might test their veracity.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean to charge, sir, that the committee has intended to convey a particular impression?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I cannot answer for what is in the minds of the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are asking you what is in your mind, sir, what you intended to convey by the use of that phrase.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I intended to convey by the use of that phrase exactly what is stated here.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I inquire? Do you include yourself as one of the witnesses among those that you have mentioned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You mean attempted to convey that I am a Communist or Communist sympathizer?

Senator FERGUSON. I did not mention Communist or Communist sympathizer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have been heard once in executive session.

Senator FERGUSON. You say no witness has been questioned.

Mr. LATTIMORE. None of these witnesses referred to here.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, were you questioned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was questioned in executive session some 7 or 8 months ago, and I have no transcript of that session.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever ask to see the transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I asked to see the transcript afterward, to go over it and see if there were any mistakes in it.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you go over it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did.

Senator FERGUSON. So you had the transcript, and you knew what its contents were?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read the transcript about 7 months ago, and naturally my memory of it is not very fresh now.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you make any notes about it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I made no notes when I read the transcript.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have an extra copy of your statement, so that we may follow it when you make it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know if I have any more.

Mr. FORTAS. There were copies delivered for each member of the committee, and the copies that were brought here have all been distributed to the press.

Senator FERGUSON. How many were distributed to the press, Mr. Fortas?

Mr. FORTAS. I haven't any idea.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know how many you had made, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't.

Senator WATKINS. It is easier to follow you if we have a statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. If we might get back to this question of your phrase, "assiduously conveyed," what did you mean by that word "assiduously"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I believe the Latin etymology of the word probably means to sit down and stick at.

Mr. SOURWINE. It comes from "assiduus," doesn't it? Did you use it in that sense?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the sense in which I used it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The impression has been assiduously conveyed in your proceedings that I am a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or dupe—

Mr. SOURWINE. How has that been conveyed, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, the record is full of it, sir.

MR. SOURWINE. You are making the charge, sir, and has anyone on the committee conveyed that impression, or has it been conveyed only by witnesses testifying here under oath?

MR. LATTIMORE. I think some of the leading questions of members of the committee could be so interpreted, perhaps.

MR. SOURWINE. Are you interpreting the questions asked by the committee as intended to convey that you were a Communist or Communist sympathizer or dupe?

MR. LATTIMORE. In writing this opening part of my statement, I was trying to convey an over-all impression of hearings that had been going on for 8 months or so in which hostile evidence, evidence hostile to me and others, has been piled up, and at this present time I am attempting to deal with that accumulation of many months.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire there as to whether or not the witness believes that it is an important subject to inquire as to whether or not an institution that is giving information to the public has been penetrated by Communists or Communist sympathizers?

MR. LATTIMORE. The subject is obviously important, but as you will find later in this statement, I raise the point that previous clarification as concerns myself was rather copiously provided 2 years ago before the Tydings committee, and has been completely disregarded in the hearings before this committee.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Do you think that this committee should take the record of the Tydings committee and close its proceedings and not conduct any examination; is that what you are asking?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is not what I am asking.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Why do you mention it, then?

MR. LATTIMORE. I mention it because I think that it is relevant to any such inquiry, and yet—especially as far as I myself am concerned—and yet no reference has been made to it.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Do you claim that that was a full and complete examination of the question of the penetration of Communists or Communist sympathizers into the Institute of Pacific Relations?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am claiming that it was relevant to me personally, and my connections with the Institute of Pacific Relations were included in that inquiry.

SENATOR FERGUSON. And, therefore, this committee should not have gone into the question of your relations with the Institute of Pacific Relations?

MR. LATTIMORE. I think that the question of my relations with the Institute of Pacific Relations might have been brought up with reference to what had gone before.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Well, do I understand, then, that you think that this committee should not have gone into that question here?

MR. LATTIMORE. No. I am merely suggesting that a more fair way of going into the question, as far as I myself am concerned, would have been to maintain at least the continuity of the record between the extensive replies that I gave before the Tydings committee and the allegations that have been made here.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Do you figure that you were cross-examined by the Tydings committee?

MR. LATTIMORE. I do.

Senator FERGUSON. Completely cross-examined; you think all of the facts were brought out?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I think that Senator Hickenlooper went into a great deal of detail over many hours.

Senator FERGUSON. Did the Tydings committee have the records that were obtained by this committee from up in Concord in Massachusetts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. Then do you think that they could have examined this problem of the Institute of Pacific Relations, without those records?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The only point I am making, Senator, is that no continuity or connection has been established in the hearings before this committee with the inquiry that was conducted by the Tydings committee, and I am not suggesting that one should have been a substitute for the other.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, do you not think, from one of your answers here, that you have indicated that this committee had gone out of its way in an unfair manner to conduct these hearings about the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am merely saying that as far as I, myself, am concerned, I think the committee would have been fairer if it had taken into account the record of the Tydings hearings.

Senator FERGUSON. On the question of the activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the question of myself and any connection between me and the institute.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, you have stated that the impression has been assiduously conveyed, and you have explained what you meant by that in the proceedings of this committee, that you are a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or dupe. Have witnesses before this committee testified that you were a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have witnesses before this committee testified that you were a Communist sympathizer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have witnesses before this committee testified that you were a dupe?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think one or two witnesses have suggested that I was either a sympathizer or a dupe.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember who any of those witnesses were?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have read through such a mass of this stuff recently that I am afraid my memory is not very clear on many of these details.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall whether, in fact, a witness did so testify, or whether you simply added that yourself as a third or possible alternative?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, no, it was based on a definite impression from my reading it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. You see, I have been working on this for a long time, I have been making notes as I went along, and the notes were eventually incorporated into this statement. But in view of the kind of work, that goes over and over a subject, you sometimes have the

note that establishes a particular point, but your mind loses the connection with which the point was originally made. I am satisfied with the point, however.

The impression has been assiduously conveyed in your proceedings that I am a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or dupe; that I master minded the Institute of Pacific Relations—

Mr. SOURWINE. At that point, sir, to what extent did you have to do with the conduct of the affairs of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. During my period of employment by the Institute of Pacific Relations from 1934 to 1941, I was responsible solely for the editing of the quarterly magazine, Pacific Affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Mr. Dennett, a former secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations, had testified that you and Mr. Jessup were the two principal leaders of the affairs of that institute?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am aware that he so testified, and I would dispute the accuracy of his testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The impression has been assiduously conveyed in your proceedings that I am a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or dupe; that I master-minded the Institute of Pacific Relations; that the Institute of Pacific Relations and I master-minded the far-eastern experts of the State Department—

Mr. SOURWINE. If you will pardon me, Mr. Lattimore, can you say that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had no influence upon the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. By the way, what is your name, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. Sourwine, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I hate replying in the blank.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was present at the executive sessions, and I met you, sir, at that time.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations were available to all and sundry, including—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you are not answering the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am leading up to my answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it is a necessary introduction.

Including members of the Government. In the years when I was active in the institute, the number of far-eastern experts and people primarily interested in the Far East was relatively small. So far as I know, practically all of them either belonged to the institute or read its publications.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you including in that statement the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am including them; and therefore, it would be my assumption that practically all far-eastern personnel, or personnel dealing with the Far East, in the Department of State, would read the publications of the institute.

Mr. SOURWINE. And most of them, you say, were members of the institute?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe some of them were.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you say most of them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I said most people interested in, and how far that includes the Government personnel, I have no way of knowing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did it include some?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The records of the institute would doubtless show.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that it did include some of the far-eastern experts of the State Department, that is, the membership of the IPR did include some of those experts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know in general that it included some, and I couldn't name you anyone definitely.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, now, let us get back to the original question: Can you say that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had no influence on the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, the way in which I was trying to answer the question was that I assume that those who read the publications of the institute formed their own opinions about it, but it is obviously impossible for me to answer on behalf of an anonymous Mr. X in the State Department whether he personally was influenced by the work of the institute, and if so, how much.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I ask a question there? Did you intend to influence the people in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The program of the Institute of Pacific Relations was perfectly clear, Senator. It was to make available on the market, the market of ideas, the most accurate information that it could assemble on the subject of the Far East, so that those who were interested could use that information as they themselves saw best.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to have you answer the question.

Senator FERGUSON. Answer my question: Did you intend to influence the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We intended to contribute to the general fund of knowledge about the Far East. Any question of a particular intent to interest the State Department as a policy-making organ of the Government was, to the extent of my knowledge, never dreamed of.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, did you furnish pamphlets and booklets and books to the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't personally.

Senator FERGUSON. I mean the institute.

Mr. LATTIMORE. You would have to ask someone in the institute who was in charge of distribution.

May I say that the Foreign Policy Association and other organizations interested in foreign policy, I believe that the general practice is to sell the publications; and then, in order to promote the sale of publications, to send free copies to people who might become likely subscribers.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you furnish free copies of the Pacific Affairs, of which you were the editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I occasionally sent out free copies; yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. To the State Department or any officials in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall whether they were included or not.

Senator FERGUSON. Then when you say you did not want to influence the State Department officials—

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as I was concerned, the intention was to provide information for those who were interested in the belief, which I think is a good old American belief, that out of a free market of information and ideas, the best will eventually win out in competition.

Senator FERGUSON. You figured yours was the best?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We furnished many kinds of opinion, as well as information.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you would not say it was good, bad, and indifferent opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I would say that to the best of our ability we always produced well-informed opinion.

Senator FERGUSON. That would be the best?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was impossible to say what would be the best, because the Far East then, as now, was an area of controversy, and equally well-informed people might come to different conclusions from the same data.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, if such was the purpose, including the making available to the State Department, with possibly having some effect on their policy, was any effort made to prevent Communists from having any voice in the conduct of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. First, I would like to be a little more precise about your wording, "to make available to the State Department," which implies an exceptional interest in getting the State Department—

Senator O'CONNOR. If it were not exceptional, it was not kept from the State Department; the information that you were making available to others, you certainly had a right to assume would be available to the State Department.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is why I say that I prefer a wording "to make available," rather than "to make available to the State Department."

Senator O'CONNOR. Does that satisfy you, that it was available to the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If the wording is that it was as available to the State Department as it was to anybody else.

Senator O'CONNOR. And that was, of course, your reason for being, was it not: to make it generally available?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To make it generally available.

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, my question was: What, if any, steps were taken during the time that you were there to prevent Communists from having voice in the conduct of the affairs of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. From 1934 to 1941, as I have stated before, I was responsible only for Pacific Affairs, and most of that time that was a one-man and a secretary office, and most of the time it was not in the United States. I was not responsible for the employment of any personnel in New York or elsewhere, and hence not responsible for policies of employment.

Senator O'CONNOR. I am waiting for you to answer the question. Does that complete your answer?

The CHAIRMAN. I am waiting for an answer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. But I was not in a position to have any concern with whether Communists were employed or not.

Senator O'CONNOR. Are we to understand that you were not interested in whether or not Communists participated in the formation of opinion and the dissemination of factual information, and are we to understand that you were disinterested and indifferent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I think that you can understand, Senator, simply that the matter never came within my purview.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you read Pacific Affairs before it was sent out to the public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As editor, I read everything that went in before it went in.

Senator FERGUSON. Then were you not concerned as to whether or not pro-Communists were writing for that magazine while you were editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is a different question, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, answer that one.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was asked about the institute.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. I think that that can be answered promptly. You can answer it categorically.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My answer is that I was concerned primarily with the quality of matter that went in. The Soviet Council was one of the members of the institute, and naturally I assumed that anything contributed by the Soviet Council was contributed by a Communist.

Senator FERGUSON. Therefore, you felt that that would be a colored view, if it was contributed by the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I assumed that any contribution coming from the Soviet Union would be in conformity with official Communist doctrine.

Senator FERGUSON. And it would be colored?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It would be colored according to official Communist doctrine.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, did you ever ascertain or try to ascertain whether or not any writers other than those in the Soviet Union, as members of their Government, were putting any articles in the magazine of which you were the editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In regard to any contributions other than Soviet contributions, if the contribution had struck me as Communist or Communist propaganda, I would certainly have gone into the matter.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever go into the matter as to who was writing, whether they were Communists or pro-Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I always went into the matter from the point of view of whether the man was well-informed and knew his stuff; and if anything had struck me as Communist propaganda, as such, I would certainly have taken up the matter.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think at that time you could have recognized pro-Communist propaganda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very likely there would be forms of Communist propaganda that would get by me.

Senator FERGUSON. You were able to detect Communist propaganda at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would not consider myself an expert on the subject.

Senator FERGUSON. Then it may be that because of your inexperience in Communist propaganda that you did not recognize it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is possible; and it is also pertinent, I think, Senator, to remember that in the 1930's there was neither the same general understanding of Communist methods of conspiracy and infiltration that there is now, nor the same general apprehension on the subject. The occasional publication of left-wing articles was com-

mon in many journals of repute, and people were not concerned then as they are today with precise shades of difference among leftists.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the reason that you allowed them to appear in Pacific Affairs, because they were appearing in other magazines?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My standard in Pacific Affairs was to secure, to the best of my ability, well-informed articles.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, now, the question is: Could you detect, if you were not an expert in Communist propaganda, that they were not giving you well-informed articles, but they were giving you pure, unadulterated Communist propaganda under the label of facts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think, Senator, that even without being an expert, if I had been presented with pure, unadulterated Communist propaganda I would probably have recognized it.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you say the Pacific Affairs never presented any pro-Communist propaganda at the time you were editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I want to be fair to the people that contributed to Pacific Affairs, and I think that I would like to ask you, therefore, to define a little more sharply what you mean by "pro-Communist."

The CHAIRMAN. Could you answer the question?

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know what pro-Communist is? I will not question you if you do not know what it is.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I should say pro-Communist, particularly in the 1930's, might include a very wide range, including some things that some people would call pro-Communist and other people would not.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, did you recognize any pro-Communist propaganda in the magazine while you were editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Pro-Communist in the sense of, say, promoting communism in the United States, you mean?

Senator FERGUSON. Promoting it in the world. You know that it is not a local matter, communism, do you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We are on the question of promoting, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. I know we are.

Mr. SOURWINE. If I might interrupt, the question which has not yet been answered is way back when, if the Senator will excuse me.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the only question which has not been answered, but if we could get to a question that would be answered once in a while, it would be very helpful.

Senator FERGUSON. Can you answer the question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What are we driving at right now?

Senator FERGUSON. I do not know what you are driving at. I am trying to get an answer to a question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Senator, looking at it from 1952, I would find it extremely difficult to lay down a definition of what was pro-Communist in 1935 or 1936.

Senator FERGUSON. That was not my question. I will go back and ask you another question. Was there or was there not any pro-Communist article in your magazine, Pacific Affairs, while you were editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it would depend on who was making the definition of what is pro-Communist.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the only answer you can give?

MR. LATTIMORE. I think that that is the necessary answer, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, suppose we make it the definition advocating international communism.

MR. LATTIMORE. I don't think we published anything of that sort.

Senator FERGUSON. You would say there was not anything like that.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, just to bring the record up to date, could we go back to my question?

The CHAIRMAN. How far back are you going?

MR. SOURWINE. This is quite a ways back, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LATTIMORE, can you say that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had no influence on the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. I cannot state whether we did or not, or how much.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you intend by the statement in this issued statement here of yours, to convey the impression that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had not had any influence on the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. To my best understanding, the Institute of Pacific Relations never had a policy of influencing the formation of policy in the United States Government through influencing personnel.

MR. SOURWINE. Now, will you attempt to answer the question: Did you intend by the language in this statement, to convey to the committee the impression that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you never had any influence on the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. I intended to convey that we never had any influence that was the outcome of a campaign or policy of influencing the State Department.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you intend to convey the impression that you never had any influence—period?

MR. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether we had any influence on individuals in the State Department or not.

MR. SOURWINE. Did you intend to convey the impression by the language which you used here, that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had no influence on the far-eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. I intended to convey the impression that we had no influence that was the result of a calculated campaign on our part.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, please leave out any question of calculation, and I am asking you whether you intended to convey to this committee the impression that the Institute of Pacific Relations and you had no influence on the far eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, my answers have to be within my competence to answer.

MR. SOURWINE. Do you think it is not within your competence to answer that question as to your intent?

MR. LATTIMORE. I have answered as to my intent already.

MR. SOURWINE. Do you disavow the intent to convey, by the language which you used, the impression that the IPR and you had no influence on the far eastern experts of the State Department?

MR. LATTIMORE. I intended to convey that I have no way of measuring whether the institute had any influence or not.

MR. SOURWINE. Go ahead with the reading of your statement, sir.

Senator SMITH. Could I ask him a question there?

Mr. Lattimore, during and after you were editor of the Pacific Affairs, did you have any conversations with any of the far eastern experts in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. During and after, yes.

Senator SMITH. Well, now, did you get any impression from them as to whether or not the articles that you had either edited or had printed, or written yourself, had any influence on them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You are asking me to throw my memory a long way back, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Well, of course, I am asking you to do just that, if you have a memory about that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can remember discussing this and that about the Far East many times with members of the Department of State.

Senator SMITH. With a good many members?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I could not give you a precise answer as to whether any article or publication was ever referred to, either one put out by the institute or one put out by somebody else.

Senator SMITH. Well, you discussed those articles with various men in the Far Eastern Division?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I think you misunderstood me, Senator. I say that I discussed far eastern matters, and I don't remember ever discussing with a member of the State Department any particular article, either one with which I had connection or one for which I had no responsibility.

Senator SMITH. With how many people in that Department did you discuss far eastern affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would find it impossible to tell you, Senator, how many people I ever knew in the Department, much less—

Senator SMITH. I did not ask you how many you knew in the Department.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Much less with how many I—

The CHAIRMAN. Won't you answer the question of Senator Smith? Do you understand the question? If you do not understand it, let us know and we will have it repeated.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The question is, With how many people did I discuss? And the answer is, I have no way of telling.

Senator SMITH. Well, did you discuss it with many, or few?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Many or few is a subjective variation, and how many is "many," and how few is "few"?

Senator SMITH. I would have thought that you had some idea about the difference between "few" and "many," but if you do not have any conception of that, I can appreciate that you probably cannot answer the question and probably do not want to answer it. Now, what I am asking you now is: How many people did you discuss it with there? How many?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Do you know the names of some of them that you did discuss it with?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I could probably recollect some names of people with whom I have discussed it.

Senator SMITH. Suppose you give it to us.

Mr. LATTIMORE. But I wonder if it would be fair to mention the names of some people, and leave the names of other people out?

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question, if you will. A question has been propounded.

Senator SMITH. I am asking for all of them. We do not want you to leave out anybody; we do not want you to slight anybody.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I would like to point out that I have lived in many countries—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, just a minute, Mr. Lattimore. Just a minute. A question has been propounded to you, and do you care to answer it?

Read the question to the witness.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mr. Fortas.

Mr. FORTAS. I said to the witness, "Go ahead and state the names."

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to admonish you again, when the witness wants advice from you, he will indicate it.

Mr. FORTAS. The witness is supposed to turn to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Please conform to that rule.

Mr. FORTAS. I will, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to make it plain to the Senator who asked me the question, that I am not trying to be evasive. I have lived in and met members of the State Department in many countries. When I changed my residence, very often the acquaintanceship would be dropped, and it might be renewed again later on. Consequently, I am not like a man who has been sitting in the same city all of his life and finds it easy to remember whom he knew in what year, and what he talked about, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. If you cannot remember, you can answer the Senator by saying you cannot remember; but there is a distinct question, very clearly pronounced to you, as to who you discussed it with, and name them all, he said, that you can remember. That, is no matter where you discussed it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I have discussed questions of the Far East—let us try and begin at the top with—I can't remember his name now. Just a moment. With Mr. John V. A. McMurray, when he was Minister in Peking in the late 1920's and early 1930's. And I have discussed questions of the Far East with Mr. Nelson T. Johnson, who was subsequently Minister and later Ambassador. And I have discussed them with Ambassador Clarence E. Dawes, in Chungking. And I have discussed them with Mr. Grew when he was Ambassador in Tokyo. And I believe I also met and probably talked about far eastern questions with Mr. Dutton, who was in the Tokyo Embassy at the same time.

And then in Peking, below the top rank there would be—do you want me to include military attachés and people like that?

Senator SMITH. My question was as to persons in the State Department, connected with the State Department.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, all of these so far are State Department.

Let me see. There would also be Mr. John Carter Vincent. There would be the men—I don't remember their names now—who were our consuls in Mukden and Harbin in 1929 and 1930; members of our consulate in Tsinsing, especially in the 1920's, and I can't recall their names offhand at the moment.

And among people who were junior personnel in the early 1930's in Peking, there would be Mr. Edmund Clubb, Mr. Donald Service. There was a man named—what was it, Rice or Millet, or some kind of

grain—it was Mr. Ringwald; Mr. John Davies—there was Mr. James Penfield; and there is a man named Landon, I think, who was consul or consul general in Chungming in 1944, and afterward I believe he went to Korea. And there was Mr. George Atcheson, and probably a lot more, but they don't come to mind.

Senator SMITH. You do not recall any of the persons working here in Washington in the State Department that you talked to about this?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, some of these people I met in China only, and some in Washington, and some both in China and in Washington.

Senator SMITH. Well, now, did you discuss with all of those, and others, the articles that were appearing in Pacific Affairs while you were the editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea, sir.

Senator SMITH. You have no recollection whatever?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should think it is very likely that when I was out in Peking, for instance, a very small foreign community, and the new issue of Pacific Affairs had just arrived from the printer and been distributed, that somebody would say, "There is a good number this time. I like that article by So-and-So," or something of that sort. But I have no precise recollection.

Senator SMITH. Do you have any recollection whether you received any word either oral or written, by anyone in the State Department after the publication of particular articles?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is quite possible, but I don't recall any.

Senator SMITH. All right, Mr. Chairman.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you not have thought that the magazine Pacific Affairs was a failure, if it had not had some influence on the State Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I should point out at this moment, Senator, that Pacific Affairs was not an American magazine.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, whatever it was.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was an international publication of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and I tried to get as much circulation for it as I could in a number of countries.

Mr. SOURWINE. In what languages was that magazine published?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In English.

Mr. SOURWINE. In English only?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where was it printed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was printed in—

Mr. SOURWINE. In what country?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the United States.

Mr. SOURWINE. Entirely in the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Printed in the United States and mailed out from either New York or from wherever the printer was.

Mr. SOURWINE. What proportion of its circulation was within the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember. You could get those figures.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it as high as 80 percent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would doubt it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it as high as 75 percent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I don't remember those ratios.

Senator FERGUSON. He has not answered my question, whether or not he would have considered it a failure if it had not had some effect upon the officials of the State Department.

MR. LATTIMORE. I would have considered it a failure if it had not interested or if it had not been of interest to intelligent people working on far eastern problems.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Were you trying to influence—you indicate that it was a foreign paper as well as United States, and were you trying to influence the foreign policy of any other nation?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Well, then, were you trying to influence the opinion of the public of America along far eastern affairs?

MR. LATTIMORE. I was not trying to influence anybody's opinion, Senator. I was trying to supply information to those interested.

SENATOR FERGUSON. But not trying to influence them?

MR. LATTIMORE. No; it was not a propaganda organ, in any sense.

SENATOR FERGUSON. No articles were printed, to your knowledge, to influence the opinion of people?

MR. LATTIMORE. We published articles of opinion as well as articles of information. You are getting into an area there of the difference between an author's intent and an editor's intent.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Well, did you write any articles?

MR. LATTIMORE. I did.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you, as a writer, try to influence the opinion of the American public?

MR. LATTIMORE. I didn't try to influence the opinion of the American public more than the opinion of anybody else who might read the paper.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Well, did you try to influence anyone's opinion, and let us make it broad now?

MR. LATTIMORE. Certainly, I had views of my own, and I marshalled my facts in connection with my own views. And incidentally, my views proceeded from the facts and not from the facts from the views.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you only publish those facts that you had personal knowledge of?

MR. LATTIMORE. I published facts—in what sense do you mean "personal knowledge," Senator?

SENATOR FERGUSON. Knowing them from personal knowledge, personal experience.

MR. LATTIMORE. Well, you mean not including something that I might have got from a written source?

SENATOR FERGUSON. That is right.

MR. LATTIMORE. Oh, no. Certainly, I have often gone on written sources.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you ever allow anyone to write in the magazine under an alias?

MR. LATTIMORE. Certainly.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Why was that done?

MR. LATTIMORE. It is a very common practice.

SENATOR O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, did you permit any Communists to write under an alias?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not that I know of.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you ever try to find out whether any person who wrote under an alias was or was not a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. I don't think that question ever arose.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Not even in your mind?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not even in my mind.

Senator FERGUSON. You were not much concerned, then, with the question of communism while you were with the Institute of Pacific Relations, is that a fair statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the 1930's?

Senator FERGUSON. Well, any time while you were with the institute.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that you should draw a line there, Senator—

Senator FERGUSON. You draw the line.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Between when I was an editor and when—

Senator FERGUSON. When you were an editor, you were not concerned with the question of communism?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the 1930's, when I was editing that magazine, Senator, subjects like the Chinese Communists, and so on, were topics of general interest, and I tried to get information on those, but I never published an article that I believed to be by a Chinese Communist or promoting the Chinese Communists' cause.

However, in the 1930's, if it had been possible to get an article by a Chinese Communist giving the Chinese Communist point of view, that would have been such a news scoop that I might well have published it, with an identification of just what it was.

Senator FERGUSON. You would, then, have identified it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you at that time, in the 1930's, that you are talking about, believe that the Communists of China were agrarian reformers, or under the international communism from Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I never believed that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers. I have always believed that they were right straight down-the-line Communists. I would like to qualify that, however, by pointing out that for many years the program of the Chinese Communists was based on winning a following amongst an agrarian population. I would like to point out, in connection with the ideological identity between the Chinese Communists and the Kremlin Communists, that for many years the Chinese Communists were working in an isolated part of China where the belief among many experts is that it was impossible for them to have constant liaison with Moscow.

Senator FERGUSON. You did understand this Communist problem, and you knew the difference between the Moscow Communists and those that might be just agrarian reformers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think that I thought any Communists were just agrarian reformers.

Senator FERGUSON. You knew the purpose of the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, the Chinese Communists, as far as I have known, have always claimed that they were straight Kremlin Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. They have never contended that they were just agrarian reformers, have they?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my knowledge.

Senator WATKINS. Might I ask this question: Did you ever challenge the Communists, or write an editorial attacking communism and exposing it to the people of the United States and to the world, through this magazine?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I was not an expert on communism, even Chinese communism, although I lived in China, and I published a number of articles very hostile to the Soviet Union and communism, by others, in Pacific Affairs.

Senator WATKINS. You do not remember about when those articles were published?

(Brief recess.)

Senator O'CONNOR. The witness may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let's see; I can remember William Henry Chamberlin.

Senator WATKINS. I said, your opinions were your own opinions, your own editorials that you wrote?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I said, I was not writing on the subject of communism.

Senator WATKINS. That is what I want to find out, if you ever wrote an editorial on communism and exposed it and pointed out any of the dangers of communism to the free world.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was editing a magazine with all kinds of people contributing, and I published anti-Communist opinions. However, I was not an expert on the subject myself, and I did not write on the subject myself.

Senator WATKINS. You did write many editorials and wrote your own opinions, as you stated a moment ago?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not many editorials. I wrote articles. I think most of the articles that I wrote in Pacific Affairs were on my own specialty, which was Inner Mongolia.

Senator WATKINS. You say you did publish some articles that were anti-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. You could name those?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I can name some: William Henry Chamberlin; Harold Isaacs, a man who was the former Dutch Ambassador, Dutch Minister in China, Oudendyk, O-u-d-e-n-d-y-k.

Mr. SOURWINE. You list a number of such writers further on in your statement, do you not, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I do; yes.

Senator WATKINS. Did you ever write on the subject of communism in your editorials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I ever wrote on the subject of communism as such in my editorials.

Senator WATKINS. Did you recognize at that time that there was a danger in communism?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I recognized that communism was one of the important subjects in the Far East.

Senator WATKINS. You did not answer my question. I asked you if you recognized that there was a danger in communism to the free world.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not in the sense that we recognize it now; no.

Senator WATKINS. In other words, you did not recognize it at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I thought in the 1930's that communism was an extremely important subject in the Far East, but I did not have the same understanding of Communist conspiracy in long-range methods that I have today.

Senator WATKINS. Yet you have traveled extensively in Russia and in Asiatic countries where communism was rampant at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I had not traveled extensively in Russia. I had traveled in China, but had never been in Communist territory or Communist-infiltrated territory in China throughout my stay in China until almost the very end.

Senator WATKINS. You do not mean to say to this committee that you did not study communism or the writings that were put out in connection with it or the articles and books written by Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I made no special study of communism.

Senator WATKINS. I have a further question here with reference to whether or not the State Department relied upon this information or was influenced by it. We had a witness before us, Mr. Lattimore, I think it was Dr. Fleugel, who said that they went to the Institute of Pacific Relations publications to get information because there were very few other sources from which they could get information on the Far East.

Do you care to comment on that, since you are a student of the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There were very few in that period. There were very few publications devoted exclusively to the Far East. There were, of course, articles on far-eastern subjects that came out in magazines like *Foreign Affairs* and in publications devoted to international relations in general, such as the publications of the Foreign Policy Association, but I believe that in those years, to the best of my recollection, the publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations were the only ones that not only specialized on the Far East but were confined to the Far East.

Senator WATKINS. And you would know as a matter of fact from your general knowledge of what was being published, written and published on the Far East, that the Institute of Pacific Relations articles were probably about the—well, they comprised the major part of literature at that time on that subject?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wouldn't know whether they comprised the major part of the literature, I think they comprise the important part.

Senator WATKINS. You are an expert on far-eastern affairs; you would naturally keep in touch with these publications, all articles written? It would be part of your job to read them and analyze them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Even in those days, Senator, the volume coming out was too much for one man. You see, the Institute of Pacific Relations dealt with everything from Asiatic Siberia down to Indonesia, and even in those days no one man could possibly be an expert on all the countries comprised within that enormous geographical range.

Senator WATKINS. Well, I understand you probably could not be acquainted with all of them, but it would seem to me that having taken on the position of editor of this magazine that dealt in foreign affairs and studied those problems, that presented facts in connection with them, that you or your staff would survey all of the current articles and the literature on the subject for review and for presentation to keep your readers informed of what was going on in the Far East.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me tell you there, Senator, the method of editing was rather different from that. I was only one person and

usually had no help except a secretary. So the method of editing and editorial evaluation, whether an article was worth publication or not, was by circulating typescript copies of articles to all countries.

You see, this magazine came out only once in 3 months, so the rate of publication was rather leisurely. If, for instance, we had an article by an Englishman affecting Dutch Indonesia, we would send that article to somebody in Holland as well as to people in America interested in the subject and similarly with all of the questions. They were, practically all the material in Pacific Affairs, had extensive prepublication circulation and was seen by a number of people.

If any questions were raised, they were always referred back to the author.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, you may continue your statement. I think you were just at the latter part of the second paragraph on the first page.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am still in the first part of the second paragraph, so if I may resume so that readers will not lose track of the sense—

Senator O'CONNOR. You have been over the first part three or four times, the "assiduously conveyed."

Mr. LATTIMORE. But the sentence hasn't been finished yet.

Senator O'CONNOR. You would prefer to go back and continue that?

I wonder whether we could withhold our questioning until the whole paragraph is read?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That would accord with my interest in the subject, Senator.

The impression has been assiduously conveyed in your proceedings that I am a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or dupe; that I master-minded the Institute of Pacific Relations; that the Institute of Pacific Relations and I master-minded the far eastern experts of the State Department; and that the State Department "sold" China to the Russians. Every one of these is false—utterly and completely false.

Senator FERGUSON. He has finished that sentence, and before he gets to the next one, could I ask a question?

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Ferguson.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you claim that you know and say that the State Department sold China to the Russians—that is, you have personal knowledge that that is utterly and completely false, or are you talking about your own—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am talking about a dependent clause of this sentence beginning, "The impression has been assiduously conveyed that," and so forth.

Senator FERGUSON. That the State Department sold China to the Russians?

Mr. LATTIMORE. But not conveyed by me. But not conveyed by me, and not believed by me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might I ask a clarifying question?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any doubt about the Russian domination of China today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, that is a very controversial question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you do have doubt?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Some people believe. I would like to state my opinion in a moment, but I would like to state it in a balanced way.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was attempting to clarify, not to bring forth a lengthy statement. If it does not clarify, I would withdraw it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Some people maintain that China is controlled in each and every detail by the Russians. Others believe that China is controlled by the Chinese Communists, but that the Chinese Communists are allies rather than subordinates of the Russians. I would incline to the second opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am afraid the question did not help clarify, Senator Ferguson.

Senator FERGUSON. I could ask a number of questions right there, but I think I will pass them.

Senator O'CONNOR. Just proceed, Mr. Lattimore.

Senator FERGUSON. Because I think it is contradictory to what he said, that they were Communists dominated by Russia, and I will go back and take the other statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That point, Senator, I think I should—

Senator FERGUSON. Clarify?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Clarify myself.

Senator FERGUSON. I wish you would.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I spoke of my belief that the Chinese Communists consider themselves completely—ideologically completely—in conformity with Russian ideas of communism. That is a question of ideological conformity, and not a question of operational control.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know of any Communists that are actually Communists, as you claim they are, that are not under the control of the Communist Party of Russia, the Kremlin?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I believe that in the case of the Chinese Communists, owing to questions of time and distance and lack of personnel, and so forth, it would be extremely difficult for the Russians to have operational control of every detail of the Chinese Communist action in China even if they wanted it and even if the Chinese Communists were willing to concede it.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you do not believe that Russia is dominating the war in Korea as far as the Chinese are concerned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I knew the answer to that question, Senator, I would be in Wall Street making a lot of money.

Senator FERGUSON. In what way would you be making money out of that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it would be extremely valuable information to know exactly who is controlling how much.

Senator FERGUSON. Who do you think would pay you for that opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I could probably go to the market.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you not say that that was the prevalent opinion in the United States—that they are dominating the action of the Communists of China in Korea?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether it is the prevalent opinion or not. I know that many well-informed people in England and India believe that the initiative there is held by the Chinese rather than by the Russians.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that your opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't know enough about it to decide either one way or the other. That is why I say if I did know I think it would be useful knowledge.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you would think that Russia would classify as a neutral as far as Korea is concerned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The question itself is somewhat of a non sequitur; isn't it, Senator?

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you. Would you classify it as a neutral?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly not.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you do have some opinion on it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have an opinion, but not a precise opinion that I would go to bat for. I recognize the limits of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask two questions?

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did the State Department, the American State Department, make the policy which the American Government followed with respect to China over the last 7 or 8 years?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know enough about it to tell you, Mr. Sourwine, how far it was made by the State Department, how far by the White House, how far by the advice of the armed services, how far perhaps by the Treasury, how far by the Congress.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think that hindsight indicates that there were any mistakes in the policy which was followed by this country with regard to China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would make a distinction there, Mr. Sourwine. In fact, I try to make it later in my statement, between mistakes and lack of success.

Mr. SOURWINE. Very good. Could we go ahead with the statement, Mr. Chairman?

Senator O'CONNOR. Except for this one question. Mr. Lattimore, you have indicated that you were not entirely informed as to the relative importance of the different agencies or departments or individuals. May I ask if you, during that time, had any connection with the State Department or the White House?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In a policy making?

Senator O'CONNOR. In any capacity.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No connection other than that of an ordinary citizen, probably as a matter of fact less connection than any far-eastern representative in this country.

Senator O'CONNOR. Were you prior to that time or at that time having any connection with the State Department or the White House?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have never been stationed in the employ of either the State Department or the White House with the distinction, which is a technical distinction, but perhaps I had better mention it, that when I was on a mission in Japan, which was a White House mission, the pay checks for some reason—some bureaucratic reason that is beyond my ken—were sent out by the State Department rather than by the White House.

Senator O'CONNOR. Did you occupy any space in either the State Department or the White House or any adjunct of them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not by right. This question has come up before.

Senator O'CONNOR. At all?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I dealt with it later in my statement, but I don't mind going into it now if you like. At one time when I was

working for Chiang Kai-shek and when my functions were largely liaison functions between Chang Kai-shek and President Roosevelt, I was back in this country, and Mr. Lauchlin Currie, who was the executive assistant to President Roosevelt, who was in charge of most of Mr. Roosevelt's interest in the China problem, offered me the courtesy, not the right, of the use of a room adjoining his own office.

That room was—there has been a great deal of confusion about it because that room was in the Old State, War, and Navy Building. The question was raised whether I had an office in the State Department. I confess I wasn't bright enough to tumble to it right away because that building housed, besides the State Department, a large part of the Executive Offices of the President and also the Bureau of the Budget. It was a multioffice building. But I did have the use of an office that was physically located in that building but was not regarded by anybody concerned as a part of the State Department.

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you then proceed to your statement, Mr. Lattimore, please?

Senator FERGUSON. I might just ask one question here. Is it a fair assumption, then, that while you were editor of the Pacific Affairs the State Department was avoiding your judgment or your opinion as an expert in the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That during the period I was editing Pacific Affairs the State Department was avoiding?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; is that a fair assumption?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Avoiding what?

Senator FERGUSON. Your—

Mr. LATTIMORE. My opinion or avoiding Pacific Affairs?

Senator FERGUSON. Your opinion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. One has to draw a delicate line between disregard and avoidance.

Senator FERGUSON. Avoidance.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think the State Department was disregarding your opinion?

Senator O'CONNOR. Let him answer.

Senator FERGUSON. Were they avoiding getting in touch with you as an expert?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think so. Of course, the manner and attitude of the State Department in those days was rather top-lofty and full of hauteur, so I suppose the mere civilian crawling on the ground might feel that he was being avoided, but I don't know whether it would be a just accusation.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you feel that you were being avoided?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't feel that I was being regarded.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, are you familiar with exhibit 229 introduced in the public record of this hearing on August 23, 1951, being a letter from Mr. Sumner Welles to Mr. Edward C. Carter, in which Mr. Welles stated that—

While for obvious reasons the Department of State has necessarily adopted the practice of refraining from enforcing or sponsoring any particular private organization, I am glad to say that in the opinion of officers of the Department who are especially familiar with the activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations the publications of the institute have been of interest and value, and the institute has been making a substantial contribution to the development of an informed public opinion.

Did you have that in mind at all in the answers you have just given?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't have that in mind. Now that you read it out it seems to me a sort of standard formula that any Government office sends out to any private organization that sends its publications and hopes for a pat on the head. They didn't want to give in their public relations any idea of scorning anybody.

Mr. SOURWINE. I apologize for that diversion, Mr. Chairman.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right. Now the next paragraph, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Concerning my reputation and character, you have now for many months been publishing to the world an incredible mass of unsubstantiated accusations, allegations, and insinuations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who does the witness mean by "you"?

Senator O'CONNOR. May I ask, Mr. Sourwine, it will expedite if we read the entire paragraph.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right.

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you continue on?

Mr. LATTIMORE. For months a long line of witnesses has set me in the midst of a murky atmosphere of pretended plots and conspiracies so that it is now practically impossible for my fellow citizens to follow in detail the specific refutation of each lie and smear.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman?

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, who do you mean by "you" as used in the first line of that paragraph? You mean this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. By "you" I mean the committee was responsible for conducting and publishing these proceedings. Later on in my statement I raise the point that I do not know whether some of the initial responsibility is that of the committee or that of its staff.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that apparently there is no doubt about whom he means. He starts out in the first sentence, "Senators." He is talking to us.

Mr. SOURWINE. What I wanted to ask the witness, Mr. Chairman, is whether to his knowledge the committee has published anything except the hearings which have been held.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have these hearings consisted of anything except the testimony of witnesses under oath?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Senator O'CONNOR. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have something to say later about the manner in which that testimony has been elicited and presented.

I should, in fact, be less than frank if I did not confess that I see no hope that your committee will fairly appraise the facts; and I believe I owe it to you to state the reasons.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean by that, sir, to charge that the committee is hopelessly biased?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I give, I say here, that I owe it to you to state the reasons.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is, What do you mean? Do you mean to charge that the committee is hopelessly biased?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean that I am going to state the reasons for which I believe that; that I have no hope that this committee will fairly appraise the facts.

Mr. SOURWINE. By saying that you have no hope that this committee will fairly appraise the facts, do you mean to charge that the committee is hopelessly biased against you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I try to make clear later in the statement, I don't know, I am in no position to know how much of this responsibility is divided between the committee and its staff.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, what you do in that sentence is to charge this committee with bad faith. Is that what you mean?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am stating here my own lack of hope that this committee would fairly appraise.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, Senator Smith asked you a simple question, whether you do or do not make such charge.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether it's lack of faith or prejudice, Senator.

Senator SMITH. You say "* * * I see no hope that your committee will fairly appraise the facts."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Now, if we would fairly appraise the facts, you would say we would be acting in good faith, if we did fairly appraise the facts? You say we would act in good faith; would you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly.

Senator SMITH. Now then, you say, therefore, if according to your reasoning as stated here that we were not fairly appraising the facts that is tantamount to saying that we are acting in bad faith; is that what you mean?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I base—I give my reasons, later on.

Senator SMITH. I am not asking for reasons; I am asking about that sentence.

Senator O'CONNOR. Is it not possible to give a categorical answer?

Senator SMITH. Not the reason, the meaning of those words.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, there is a difference between bad faith and prejudgment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you attempting to make a technical distinction between bias and prejudice?

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a minute; he ought to be permitted to complete his answer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I base this statement here largely on the fact that the chairman of this committee at a time that the hearings are still in progress and before all the evidence is in has stated in print in a published interview as his "curbstone opinion" that the IPR originally was an organization with laudable motives. It was taken over by Communist design and made a vehicle for attempted control and conditioning of American thinking and American policy with regard to the Far East.

It was also used for espionage purposes to collect and channel information of interest or value to the Russian Communists. That was, in my opinion—

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you just identify that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is the United States News and World—it's quoted later in my statement. United States News and World Report of this city, and the date is November 16, 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire at this point? Would it interrupt Senator Smith?

I would simply like to inquire, Mr. Lattimore, do you know that at the time the chairman made that statement this committee had taken five volumes of testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea, Mr. Sourwine, of how much the committee had scooped up or what it scooped it up in, but I am aware that the hearings are not complete, that this is a prejudgment in a hearing that is still under process where most of the accused have not yet been heard.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you mean, Mr. Lattimore, to imply your feeling that the chairman of the committee had no right to form for himself a personal opinion as to what the testimony up to that point indicated?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I am merely pointing out that when the chairman of this committee makes a public statement of this kind in a publication that goes to many thousands of people and may, therefore, influence public opinion while the hearing is still in process, it deprives me of hope that the committee will fairly appraise the facts.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, were you taking this statement of what you read of the chairman as a personal one to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am taking it as a statement on this whole inquiry of which I am a part.

Senator FERGUSON. Could it be possible that evidence in this committee does show exactly what the chairman said? Leave yourself out of it. I am talking about the other evidence not concerning you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. You mean accusatory evidence, some of it rather obviously biased and prejudiced with no clarification from the many defendants yet in the picture? No, I don't think it's possible to make a fair appraisal under those circumstances.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you say that if seven or eight witnesses who wrote for IPR had appeared in this room and when asked the question at the time that they wrote as to whether or not they were or were not Communists and they refused to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate them after there was evidence in the record that they were Communists; that this IPR then had been penetrated by Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am saying here——

Senator FERGUSON. Answer my question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I see no hope——

Senator FERGUSON. I am not asking you what you see.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That the committee will fairly appraise the facts as they regard me.

Senator FERGUSON. Answer my question. With seven or eight witnesses testifying as I have said, would you say it would be a fair statement by the chairman that it had been penetrated by Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I come to the question of these witnesses later in my statement.

Senator FERGUSON. Can you answer my questions?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At the moment I would say that it is a biased and prejudiced action to make a public statement of this kind from such a position of responsibility as the chairman of this committee at any time before all the evidence is in, including the rebuttal evidence.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, you have made the statement that there was not any Communist influence in this. Do you not think it would have been well for you to hold your opinion until all the evidence was in?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Excuse me, Senator, the discussion up to this point has not been about whether there was any Communist influence in such a vague thing as "in all this" or "in this," I forget your exact terms. The discussion has been about Pacific Affairs, which I edited, and about my responsibility for that.

Senator FERGUSON. You are not named in the United States Reports, are you? Your name was not used in relation to this sentence that you read?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As one of those who for the first time in something like 8 months is being given an opportunity to say something in public for himself, I think I am entitled to make that statement, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. But you were named in this statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I was not named.

Senator FERGUSON. In relation to the sentence——

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was not named, but the statement which I am quoting is one of a kind to implicate anybody concerned with the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Senator FERGUSON. Why did you adopt that sentence as meaning you when there was other testimony in the record showing that Communists had penetrated the IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am simply referring to a statement made while an investigation is still in process which I consider a prejudicial statement.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, but you are criticizing the Chair for making a statement when there was evidence in this record showing that Communists had penetrated. I am leaving you out of the question entirely, that Communists had penetrated the IPR. You are criticizing the chairman's statement of that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not see the justification, Senator, for such a statement in characterization of the whole when the evidence applies to only a part. This statement does not say in part or as far as the hearings have gone, or without prejudice to those who may be innocent, or anything of that kind. There is no reservation in it.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think that that statement indicates that everyone connected with the IPR was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that statement means exactly what it says.

Senator FERGUSON. Does it say that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That Senator McCarran came to the conclusion that it was taken over by Communist design and made a vehicle and so forth and that it was also used for espionage purposes. The fact that some individuals may have refused to testify whether they were ever Communists is thus creating a belief in any reasonable mind that they probably were at one time Communists or may still be Communists is still not evidence that they took over the institute or that they controlled it or that they used it for conveying information to Soviet Russia.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Lattimore, you understand that this is a seven-man committee, do you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. And that the chairman obviously was not trying to speak for anybody but himself. As far as I am concerned I am trying to keep my mind open on this question, and it does not help any for you to come along and make charges like that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I appreciate that.

Senator SMITH. Was there any question that Field was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe he has refused to testify, hasn't he?

Senator SMITH. I thought he admitted.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know; is it in the record?

Senator SMITH. He had a Communist demonstration before the White House, did he not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know what the record has in that respect, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Have you read all this record now, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I read most of it once. Some of the more recent testimony that hasn't been printed I haven't read yet.

Senator SMITH. Could you reach any conclusion if you did not have any interest in this matter, the same as Senator McCarran, as far as it has gone?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My primary conclusion on reading the record, as I state precisely later on, is that the record shows that no witness has been subjected to examination, much less cross-examination, to test his veracity or the validity of his evidence.

Senator SMITH. Do you understand that this is a trial or it is in the nature of a grand jury procedure? You know the difference?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry I don't.

Senator SMITH. You know that a grand jury proceeding is one in which you are trying to get facts on which to base a charge. This is a grand jury. In a trial you say, "This man is accused of being guilty. Is he innocent or guilty?" You see a distinction, I know, between those. You understand that this was an inquiry in the nature of a grand jury proceeding to see what are the facts on which charges might be based. I guess your counsel will agree with that distinction.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, wouldn't even an all-powerful and careful grand jury be somewhat interested in the quality of its witnesses?

Senator SMITH. Absolutely, but you cannot do everything in one hearing or 1 day or for that matter 1 year.

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, could we have a recess?

Mr. SOURWINE. Could I have just one question to tie up that paragraph and then go to the recess?

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think the question has been asked before, but not directly answered. When you said that you saw no hope that this committee would fairly appraise the facts, did you mean to charge that the committee is biased?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that question has been asked in at least two or three forms already, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think it has. Will you answer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My feeling I expressed as clearly as possible in the words I have here, simply that I see no hope that this committee will fairly appraise the facts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you make a technical distinction between inability to appraise the facts fairly and being biased?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Those aren't the only two alternatives, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you make a technical distinction between those two alternatives?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would not make a technical distinction between those two alternatives only when they are not the only alternatives that apply to this instance.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you make a technical distinction between those and other alternatives?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will say that my statement is primarily based on the impression that I have from a reading of the proceedings as they have thus far been published of a general attitude of minds being made up in advance.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you not think that being biased and being unable fairly to appraise the facts are substantially the same thing? Do you want to make a distinction between them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I am no scholar of philosophy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you want to make a distinction between them? Do you want to make a distinction here between being biased and being unable fairly to appraise the facts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Being biased or being unable to—

Mr. SOURWINE. Fairly appraise the facts.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I will rejoin the split infinitive, unable to appraise the facts fairly.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that question. I am anxious to get over to the next page where Mr. Lattimore makes it clear that he is opposed to making a technical distinction.

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment; I might ask a question.

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Ferguson.

Senator FERGUSON. There is not any doubt, Mr. Lattimore, that you have made up your mind about the committee as to what you read from the United States Reports?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I made up my mind primarily on one thing, Senator, and that is that I am an innocent man.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, would you say that your opinion is biased about this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, if you want to go on with this game of semantics, I would say that from my point of view if you draw a diagram I stand at the center of this picture and it's very hard to be biased in the center. You can be biased at any point departing from the center, but it's extremely difficult to be biased at the center, to stand at the center as I am and you are what you are.

Senator O'CONNOR. We will take a recess now until 20 minutes after 4.

(A short recess was taken.)

Senator O'CONNOR. The hearing will please come to order.

All right, Mr. Lattimore, will you proceed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To give a false appearance of reality to this nightmare of outrageous lies, shaky hearsay, and undisguised personal spite, the subcommittee has put into the record letters, memoranda, book reviews, and other items from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, that is a long paragraph. Might I ask a question at the end of that sentence?

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Dr. Lattimore, who do you charge with "undisguised personal spite"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That comes later in my statement, Mr. Sourwine.

Senator SMITH. Let us hear it now; I know I have no personal spite.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am glad you don't.

Senator SMITH. Why should I?

Senator WATKINS. I am in the same position I indicated. nobody makes up my mind. I say you are not helping by discussing the committee to start with.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am trying to say that the subcommittee started to put into the record letters, memoranda, book reviews, and other items.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who do you charge with "undisguised personal spite," sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I look through the—

Mr. SOURWINE. You know who you refer to. Do you have to read that statement to learn who you refer to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. One rather obvious example of personal spite is one of your former employees, Miss Freda Utley. I should say—

Mr. SOURWINE. Has Miss Utley testified before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Miss Utley was in the employ of this committee and presumably helped to recruit and prepare some of the other witnesses.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know any witness that Miss Utley has helped to recruit, Mr. Lattimore?

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a moment; Mr. Morris has a question.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know of any one witness who Miss Utley helped to recruit for this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea. I know that Miss Utley showed her personal spite when she testified.

Mr. MORRIS. That is not the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. When she testified before the Tydings committee a couple of years ago, and then she was hired by this committee for a couple of months.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you referred to "this nightmare," were you referring to the proceedings of the Tydings committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was referring "to this nightmare of outrageous lies, shaky hearsay, and undisguised personal spite," presented before this subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Now the "undisguised personal spite" that you refer to as presented—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Which includes Karl Wittfogel, would be a good example. I should think Professor McGovern and Professor Colegrove, both of Northwestern University.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now we are getting at it. Who else would you include in your charges of "undisguised personal spite"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I have read through and endeavored to clarify as much as one brain can hold it, an enormous mass of testimony already issued by this committee, and if you will give me time I would be very glad to come in tomorrow with some more specific identifications.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman.

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Here is a fairly simple statement, "and undisguised personal spite." That means personal spite that anybody can see; that is undisguised. Now if the author cannot tell us who it is that has this spite, I do not know whether we should even consider this statement any more if it is so flimsy that he cannot tell you who it is that has personal spite.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have given certain examples.

Senator SMITH. You have not named anybody on this committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presented before.

Senator O'CONNOR. Are we to understand, then, Mr. Lattimore, that you do not intend that to be applicable to any member of this committee?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, your whole sentence says the subcommittee has done something and tells why you think the committee has done it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The subcommittee has put into the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir. Why do you say that the committee has put into the record certain things? Do you not say that the subcommittee has done that "to give a false appearance of reality to this nightmare * * *" meaning the proceedings of this subcommittee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say "this nightmare of outrageous lies, shaky hearsay, and undisguised personal spite * * *." Are you not then charging that this subcommittee has done certain things, namely, put matters into the record in order "to give a false appearance of reality" to the proceedings of this committee? Is that not what you are saying there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. "To give a false appearance of reality to this nightmare of outrageous lies, shaky hearsay, and undisguised personal spite," and so forth. I specified below that a large part of this comes from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you have indented—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I said on the previous page—no, at the top of this page—that I do not believe, that I have no hope, that this committee will fairly appraise the facts, and this is part of my supporting statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not challenging you on what you are saying, sir, at the moment; I am trying to make the record clear as to what precisely you are charging. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This material has been presented in such confusion, and years and dates have been so jumbled, as to make it impossible for ordinary citizens who are not experts on the Far East to judge whether a problem is being discussed as it was at the time, as it might have been, or as it is now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions about that sentence. You say the material has been presented in confusion, sir. Did you find it confusing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say that years and dates have been jumbled. Is there any document that you know of that has been introduced in the hearing record to date which has been misidentified as to date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean a confusion in the order in which dates and subjects have been presented.

Mr. SOURWINE. You take issue with the order in which they have been presented. Will you answer as to your knowledge whether any document has been put in the record and improperly identified as to date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know of no such example, and I wasn't talking about any such thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman?

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Ferguson.

Senator FERGUSON. You are criticizing the committee for taking a witness and going through that particular witness on documents and dates even though it may skip certain periods. You would want the committee to bring a witness back, have all the witnesses here, and put it in, all the testimony of 1 year, in at that period so that you could judge the evidence of all the witnesses for a particular year; is that what you are after?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, my impression from trying to go through all this material and reduce it to some order for the purpose of answering these charges against me is that it is extremely difficult to do so because the allegations jump all over the place from year to year, the documents of different years are introduced at various points.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that not because witnesses have knowledge of certain documents and not knowledge of other documents?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Senator. To some extent the presentation of documents seems to have been, according to the record, at the instance of counsel of the committee rather than of the witnesses themselves in some cases at least.

Senator SMITH. I would like to ask a question.

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, you realize that every witness that has testified has testified under oath here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Quite so.

Senator SMITH. Do you recognize that that system of having witnesses in courts or what-not under oath is the only system that you can have when you start to take the testimony of a person? You would say, would you not, that when a court swears a witness to testify to the truth that is all the court can do at the moment; is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. The court cannot know in advance what the witness is going to say precisely; can it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, in the case of this committee the practice apparently has been to hear every witness, or practically every witness, in executive session before and then to hear them in public. By the time the public record is published it includes a number of references showing that witnesses have been questioned on the basis of something that they have previously said in executive testimony which would presumably give the maximum opportunity for presenting problems in chronological order and with the documents for those problems introduced at that point in the record.

Senator SMITH. You approve of having executive sessions to first give the witness a chance to testify without publication; do you not, or do you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have never been a Senator, Senator, and I can't solve that kind of problem.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you whether or not you prefer to have and think it would be fair to have an executive session first to try to get at the facts before they were brought out in public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I never had the responsibility of handling that kind of problem.

Senator SMITH. I am not asking you that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I just don't want to give an off-the-cuff answer on a problem I have never handled.

Senator SMITH. How would you conduct an investigation of this sort if you were trying to get at the facts? Would you first have the witness sworn or would you take him unsworn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Senator, I certainly would not let months and months go by before people who have been accused of very vile charges—

Senator SMITH. I did not ask you that question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not given a rebuttal.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you how, step by step, you would conduct an investigation. Would you first swear the witness, or would you prefer to have him unsworn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Have any witnesses been unsworn?

Senator SMITH. No; I said would you prefer to have a witness sworn or unsworn.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, Senator; you are asking technical questions.

Senator SMITH. Not at all. I am going to the question of whether or not this committee has gone on in good faith in swearing witnesses to try to get the truth.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I said nothing about swearing witnesses.

Senator SMITH. But you attacked the committee here. You said that it is "To give a false appearance." That is what you said we are trying to do, give a "false appearance of reality to this nightmare of outrageous lies, shaky hearsay, and undisguised personal spite." Up to now you have not pointed out who on this committee has personal spite against you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have.

Senator O'CONNOR. What did you say?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I have.

Senator WATKINS. On the committee?

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Smith said "on the committee," said you disavowed that previously?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, no, thank you.

Senator SMITH. So you do not want to tell us how you would proceed in conducting an investigation when you are trying to get the facts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I don't think my amateur opinion of how—

Senator SMITH. Do you not know that what we are doing here is trying to get the facts? Nobody has been charged with a crime so far as I know here. Do you not understand that we are just merely trying to get the facts to start with?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am saying that I should have liked to see witnesses given an earlier opportunity to answer charges. I should

like to see some examination and cross-examination. Those are questions on which I can answer. The question on whether you ask a witness to swear standing on his head or sitting down, that kind of thing, is just beyond my competence.

Senator SMITH. We have asked you to testify under oath; have we not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. And you are testifying under oath?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am.

Senator SMITH. And we are cross-examining you; are we not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. What is the question about that? You have a chance to say anything you want to say.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I haven't accused anybody of being a Communist on inadequate evidence, but I am being cross-examined.

Senator SMITH. Who has?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A whole string of your witnesses.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who are you accusing of what?

Senator SMITH. They swear under oath.

Mr. LATTIMORE. But they haven't been cross-examined.

Senator SMITH. Well, whenever they get ready to charge anybody with being a Communist, they will be cross-examined at the trial of the case. We are not trying the case now. You seem to misconceive the purpose of an investigation, that is just to get the facts to start with. I would not want you accused here without giving you a full chance to reply, not at all. That is the reason I understood we were going to hear everything you have to say, and I am in favor of that, giving you a chance to explain everything.

Senator WATKINS. This is not a trial, Mr. Lattimore. If you were in court and said the things you said to this committee to a court, you would be promptly held in contempt of court and would be in jail. So this is not a trial. You are getting a lot better treatment than you would get in a trial if you made those statements to the judge.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have made a statement here which I have been working on for months, in which I have tried to give as orderly as possible a presentation of what I want to say in as orderly a way as I know how to do it. I have made my statement and then bring in what else I have to—

Senator WATKINS. Do you want us to consider it fairly, impartially, and without bias? Answer me that. Do you want us to consider it that way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly.

Senator WATKINS. Why do you start out abusing us if you want us to do that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have to characterize the kind of evidence that has been piled into this record.

Senator WATKINS. You are not characterizing the evidence; you are characterizing the committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I am characterizing the way in which this kind of evidence has been piled up with no opportunity for rebuttal, and very important, I think.

Senator WATKINS. You are here for rebuttal now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. And no testing of the credibility or veracity of the witnesses.

Senator SMITH. How do you think we ought to test your credibility and your veracity? We are taking you on what you say. How do you say we test your credibility and veracity right now in your own case?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I think all of you are doing the best you can.

Senator SMITH. We are doing just what you said we were not doing then; are we not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Senator, I think that the kind of examination to which I have been subjected for several hours now, has been rather markedly absent in the case of some of the witnesses who have been making the accusations to which I am trying to reply.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, you are accusing, are you not, certain witnesses coming before this committee with outrageous lies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. That is what you are saying about other witnesses?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Now why do you then censure other witnesses who came in to say that you had not told the truth? Why should you censure them and not want them to censure you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I think that thus far I have probably not read a complete sentence without interruption, whereas the witnesses to whom I refer have been given a very free hand.

Senator FERGUSON. Did anyone accuse you—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Without the same kind of—

Senator FERGUSON. Did anyone accuse you as being an outrageous liar?

Mr. LATTIMORE. By implication, certainly.

Senator FERGUSON. You are using not implications but the exact words.

Mr. LATTIMORE. They are accusing me of being a Communist, and I am denying it. Wouldn't that be an obvious lie?

Senator SMITH. We do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All I am trying to do, Senator, is to get out a straight statement.

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a minute, Mr. Lattimore is speaking. Go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not legally trained myself. I am trying to read a statement that I have made in as simple English as I can, and I have been interrupted repeatedly. I don't want to give an impression of evasiveness or hair-splitting or anything of that kind, but I cannot help but be conscious of what I believe is one difference between the grand jury procedure which you yourself mentioned not long ago and this kind of procedure, namely, that I believe that a grand jury is not usually composed exclusively of trained lawyers.

Senator SMITH. I do not know of any grand jury—

Mr. LATTIMORE. When on the other hand I am perhaps unwarrantedly aware of the fact that I am sitting here under conditions in which my own lawyer is not allowed to tender advice to me while I am asked rather complicated questions involving legal points which might be pitfalls for me, to which I have to try to reply to the best of my ability.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, is that not begging the question? You were advised, and if you were not advised, you are now, that on any of these so-called complicated questions if you are unable to comprehend them you have the right to consult with your counsel. Why do you give the impression in the record that you are being deprived of the right of consultation with counsel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, my counsel is not allowed to intervene at any time.

Senator O'CONNOR. You are allowed to consult him.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At any time he thinks I may need advice and I in my ignorance may be at the most need of advice at any moment—

Senator O'CONNOR. It is evident that you know when you need advice, and you know better than anybody else when you need it.

Senator WATKINS. Most of the witness' statements up to date have been charges against the committee, and now he is including some of the witnesses, and I think the committee had the right immediately to find out what he meant by what he was saying, who and all that.

Now we had not had any witness before that has shown the contempt for the committee that this witness has and made the charges that he has. I think we have had a perfect right to question him on that. I think he comes in and says he cannot get a fair trial, and immediately afterward he will say he did not have a fair trial.

I came here with an open mind to try to get your statement. When you keep on attacking and attacking it seems to me you cannot be fair.

Mr. FORTAS. I am counsel for Mr. Lattimore. Do I have the privilege of saying something here?

Senator SMITH. If you can give us any facts, I say you should.

Senator O'CONNOR. What did you wish to say?

Mr. FORTAS. I wish to address myself to this program that the distinguished Senator Smith raised—that is, about procedure. It is, after all, a legal question. It is very difficult for a lawyer to sit here and hear statements that affect the interest of his client and to be in a position where he can't say anything. I am sure that all of you gentlemen who are distinguished lawyers appreciate that.

Now as to Mr. Lattimore's consulting with me, he is sitting here under an intense barrage questions from one, two, three, four, five distinguished gentlemen, and his concentration is intense upon those questions, and obviously he can't be expected to know when to consult counsel.

Now of course I have a very fundamental difference of opinion with Senator Smith as to the purpose of a Senate investigation. I believe that the purpose of a Senate investigation is to develop the facts, both sides of the facts, impartially and fairly. It is not my position or my prerogative to say whether that has been achieved here or not. I haven't read your hearings, and it is none of my business here. But it does seem to me that when Mr. Lattimore is confronted with a choice as to whether this is a grand jury or petty jury proceeding that he is obviously at a serious disadvantage.

If Senator Smith says that it is like a grand jury proceeding, it's like a grand jury proceeding so far as Mr. Lattimore is concerned. To me there are a great many differences.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may suggest it, this witness has read a page and a half of this statement. The statement says that "I believe I owe it to you to state the reasons for what is a serious accusation of this

committee." As I read the statement it is a serious accusation of the committee, and I have read the statement, and he proceeds to set forth the reasons why he makes that accusation. He may be right; he may be wrong. He may be justified; he may be completely unjustified, but, Senator, may I respectfully beg of you that the witness be allowed to lay before the members of this committee, most of whom, I take it, have not read the statement, what the reasons are and then may I respectfully suggest that you go ahead and cross-examine him on it, but I suggest that no human being can present a statement in that fashion.

I know many of you gentlemen; I have the greatest respect for all of you, and I am sure that it is merely because you do not realize, as I keenly do, the strain under which this man is and has been for many days and many weeks that causes this. I beg your pardon, Senator, for getting emotional about this, but I do believe that it should be said.

Senator O'CONNOR. The committee has considered the matters. The sessions are not to be prolonged; certainly they have not been thus far. We did not begin until some time approaching 3 o'clock. At the request of the witness a recess was taken, and we are going to continue only to 5 o'clock. So that in full time he will not have been on the stand much over 2 hours, so it is not too long. He has enjoyed advice of counsel during the preparation of the statement, and he has shown himself to be capable.

The point I was making is that he was giving an erroneous impression that he is not enjoying advice of counsel. The point is that he has the right to advise with you at any time. If that has not been sufficiently indicated before, it has now.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Fortas, if this were a grand jury procedure you would not be entitled to be in the grand jury.

Mr. FORTAS. No, and he would not be confronted with a group of skilled lawyers.

Senator FERGUSON. Would he not have the Attorney General and would he not have any number of assistants to the Attorney General and would he not be before the grand jury?

Mr. FORTAS. The point I am making, and I beg of you to consider, is a human matter. The point that I am making to you is that the strain upon a witness of having questions shot at him, which is perfectly appropriate procedure, I am not criticizing you, I am asking you to bear in mind that strain, of having questions shot at him by a number of very skillful lawyers, is very great indeed, and it is so great as to preclude his use with ordinary intelligence of the availability of counsel for consultation.

Senator FERGUSON. What length of sessions would you desire?

Mr. FORTAS. It's not a matter of the length of session. You have been very kind, and when I saw the witness was under great fatigue and asked the chairman for a recess I got it, and I am sure that you will continue to extend that courtesy. But, gentlemen, these proceedings are a tremendous strain. I have seen that with people that I have handled, and I beg you to keep that in mind and let this man lay out these reasons which will retrace many of the things which you have already asked him.

Senator FERGUSON. You are again asking this committee to conduct the examination by allowing the witness to read this statement without cross-examination?

Mr. FORTAS. No; I am not.

Senator FERGUSON. I, for one, do not believe that that is the way to conduct this examination. You and I differ on that problem. I am sure, Mr. Fortas, that if you were over here you would want to ask some questions.

Mr. FORTAS. I don't know what my attitude would be, Senator. I am sure that I would want to have the witness say what he had to say in an orderly fashion. I don't believe this witness has done it.

Senator SMITH. I think the difficulty there, Mr. Chairman, is that these statements which we have cross-examined him on are manifestly unfair statements which he has made about the committee and about witnesses. Now I can understand how Mr. Lattimore might sit down and write this or dictate it in a free-hand fashion and make statements that he does not have proof of, and that is a thing that he can do until he is challenged.

We are challenging Mr. Lattimore's statement that we are trying to give a false appearance; we are challenging the statement that the committee will not fairly appraise the facts, not that it is not able to do so but will fairly appraise the facts. That is to say that we will improperly and unfairly appraise the facts.

I resent that because I do not think this committee has any prejudice against Mr. Lattimore; certainly I do not have, and I do not believe the rest of you have. We may have had witnesses that were prejudiced against him, but that is not our fault as long as we swear them to tell the truth.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, may I take up one thing?

Senator O'CONNOR. The witness.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Namely, that if you believe that this committee in its published proceedings has created the impression that this is a committee before which a witness could appear with only a statement that he had light-heartedly, and I think you said free-handedly, dictated—

Senator SMITH. I did not say "light-heartedly."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think you underrate the committee.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Chairman?

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Watkins.

Senator WATKINS. I want to make a comment with respect to the suggestions of Mr. Fortas that we wait until he is through.

Mr. FORTAS. I beg your pardon; with the subject matter.

Senator WATKINS. If you are going to go through 50 pages, by that time the Senators have to go to other matters, and we have to ask questions as we go along because it has been my experience that we never ask them. We have to ask them as the witness goes along.

He has raised the charges against the committee. He has not gotten down to facts.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have been trying.

Senator WATKINS. But you did not get by the charge statement against the committee, and we have a right to know.

Mr. FORTAS. You haven't a copy of the statement, but you will notice that on page 8 there is a roman II, and all that I had in mind was that the witness be allowed to get through with this one subject matter so that you can see and cross-examine him on what he says about that particular subject matter.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that it is 5 o'clock and we recess. The press has had this; the public have had it, and the only people that are going to miss anything are those people who are now in the room and who have not had the opportunity to read it.

Senator O'CONNOR. It has already been determined to recess at 5, and it is almost that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I make one remark?

Senator O'CONNOR. The witness.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Please do not think that I was trying to accuse the Chair or the committee of denying me advice of counsel. I am perfectly aware it was made expressly clear by Senator McCarran at the very beginning that I am entitled to advice of counsel when I ask for it.

All I was trying to point out is that this is a one-way procedure and that my counsel is not entitled to intervene when he as a lawyer might see that I am trying to answer these complicated legal questions from trained lawyers, might, as a layman, be getting into trouble that I did not appreciate and therefore couldn't ask him about in advance.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, in retrospect as you look back on this afternoon's hearing has there been any point where you would have preferred Mr. Fortas to advise you when you realize that you did not ask for advice?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I don't know if you realize the kind of strain that this hearing is, but it requires such an intense concentration on each question as it is asked that I at this moment could not give you an intelligent recapitulation of this afternoon.

Senator FERGUSON. He may be by morning.

Senator O'CONNOR. But you cannot refer to a single instance where you were at a disadvantage by reason of that fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not offhand, no, because my mind is now a maze.

Senator O'CONNOR. At this point then we will as previously agreed stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 5 p. m., the committee adjourned to reconvene at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 27, 1952.)

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 10:55 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Pat McCarran (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran, O'Connor, Smith, Ferguson, Jenner, and Watkins.

Also present: Senators Langer and McCarthy; J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; and Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

The chairman on yesterday intended to but omitted to make this statement to the audience, that the committee prefers that there should be no demonstration of any kind to any statement made by any witness, either approving or disapproving of the statement. We hope that the audience may see fit to conform to that rule.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Lattimore, you were interrogated yesterday, and you covered about three pages of your statement. You have a statement there of 50 pages. Would you desire to insert that full statement in the record, or do you desire to read the statement and be interrogated on it, paragraph by paragraph? And if you insert it in the record, as you may do if you see fit, it will become a part of the record, but you will be cross examined on your statement and on other matters pertaining to your statement and your position. Which do you wish to do?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I at this moment avail myself of your previous permission to use my one-way communication with my counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You can have a two-way communication if you want to.

(Mr. Lattimore conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like to read my statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. You will be interrogated as you go along.

Senator O'Connor, I will have to ask you to take over. I have to go to another assignment. Thank you very much.

(Senator O'Conor assumed the chair.)

Senator O'CONOR. You may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not quite sure where I got to yesterday. I believe it was near the bottom of page 2, is that right? Does the record show?

Senator O'CONOR. I do not think that you got through the second paragraph, but the sentence beginning, "This material has been presented," and so forth. I think you were being interrogated on that. In any event, I think time might be saved, if you so desired, to take it up at that point and just read on.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This material has been presented in such confusion, and years and dates have been so jumbled, as to make it impossible for ordinary citizens who are not experts on the Far East to judge whether a problem is being discussed as it was at the time, as it might have been, or as it is now. I do not know whether this is chargeable to the committee or its staff—

Mr. SOURWINE. At that point—

Senator O'CONOR. I think you should be permitted to finish the sentence and the paragraph.

Mr. LATTIMORE. But no one can read the record without realizing that this is what has happened.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LATTIMORE, do you mean by that statement that you do not know whether this is chargeable to the committee or its staff, to say that in your opinion there has been a deliberate jumbling by either the committee or its staff, or both?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I believe the record as it has been accumulated shows just what I have said, a jumbling that makes it impossible for ordinary citizens to judge whether a problem is being discussed as it was at the time, as it might have been, or as it is now. The responsibility for that is clearly the responsibility of the committee. I am obviously not in a position to know how far the committee has exercised its own individual and collective responsibility, how far it has delegated it to counsel, or exactly how this has been done.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I inquire? Is your complaint, Mr. Lattimore, against the committee, the way it has handled the investigation as far as you are concerned, or does it go to the investigation of IPR and other people connected with IPR? Is this a charge on all matters of investigation, or is it only as it relates to you, that you may be concerned with the investigation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is a statement, Senator, of my opinion on the record as it stands to date, in which I am involved.

Senator FERGUSON. There are many other people involved, also, is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is correct.

Senator FERGUSON. And there is the question of the relationship of the IPR with the State Department, is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If any, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, now, you say "if any." Do you think that there is no connection whatever between IPR and the State Department, or any of the State Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, you have used the word "connection," which may mean different things to different people.

Senator FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At this point I should like, if I may, to say a few words as carefully considered as I know how to make them.

Senator SMITH. Did you not ask him a question? I do not see why we cannot have plain, simple answers to the questions.

Senator FERGUSON. Then we will get along quickly.

Senator O'CONNOR. Well, I do think that if the question is susceptible of a direct answer, that might be made; and then any explanatory statement that you might desire to make in connection with it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am trying to make a statement on the thoughts that are guiding me in making my answers, and I think perhaps if I were allowed to express those thoughts at the present time, it might clarify other questions coming up, as well as the question immediately before the committee.

Senator O'CONNOR. You may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have been for many years a professional writer. I am also a university professor. I am accustomed to a careful use of words. I have tried to boil down into 50 pages what I have to say about an accumulation of material presented before this committee in something like 8 months. I have tried to use firm and precise language.

Yesterday under questioning I felt at times as if perhaps I might be giving a defensive or what some people might even think evasive or hair-splitting series of answers to many questions. I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no intention of evasiveness; that I have said as clearly as I can what I have to say; that if there is any hair-splitting, or if there is any playing with alternative choices of words, that is not my responsibility. It is a consequence of the form in which questions are asked me.

As I said, I have used firm language. Many of the questions that have been addressed to me appear—I may be oversensitive on the subject—but appear as if they were intended to make me either soften my statements or perhaps in frustration say something more strong than what I intended to say.

Gentlemen, I am not a lawyer. I am an innocent man trying to defend himself as best he knows how. I may at times be forced by this manner of questioning to overstate my reactions. If so, I want it to be perfectly clear on the record that these are not my words—they are words put into my mouth by the manner of questioning.

Senator SMITH. Could we have one understanding before we proceed further, Mr. Chairman, that we are not, or I for one am not asking Professor Lattimore on language. As I understand, all we are asking him is to state the facts in such plain and concise language that all of us can understand what the answers to a question are, instead of having these long, spun-out discussions, including the comment about splitting infinitives, which indicates there was some little intention to quibble about language.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, I want to assure you that I was not trying to put words into your mouth, and I do not intend to so try. I just want to ask questions, and I want to leave you out of it as much as possible. I am not talking about this statement, as far as you personally are concerned now; I am talking about the investigation by this committee into what I think is a very, very important matter, and that is the question of penetration of communism into institutions of Amer-

ica, and for that matter, into other governments and other countries. We are fighting a war involving that very principle. And if we have to limit our investigation here and be cowed down and fearful that we are going to offend someone, then we are not going to get very far in advising the people of America on this great problem of penetration. And that is why I want to talk about the State Department. I want to give every man the right to make statements, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and I will advocate it with him; but I think that when that freedom of speech and that freedom of thought goes to the department of Government that can influence the action of that Government, then the people ought to be able to thoroughly go into the matter, not in personalities but in questions of the broad principles. That is why I asked you the question here now about the State Department and the IPR.

Forget that you were a trustee for a moment. Let us look into it, as you said in the statement. I was a member, yes, I was a member of the IPR. I paid nominal dues. I was a judge in Michigan at the time that I went into it, and I wanted to learn something about the facts. Now, let us forget whether we were members. Let us now look at the IPR and try to ascertain whether or not people did penetrate it, and what difference does it make to you and to me, except that we ought to both want to expose it if people did penetrate it. And to think that I sat here, and if you would have been here you would have heard people come in and say, "When I wrote those articles for the IPR, when I wrote a book that was to be used in the public schools, I refused to answer whether or not I was a Communist."

Mr. Lattimore, I think that you and I ought to be greatly interested in the problem as to whether or not the IPR was penetrated by communism to the extent that Communists wrote books under the label of the IPR, that we were members of, and put them in the public schools of America. I think that the time has come when you and I ought to forget the personal things and try to ascertain for the benefit of the United States citizen what is happening by communism, and if we are going to deal in personalities and if we are going to have arguments about personalities in this investigation, we are never going to advise the people.

Let us look at the IPR, and let us take for granted that the people that were running it were innocent; but, whether they were innocent or guilty, if they were penetrated should we not then show that to the public so that in the future there will be no further penetrations?

Now, if we can think of it in that way, maybe we can get somewhere.

Now I will ask you the question, Professor: Did, in your opinion, the State Department get information from IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am in agreement with what you say, especially about not being cowed.

Senator FERGUSON. And I do not want you to be cowed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am dealing with, I think, all of the questions that you have brought up, and I have tried to put them in my statement in an orderly manner, and to support what I have to say. I have adverted to this matter of the questioning because it contributes, in my respectful opinion, to the character of jumbled evidence that I referred to before, and it leads very frequently to a request to me to give an offhand statement of something that I have later put in my prepared statement, in my own words and in my own way, in such

a manner that I may later be confronted with possibly quibbles about, "You said it this way on interrogation, and you said it that way in your statement."

I think, Senator, it would be much more orderly if I were allowed to proceed with my statement, and then to answer any questions you like in any order you bring them up.

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a second. You are not to determine for the committee how it is to proceed. The chairman gave you the right this morning to place the entire statement in the record if you so desired, or to proceed and have the committee to undertake its interrogations as you went along. You consulted with counsel as you desired to do, and then you determined that you did not wish to put your statement in the record in toto.

Now, you are not to tell the committee how it is to proceed. The question Senator Ferguson asked is a very direct one and a simple one, and it admits of a clear answer, and we would like very much to have you address yourself to it and answer it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I only meant, Senator, to say how I would like to proceed.

Senator O'CONNOR. Fortunately, you are not a member of the committee, sir, for this purpose.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Your question again?

Senator FERGUSON. I will put it this way—

Senator O'CONNOR. Let the stenographer read it so the committee might have it before them.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I never worked in the State Department.

(The question asked by Senator Ferguson was read by the reporter as follows:)

Now I will ask you the question, Professor: Did, in your opinion, the State Department get information from IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have only an outsider's presumption that members of the State Department got information from IPR publications, as they did from any other publications that might interest them, on the subject of the Far East.

Senator FERGUSON. The reason I asked you that question was—and I think that your answer brings this up now—you defend two or three people in this statement, as far as the State Department is concerned, and you tell the public in this statement that, for instance, Mr. Clubb was freed by the Loyalty Board. And where did you learn that, if you know nothing about the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. From the press.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I will ask you whether or not you know that it is a fact that the State Loyalty Board itself did not clear Mr. Clubb, and that Mr. Acheson personally, when it went to him for review, was the one who set aside the ruling of the Board and freed Mr. Clubb?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have not seen that in the press, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you whether or not you know it is a fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, then, are you just quoting here in this statement about these people what you learn in the press rather than trying to get the facts? You are giving to the public the idea that

Mr. Clubb was freed by the Loyalty Board, and I am asking you whether or not you know it was a fact that that was not a fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know that it was not a fact.

Senator FERGUSON. Then why do you give it to this committee and expect this committee not to ask you any questions?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You are perfectly free to ask me that question, Senator. I have given you my answer.

Senator FERGUSON. And your answer is that you do not know. Have you talked to Mr. Clubb about it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have seen Mr. Clubb since he was cleared: yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ask him whether or not the Loyalty Board found against him, and then when it went up to Mr. Humelsine he approved the Loyalty Board, and when it went to Mr. Acheson he reversed the Loyalty Board?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not either an amateur or a professional snooper.

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask you that; and I asked you whether or not you asked Mr. Clubb.

Senator SMITH. That is a simple question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I accepted Mr. Clubb's word that he had been cleared.

Senator FERGUSON. Did he tell you that he was cleared by the Loyalty Board?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was not interested in going into post mortems on the fact, and I congratulated him and then we went on to talk about other subjects.

Senator FERGUSON. Did he tell you why he had resigned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the subject of his resignation, I did not ask him why he had resigned. I congratulated him on resigning, and he later made a statement to the press that he was resigning at this time because he felt that his career had been permanently damaged, and that under the system of multiple jeopardy now prevailing, he might be haled up again at any other time. I accordingly wrote in my statement that he has taken to heart the now obvious lesson that the State Department is not a safe place for a man who has been cleared. That is my opinion.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you discuss that with Mr. Clubb—as to why he resigned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not discuss it with him, Senator Ferguson. He is a friend of mine, and an honorable man, and when he said he had been cleared, I said, "Thank God." Why should I badger him?

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know that the State Department on a number of occasions, Mr. Lattimore, has brought the charges, and then allowed people to resign; and that up to date, as far as from the State Department's view, no one has been discharged for loyalty reasons, and we will exclude the Clubb situation. I am asking you whether or not you know that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not know it, and it is no concern of mine and no duty of mine as a citizen.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, when you raised these questions here about certain people in the State Department, I wanted to know whether or not you had actual knowledge.

Senator SMITH. Might we inquire as to why—I believe it is on page 21—Professor Lattimore even went into the matter of Mr. Clubb at all? What was the purpose in doing that?

Senator FERGUSON. That is what I wanted to know.

Senator SMITH. If you were not concerned with it, what was the purpose of bringing his name into this statement of yours?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Senator, I protest once more at being forced to take up my statement disjointedly instead of in the orderly manner that I wanted to do, but I would point out to you that on page 20 I give my reasons:

The three outstanding examples of men sacrificed to the hysteria that has been whipped up in this country by the China lobby—a hysteria to which this committee, I am sorry to say, is contributing—are—

And then I go into the names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire?

Senator FERGUSON. You had no personal knowledge, did you, Mr. Lattimore, on the Service and the Clubb and the Vincent, the three names that you mentioned here in your statement—you have no personal knowledge as to what was in the loyalty reports, and the evidence, and the FBI reports; have you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, all three men are men that I have known for years, and all three men are such trustworthy members of the Department of State that they would not, and I have never asked them to, talk to me about the internal mechanisms of the Department of State. My concern is—and again I return to my statement, and again in a fragment:

I believe that it is as important to the welfare and safety of this country to have a strong State Department and an able Foreign Service in our diplomacy as it is to have effective military forces. I believe that—

Senator FERGUSON. I agree with you on that.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

That the usefulness of our Foreign Service personnel has already been jeopardized by the work of this committee—both directly by attacks on irreplaceable personnel, and indirectly by impairing the confidence of the Nation and our foreign allies in our State Department and by instituting a reign of terror among our Foreign Service personnel.

Senator FERGUSON. That was not my question, Mr. Lattimore, but I am glad that you read that into the record, and I agree with the first part, as I indicated.

My question is: Do you know what the charges were, and do you know what the evidence was, as far as the State Department, the FBI, and the Loyalty Board are concerned, on these three people named here in your statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, am I a citizen of America, or a subject of Czechoslovakia or Franco Spain? Am I expected to run around snooping on my fellow citizens?

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a moment, Senator Ferguson.

That statement is entirely unnecessary. The question of Senator Ferguson did not call for any such outburst as that. Now, will you kindly confine yourself to the question that is asked, and I think if it is answered in the same manner in which the question is asked, there will be no difficulty.

Senator SMITH. May we have the question read?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Senator O'CONNOR. You either do or you do not know.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know the charges as far as they were in the press, and I do not know the procedures or the documents; unlike Senator McCarthy, I have not been procuring classified documents.

Senator FERGUSON. I am just asking you whether or not you knew; and you say you do not know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Senator FERGUSON. That is all.

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, counsel desires to inquire.

Senator WATKINS. Yet you passed judgment on all of those situations; did you not?

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Watkins asked a question.

Senator WATKINS. Now, you say you did not know, and yet you pass judgment on each one of these cases and you proceed to characterize their treatment.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am standing on the public record as it is in the press, as it is in the record of this committee; and I am somewhat resentful, I think naturally, of the implications that I should have constituted myself a private eye of some kind and gone probing into matters that are not the ordinary province—

Senator WATKINS. That is not an answer to what I asked you. Did you or did you not pass judgment on it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Pass judgment? I expressed an opinion.

Senator WATKINS. That is in the nature of a judgment that they were given unfair treatment.

Senator SMITH. The question, it seems to me, is whether or not we expect him to do any snooping, because that is up to his own conscience to determine, and the question is whether or not he was willing to make statements in this statement of facts, supposed to be, about someone that he had not investigated, and I thought that was what Senator Ferguson asked.

Mr. LATTIMORE. When it has been stated in the press, Senator, that a man has received official clearance, that is sufficient for me.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right, now.

Mr. SOURWINE. The witness hasn't answered Senator Ferguson's question as to whether Mr. Clubb told him why he, Mr. Clubb, was resigning.

Senator FERGUSON. I think he answered that by saying he did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did the witness say Mr. Clubb did not tell him why he was resigning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I told the Senator that I took up the subject by congratulating him, and that I then saw Mr. Clubb's statement to the press.

Mr. SOURWINE. Precisely. You told the Senator that you had not asked Mr. Clubb about his resignation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not ask Mr. Clubb.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you told the Senator that you had read it in the press, but you did not answer the question as to whether Mr. Clubb told you why he was resigning; and, now, did he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I said I did not ask Mr. Clubb, and I didn't go into any post mortem, and there was no conversation on the subject.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he tell you why he was resigning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; he did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. He told you that he was resigning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I assumed that I knew why he was resigning, and that was all there was to the conversation.

Mr. SOURWINE. He told you that he was resigning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I think I saw him after his resignation had been announced.

Mr. SOURWINE. He did not tell you that he was resigning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He didn't tell me beforehand that he was going to resign.

Mr. SOURWINE. You simply met him and congratulated him on it, and there was no discussion as to why he had resigned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. It had already been in the papers with his statement?

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, if you will, the bottom of page 2, then. We will proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All kinds of attempts have been made to depict me as a Communist or a Soviet agent. I have in fact been falsely identified as a fellow traveler, sympathizer, or follower of the Communist line or promoter of Communist interests. Now I want to make my position clear. I am not interested in fine or technical distinctions. I am not interested in graduations or degrees of disloyalty. I have no use for fancy, legalistic distinctions. I am none of these things and have never been. I am not and have never been a Communist, a Soviet agent, a sympathizer, or any other kind of promoter of communism or Communist interests, and all of these are nonsense. I so testified long ago, under oath, before the Tydings subcommittee, and I do so again.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I might break in, there are four or five questions which have been asked a number of witnesses here, and in order to give Mr. Lattimore an opportunity to make his denial completely categorically, I would like to ask those questions:

Mr. Lattimore, are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States or a member of the Communist Party of any other country?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever been asked or invited or urged to join the Communist Party of any country?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever a part of any Communist organization, apparatus, or network?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever under Communist discipline?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever agree to accept Communist discipline?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you.

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. One of the most shocking things that has happened in the proceedings is that not one of the witnesses against me has ever been asked in examination or cross-examination a question that would test his motives or his reliability. Most shocking in this respect has been the suppression or at least the bland ignoring of evidence

already of record. The counsel of this subcommittee, Mr. Morris, was the counsel of the Republican minority of the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations—the Tydings committee—and therefore had intimate knowledge of this record evidence. It has also been widely reported in the press.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I might interrupt the witness at that point, I would like to ask this:

Are you intending to charge Mr. Morris with willful suppression of evidence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't profess to know the inside of Mr. Morris' mind.

Senator O'CONNOR. That was not the question. You were asked what was in your mind.

Mr. LATTIMORE. What is in my mind is that Mr. Morris had intimate knowledge of this record evidence, and that I think it is a shocking thing that in the proceedings before this committee no mention has been made of that fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you carefully phrased your language for the purpose of conveying implications which you do not desire flatly to make, of implying charges that you don't care to state?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, that is one of those hair-splitting legalistic questions to which I referred, and I do not want to give a hair-splitting answer. I have tried to make my language clear and firm. I have tried not to imply that I know things which I do not know.

Senator FERGUSON. I want to refer the witness to page 2519 of the State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation—I think that it might better be known as the Tydings investigation—under Senate Resolution 231, in going into the question of whether or not they went thoroughly into IPR, and yesterday it was brought out that they did not have the files of the IPR. Senator Tydings says this:

There isn't anything, Mr. Morris, that isn't pertinent, and we can keep on asking for things, and there is no doubt in the world, that would be a good thing to get, and you could ask for 5,000 different things; but we are pretty far away from loyalty in the State Department when we get out in the Institute of Pacific Relations with our little force. We just haven't got it.

Does that not indicate that Senator Tydings was not going into the question of the Institute of Pacific Relations and its relation to the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson, I was very clearly, in my statement, referring not to things that the Tydings committee might have gone into. I had no more control over the proceedings of the Tydings committee than I have over the proceedings of this committee, and I was referring specifically to matters that are of record in the Tydings hearings.

Senator FERGUSON. You see, I am much more interested in the whole procedure of the investigation of penetration in the Institute of Pacific Relations, and I am not directly interested in the individuals that may come up from time to time in that investigation, only as it relates to the broad question of penetration into the Institute of Pacific Relations, plus the other question of the Institute of Pacific Relations' relations to the State Department and making of foreign policy. So I feel that the committee has a much broader field, and a more in-

portant question than even the Tydings committee had, of individuals and their loyalty.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson, the next passage in my statement refers to a witness who appeared before the Tydings subcommittee, and has also appeared before this subcommittee. It illustrates exactly what I meant to say.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before the witness goes to that, if the Chair will permit, I would like to get back to this question of the charge against Mr. Morris. The witness did not answer the question as to whether the language here was intentionally put together for the purpose of implying a charge that he does not want to make. If that is not the case, it should be very easy to say, "No, I did not."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that I answered that question, Mr. Sourwine, and I said that my language was carefully chosen not to imply things that I do not know; and I do not know—

Mr. SOURWINE. That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether Mr. Morris acted in bad faith or not. That is a matter for his conscience.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have an animus against Mr. Morris, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I have no animus against Mr. Morris. I am merely defending myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any feeling against him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. How do you mean "any feeling"?

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you dislike him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you dislike him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any feeling of enmity or irritation against him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have a feeling of outrage at the way in which the evidence before this subcommittee has been stacked, in which he took a material part.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what you are expressing here, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am expressing the fact here that—

most shocking in this respect has been the suppression, or at least the bland ignoring, of evidence already of record. The counsel of this subcommittee, Mr. Morris, was the counsel of the Republican minority of the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations—the Tydings committee—and therefore had intimate knowledge of this record evidence.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have gone back to read the statement again, haven't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is quite right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you going to insist throughout this hearing on saying nothing outside of the language that you have said has been carefully phrased over months, in this statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am endeavoring, Mr. Sourwine, as I said before, not to confuse issues by having words put into my mouth in the answering of questions, thus obscuring what I have clearly and categorically said of my own volition.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you realize this paragraph you have just concluded reading will, to any ordinary person who reads it once for the first time, convey the impression that you are charging Mr. Morris with deliberate suppression of evidence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I am referring here to the proceedings of this subcommittee—

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked you if you were aware—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Of which Mr. Morris is only a part.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware that the original reading of this by almost anyone will convey the impression that you are charging Mr. Morris with the deliberate suppression of evidence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not aware, Mr. Sourwine, of your authority to state how the ordinary citizen would react. You are an interested party.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked you if you were aware of that fact. You are, as you have stated, a man of education, a man who is a university professor; and now, are you aware that the average reader will get—or do you have an opinion as to what impression the average reader will get from this?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have an opinion of the impression I intended to convey.

Mr. SOURWINE. Good. Now, what did you intend to convey?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I intended to convey that “most shocking in this respect has been the suppression or at least the bland ignoring of evidence already of record.”

Mr. SOURWINE. In other words, you intended to convey—and then you state exactly the language which is in here.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right, and I hope the impression was conveyed.

Senator SMITH. Professor Lattimore, you say first that there has been the suppression. Well, now, are you certain that you meant to convey the impression that you spoke with certainty that there had been suppression of evidence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I had meant that, Senator Smith, I should have said so. That is why I wrote, “suppression or at least the bland ignoring.”

Senator SMITH. So that when you said “suppression,” you did not really mean “suppression,” that you had any evidence of suppression; but you are making the statement of either suppression or bland ignoring?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Smith, the evidence that I have is that the great majority of the allegations that have been made against me before this subcommittee were previously made before the Tydings committee and thoroughly dealt with there, and that this connection has never been referred to in the proceedings before this subcommittee; that Mr. Morris was one of the counsel of that committee, and one of the counsel of this committee; that the absence of connection in the two proceedings indicates either suppression or bland ignoring.

Senator SMITH. Well, now, then that is your answer to what you meant when you charge this committee, or at least Mr. Morris, with suppression of evidence; that is all the answer you want to give to that, is it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is all of the answer I want to give.

Senator SMITH. Do you think that that is any answer at all when you charge a man with suppressing evidence, or do you think that you have answered that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am referring to the fact, Senator, that evidence has been omitted before this subcommittee.

Senator SMITH. Was anybody attempting to keep you from offering any evidence you wanted, if it has been omitted?

Mr. LATTIMORE. After 8 months, I have finally been allowed to appear here and read a few paragraphs of what I want to say.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the paragraphs you have already read, have you offered any evidence?

Senator O'CONNOR. Just hold that.

Have you concluded?

Senator JENNER. The witness has stated this matter has been gone into thoroughly before the Tydings committee. I think that the reading of Senator Ferguson from the Tydings committee shows that they did not have the staff and they did not go into this fully. I believe my recollection is probably correct that this investigation primarily is with IPR, and to show its relationship with the State Department and the influence it might have had upon the State Department. He says this matter was gone into thoroughly before the Tydings committee. The files and the records of the IPR were not even available. As a result, we found them some place up here in a barn, stored away, and that is the base of this investigation. So on that basis, how could Mr. Morris be fully acquainted with all of this, and how could it have been thoroughly gone into in the Tydings hearings when it was not even available? How could it have been suppressed? I want to ask the witness, on the basis of that fact, how it could have been suppressed? How could it have been thoroughly gone into?

Senator O'CONNOR. Do you understand the question? The question is addressed as to how you could contend that that evidence, which was not then available to the Tydings committee, was in fact suppressed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, the Tydings committee, I think, investigated me very thoroughly, and they stated in their conclusions:

Having found on the evidence before us that Mr. Lattimore is not an employee of our State Department, that he is not the architect of our far eastern policy, and that he is not a spy, our consideration of him should be concluded, since to do otherwise would place us in the anomalous position of passing judgment on the ideological disposition of a private citizen. We are constrained, however, to make some observations relative to the case in its entirety, not only as a matter of elementary fairness to Mr. Lattimore, who traveled half way around the world to answer the charges against him, but the scholars and writers throughout the country and the American public generally. Owen Lattimore is a writer and a scholar who has been charged with a record of procommunism going back many years. There is no legal evidence before us whatever to support this charge, and the weight of all other information indicates that it is not true. We find absolutely no evidence to indicate that his writings and other expressions have been anything but honest opinions and convictions of Owen Lattimore. Similar opinions and convictions vis-à-vis the Far East are entertained by many Americans about whom no conceivable suggestion of Communist proclivities could be entertained. We do not find that Mr. Lattimore's writings follow the Communist or any other line, save as his very consistent position on the Far East may be called the Lattimore line.

Senator JENNER. That is an opinion of a committee without the evidence that this committee has had before it. The Tydings committee did not have this evidence before it, and that is an opinion they reached on the evidence before their committee. But since that committee has concluded its hearings, the files and the records of the IPR have been disclosed, and we have obtained them in a barn up here in Connecticut or some place. Now, this hearing is based upon

a different set of facts, and so how could you say that the counsel has suppressed evidence that was never before the Tydings committee in the first place, and how could you say that the Tydings committee thoroughly went into this when they did not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, the evidence that has been used against me before this subcommittee comes only in very small part from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, illegally taken by this subcommittee—

Senator SMITH. Wait a minute. Did you say “illegally”?

Senator O’CONNOR. Just a second. I do think Mr. Lattimore ought to be allowed to complete his sentence.

Senator SMITH. I did not understand whether he said “legally” or “illegally.”

Mr. LATTIMORE. Illegally.

Senator O’CONNOR. Proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The main evidence that has been used against me is a regurgitation, with an additional birth now and then, of the stuff that was put up before the Tydings subcommittee and dealt with there.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you answer, now, why you used the phrase that the evidence was “obtained illegally”?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am basing that on the statement of, as I recall, Mr. Holland, in his appearance before this subcommittee.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you accustomed just to repeat a statement on the legality or illegality of a matter because one particular witness says—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe Mr. Holland, when he was questioned about that, replied that he was making a statement on advice of counsel.

Senator FERGUSON. Why, Mr. Lattimore, are you defending the Institute of Pacific Relations? I can see a reason that you might be greatly upset on your own problems, but why do you bring up this question now of defense on the legality or illegality of this committee getting records of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am dealing with the Institute of Pacific Relations only as it is being used in this attempt to make me out to be what I am not and never have been.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you think if the evidence does prove that the Institute of Pacific Relations was penetrated by Communists, that that casts a reflection upon you, and therefore you are making these statements today, in your own defense?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Would you repeat that question?

Senator O’CONNOR. We will have it read.

You may consult counsel.

(Mr. Lattimore conferred with his counsel.)

Senator FERGUSON. You have raised the question of legality of this committee obtaining evidence, and you say that this committee obtained “illegally,” and you are accusing this committee of illegally obtaining evidence and using that evidence that it illegally obtained. Now, that evidence is only evidence from the IPR and not from you. I am asking you whether or not it is your contention that if the IPR is found to have been penetrated by Communists, that that will cast a reflection on you, and that is the reason that you are raising this question of legality or illegality?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Aren't you raising two questions, Senator Ferguson?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. You can answer them, and I made an explanation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. One question is about the legality of obtaining the files, and the other question is about the validity of any evidence contained in the files.

Senator FERGUSON. I am talking about your defense. You brought up the question, indicating in this record that this committee illegally obtained evidence, Mr. Lattimore; and I asked you the question where you got that opinion, and you said from Mr. Holland's statement to this committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. And then I went on to ask the question about whether or not you took other people's opinion on these questions of legality or not, and repeated them; and then I came back to your defense of the IPR.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, it is my belief, Senator, throughout my connection with the IPR, that it was never controlled by Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. Was it ever penetrated?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A number of people who have refused to answer whether they were Communists or not, and therefore presumptively may be or may have been Communists, worked in the IPR. That is a far cry from saying that they controlled or influenced either the IPR or me.

Senator FERGUSON. I asked you the question: Was the IPR penetrated? And is there any evidence, in your opinion, in this record that the IPR was penetrated by Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, "penetration" is your word, and may I ask you what you mean by it?

Senator FERGUSON. Influenced; let us use that word now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because the IPR may have been penetrated in the sense that Communists had jobs in the IPR. I have yet to see evidence that Communists controlled the IPR.

Senator FERGUSON. I think that you have made the statement that, in your opinion, Field, who was connected with the IPR, is a Communist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is certainly my impression.

Senator FERGUSON. And you say that he became a Communist, I think, in the 1940's, did you use that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think that I used that. Somebody else used it and I am quite willing to accept it. I did say the forties.

Senator FERGUSON. In 1940. Do you think that the position that Mr. Field held in the IPR, as a Communist, on your own statement that he was a Communist, had any influence on the IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, the record is that everything published by the IPR was always circulated to many readers of diverse qualifications of knowledge and diverse opinions before being published. I think that that is by far the strongest safeguard that any private institution can have on its output not being biased by the propaganda of the Communists or anybody else.

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask you about that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. And, therefore, I believe that it is not true that Field, or any other Communist, controlled the IPR or its output.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, you have used the word "controlled," and I have asked for the word "influence." You have taken the defense again that they had a mechanism to avoid being controlled, and I am not talking about whether they tried to avoid or not.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your word, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Influence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; influence. I do not believe that the work of the IPR was influenced in a Communist direction or in the service of Communist propaganda by Field or anyone else.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, then, the difficulty, I think, between you and me on this problem is that you take for granted that Communists do not have the capacity and the ability to penetrate and influence, in a devious way even, against the great effort of honest people.

My experience on this committee, and I must tell you, Mr. Lattimore, is such that the devious activities of Communists, and the way they work and manipulate and the way they have worked and manipulated all over the world, leads me to believe that you cannot set up in any organization that has them in responsible positions any mechanism to keep out their activities and their influence, and I think the only way that you can do it is not to have them in.

Now, you may disagree. Do you disagree on that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On that all I can say is that I am not an expert on Communists or communism. I do have some experience in research work and editing and some experience of putting out a good product that is free of propaganda. I will go no further than to say that the IPR was run in such a manner that it had the maximum safeguards that a private institution can have in protecting itself against these dangers. Whether it was absolutely successful in every sentence, half-sentence, and comma is a matter on which opinions might well differ.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think, Mr. Lattimore, that we could trust a Communist in a responsible position in IPR; that he would not try and actually influence for communism? What is your opinion on that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My opinion is that I would not knowingly employ any Communist in the IPR, or a similar organization. To that I can only add, as I have said in my statement, that in the 1930's, no private organization was running a private FBI to sift and check its personnel, and that our sole standard was not to promote any propaganda, but to promote free presentation of information and discussion of that information.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think, Mr. Lattimore, today—let us look at it as of today—that any Communist can fairly present the facts and not actually use facts as propaganda to further communism?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have just stated that I would not myself knowingly employ a Communist, and it is for those reasons that I wouldn't.

Senator FERGUSON. That answers my question; you and I agree on that.

Senator O'CONNOR. Would you resume, then, Mr. Lattimore? One suggestion occurs to me, which I would like to see if counsel and all agree on: That it appears that from this point up until page 9, there is one segment of the matter that possibly could be given, to the best in-

terests of all, uninterruptedly; and so, if that is given as a whole, it might admit, then, of better discussion and consideration.

Mr. **FORTAS**. That is splendid, Senator.

Senator **O'CONNOR**. For the purpose of expedition, I offer that as a suggestion, that you should proceed, and that would be a very proper way in which to proceed.

Mr. **LATTIMORE**. I will cite just one example, a rather striking one—that of Louis F. Budenz.

The proceedings of the Tydings committee show that Budenz's accusations of me before that subcommittee were a complete fabrication concocted for the specific purpose of his appearance there. They show (1) that until he was recruited to tell his fantastic yarn, Budenz never mentioned me to the FBI despite hundreds of hours of testimony (transcript, p. 1116); (2) that in 1949 when he wrote an article for Collier's, denouncing many persons for their participation in the Chinese situation, Budenz made no mention of me (transcript, p. 1096); (3) that when he published a book in 1950 dealing with the same subject, he made no reference to me in his manuscript, inserting a passing mention only after I was publicly attacked by Senator McCarthy (transcript, p. 1115). All of this material was available to your committee, and your counsel, Mr. Robert Morris, was thoroughly familiar with it, but not one syllable of it was entered in your record nor was Mr. Budenz asked a single question concerning it.

In connection with this man Budenz, Senators, I call your attention to the fact that the personal history and character of Louis Budenz was thoroughly gone into in the hearings before the Tydings committee in 1950.

This man, when he became a functionary of the Communist Party, was neither a dupe nor a visionary. He was a hard-bitten man of 44, and his own sworn testimony, contained in the official transcript of the deportation proceedings entitled "In the Matter of Desideriu Hammer, Alias John Santos, Respondent in Deportation Proceedings File No. A-6002664" shows that he was already, before becoming a Communist, a man of immoral life.

I exposed him as a liar before the Tydings committee. Since then a distinguished newspaperman, Mr. Joseph Alsop, has publicly challenged him as a perjurer, and has demanded of this committee that the record of Budenz' testimony be sent over to the Department of Justice for examination to see whether he should be prosecuted for perjury.

Before the Tydings committee, Budenz was an uneasy and evasive liar who weaseled and retreated when his credibility was questioned, but before this committee every question that was addressed to him was an invitation to make the most imaginative and inventive use of what Mr. Joseph Alsop has aptly called "the built-in pick-up" in his memory. Thus admonished, drilled, and exhorted to take heart and fear not, he proceeded to bring up his old, disproved charges with a new assurance and with new embroideries and embellishments.

In the Tydings hearings, Budenz finally said, "I have never seen any vestige of his [Lattimore's] Communist Party membership." Senator Lodge attempted to get Budenz to state "a specific instance when an order or an instruction was given [to Lattimore] and carried out" (p. 1134). After hesitating and weaseling, Budenz said: "Well, the order to represent the Chinese Communists as agrarian reformers

was certainly carried out." Then, when Senator Lodge asked, "Is that the most concrete and specific illustration there is?" Budenz then said, "That is the most concrete, yes, sir" (p. 1134).

Now, it was clearly established in the Tydings committee hearings that in fact I had never called the Chinese Communists "agrarian reformers," nor had Pacific Affairs carried articles calling them agrarian reformers, with the single exception of an article by a Chinese Communist, which was clearly labeled as such, and was presented as an example of what the Chinese Communists were saying. It was thus clearly brought out that Budenz was not only lying when he said that I "carried out an order" but lying in the dark and by guesswork.

Before the Tydings committee, Budenz backed away when asked to show whether he really knew anything about my writings or opinions. Senator Green summed it up:

Then, you say you have never seen him, never talked with him, never had any communication with him, you have read none of his books to speak of, none of his articles to speak of.

Now, it is characteristic of this man and of this dark world of intrigue, that your counsel, Mr. Morris, carefully refrained in the hearings before you from asking Budenz whether he had read my writings. If he had, Budenz would have had the choice of plain, not fancy, perjury or confessing that he had no basis for his charges. Instead, Mr. Morris and Budenz sought to achieve just as good a general effect. Mr. Morris obligingly asked "Subsequent to that time, did you follow the publication Pacific Affairs?" and Budenz obligingly replied, "Yes, although, of course, today that is not all fresh in my memory."

Before the Tydings committee it was brought out that when Budenz was in conference with an editor of Collier's magazine and not protected by congressional immunity, he stated (p. 1096) that he was not saying I "acted as a Communist agent in any way." Before this subcommittee, however, knowing he would be protected, he lied glibly and obligingly (p. 1016).

Senator FERGUSON. I think I will ask a question there. Do you think that Mr. Budenz is protected from perjury as far as the Department of Justice is concerned for his statement before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is a legal question. I do not know what the answer is.

Senator SMITH. You made the statement.

Senator FERGUSON. You have made the statement.

Mr. FORTAS. May he confer with counsel?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. He has made that statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. He is protected from libel action by me, I understand.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; but not from perjury. Mr. Lattimore, as I understand it, you feel that this whole question of perjury, as far as you are concerned and as far as Mr. Budenz is concerned, ought to be referred to the Justice Department. Your counsel has just said that they can take it up on reference.

There is not any doubt that you accuse Budenz of perjury, is there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have been reminded several times that this committee makes its own procedure. If this committee, in its

discretion, wants to refer my case to the Justice Department they are, of course, free to do so. My opinion is the case of Budenz should be referred to the Justice Department.

Senator FERGUSON. I understand. Now, of course, if they are going to convict Mr. Budenz of perjury as to what he said to you, then—

Mr. LATTIMORE. He didn't say anything.

Senator FERGUSON. No; about you in this committee. The only way that it could be referred would be to refer to your statements and his statements, so that the Justice Department—

Mr. LATTIMORE. And Mr. Alsop's, and Mr. Vincent's statements, and Mr. Wallace's statements.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; refer them all to the Department of Justice. Is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is in your discretion, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. From what you are saying here, accusing Budenz of absolute perjury, do I understand that you do accuse him of perjury?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not a lawyer.

Senator FERGUSON. I am trying to get some information. If you do, then I would recommend to this committee that they do refer this matter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not aware of the precise legal distinctions here between a liar, a liar under oath, and a perjurer. You are a lawyer. I will just ask you which of those terms is the strongest? Tell me the strongest one and that is the one that I want to use.

Senator FERGUSON. Perjury implies that he willfully testified falsely, knowingly.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is that the strongest term?

Senator FERGUSON. I think that is the strongest.

Mr. LATTIMORE. O. K., that is my term. He is a perjurer.

Senator FERGUSON. Then if you say that now, then I say that I will recommend to this committee that the matter be referred to the Department of Justice.

Senator WATKINS. I would like to ask one thing.

Senator O'CONNOR. Senator Watkins, if you would not mind, we would like for him to complete this segment.

Senator WATKINS. It is on the very same thing. I noticed that he said, before the Tydings committee, it was brought out that when Budenz was in conference with an editor of Collier's magazine and not protected by congressional immunity—as a matter of fact, he was protected by congressional immunity when he was before the Tydings committee, was he not, the same as he would be here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would have to ask a legal question on that.

Senator WATKINS. You are giving a legal opinion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The conference that he had with Collier's is outside of the Congress.

Senator WATKINS. The testimony of Budenz was when Budenz was before the committee, at the same time.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The point I am making is simply that when Budenz was out of the shelter of the Congress and was asked a straight question by somebody, he refused to lie.

Senator O'CONNOR. I interpreted your statement to mean that you are referring only to the Collier's conference.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am referring only to the Collier's conference.

Senator O'CONNOR. That is in indicating that that was not protected by the immunity?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. As I get it from the sentence there, it seems rather vague and indefinite.

Before the Tydings committee it was brought out—

Was it brought out from Budenz or was it brought out from somebody else?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will continue with the statement.

MORRIS. Was Lattimore discussed as a Communist?

BUDENZ. Instructions were given to him as a member of the Communist cell; yes, sir.

I recall to your minds that Mr. Morris was present throughout the Tydings committee hearings and knew that Budenz had backed away from saying that I had acted as "a Communist agent in any way." Yet this same Mr. Morris is the one who invited Budenz, from the borrowed immunity of his presence before this subcommittee, to testify that I received instructions as a member of a Communist cell. If the precise phrases used mean anything different, it is too subtle for me. To my non-Communist mind, Budenz said one thing to Collier's, and the opposite here.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine, you indicated you had some questions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have several questions over that matter that has just been traversed.

Senator FERGUSON. I just wanted to say, Mr. Lattimore, you realize, in referring this matter of Budenz to the Justice Department, they would then have to determine who committed the perjury. Is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You mean whether Budenz—

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, in bringing a charge.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I imagine Budenz will be referred to the Justice Department. It would be a question of whether Budenz committed perjury.

Senator FERGUSON. But then you would not want your testimony referred?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You mean that the price of accusing anybody of perjury is to be accused of perjury yourself?

Senator FERGUSON. One of the statements has to be false. That is correct. Either you are correct or Budenz is correct. That is, to determine whether Budenz is guilty of perjury.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My belief that Budenz is a perjurer could be proved or disproved.

Senator SMITH. What he means, Mr. Lattimore, as I understand that which Senator Ferguson is driving at, is that you and Mr. Budenz have made diametrically opposed statements. That is true, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. Statements of fact, and both of you have made them under oath. That is true, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. Now then, if one is right the other is wrong. The one that is wrong is the one that has committed perjury. That is

what Senator Ferguson is getting at. There would have to be an inquiry by the Department as to whether you or Mr. Budenz had been the one to commit perjury.

Senator WATKINS. And if they determined that you are the one who told the untruth, then you would be prosecuted for perjury. That is what they should do.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, I know that I am not a liar of any kind. I believe that the evidence shows that Budenz is a perjurer. I should like to see the indications of Mr. Budenz's perjury followed up, and lead where they may.

Senator WATKINS. I think that it proper. It should be referred, of course.

Senator FERGUSON. These two gentlemen cannot both be right. He says that they are opposite.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask the indulgence of the committee to ask a few questions over the several pages which the witness has just finished reading?

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you proceed please, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. On page 4, Mr. Lattimore, under the subpoint that you have numbered 3, you refer to a manuscript presumably the manuscript of a book published by Mr. Budenz in 1950. Have you ever seen that manuscript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have never seen the manuscript myself. The question was brought up in the hearings before the Tydings subcommittee. I would recommend that they be reviewed by this subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. The page references which you give here, are they to the printed hearings or to the typed and mimeographed transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. They are to the typed and mimeographed transcript.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the paragraph at the bottom of page—

Senator SMITH. One moment, please. Right there, Professor Lattimore, you said "he made no reference to me in his manuscript."

If you did not see and had not seen the manuscript, how could you make that statement under oath yourself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I believe that if the committee will investigate that transcript, which has not apparently been done yet, it will be found that I made that statement on the admission of Budenz.

Senator SMITH. I never asked you that. You said "in his manuscript."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. You said "he made no reference to me in his manuscript." You just said a moment ago, as I understood it, that you had not seen the manuscript.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is the result of questioning of Mr. Budenz.

Senator SMITH. Do you still understand you are testifying under oath?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Then how can you testify under oath that he made no reference to you in the manuscript if you had not seen the manuscript? I just want to test the ability of you to make statements of that sort.

MR. LATTIMORE (reading):

MR. MORGAN. Now going back, Mr. Budenz—

Senator SMITH. What are you reading from?

MR. LATTIMORE. The transcript of the Tydings subcommittee.

Senator SMITH. That is something that was beyond your knowledge was it not?

MR. LATTIMORE. I was there, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I asked you the simple question how could you swear that he made no references in the manuscript after you said you had not seen the manuscript?

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have here a statement that "The proceedings of the Tydings committee show—". And it repeats "they show—." Now everything that follows below there is a reference to what the proceedings of the Tydings committee shows. It is not a statement of my own knowledge.

Senator SMITH. You said he made no reference "to me in his manuscript."

MR. LATTIMORE. I said that comes, Senator, without a full stop under the sentence beginning "They show—."

Senator SMITH. That is so far as you are concerned, and that is not sworn testimony so far as you are concerned?

MR. LATTIMORE. It is sworn testimony and that is in the Tydings committee.

Senator SMITH. Is that a statement of sworn testimony of fact by you?

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator, you are getting me confused.

Senator SMITH. I do not mean to confuse you. I asked you a simple question. When you put something in the statement here, and after you had already testified you had not seen it, the manuscript, that is a simple question.

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am testifying that I did not see the manuscript, and that I am basing my statement on sworn testimony before the Tydings committee.

Senator SMITH. But not your sworn testimony, not your sworn statement?

MR. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Senator SMITH. All right. That is what I was getting at.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right, gentlemen.

MR. SOURWINE. May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes, Mr. Sourwine, will you continue, please.

MR. SOURWINE. The full paragraph at the bottom of the page—

MR. LATTIMORE. May I complete that reference first?

Senator O'CONNOR. Go ahead.

MR. LATTIMORE. By introducing what the testimony was before the Tydings committee, may I complete it?

MR. SOURWINE. You have given your page reference, Mr. Lattimore, to the testimony you were referring to. We are going to recess here at half past 12. That has been stated. May counsel have permission to traverse what you have already read as to your statement?

MR. FORTAS. I believe the chairman ruled on that.

Senator O'CONNOR. It is permissible to make reference to the transcript of the other proceedings upon which the witness said he relied, and you can do that. You have done it by way of page reference now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, my feeling is that reference by page number was adequate in the first instance, but is not adequate since the questioning by Senator Smith; that Senator Smith's elaboration by questioning entitles me to read the more detailed record myself.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, there is another problem involved there, there is a problem of cross-examination by us of the men who made the statements in that testimony, and therefore that ought not to go into this record except by reference. We do not want to adopt that as truthful testimony because we do not know.

Senator O'CONNOR. I think it is a very simple issue. What portion of that, Mr. Lattimore, do you refer to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My reference in my statement is to page 1110. The fuller reference would be page 1114, beginning with Mr. Morgan's questioning of Budenz about his book, and the course of publication, and ending with the answer to a question, by Budenz, near the top of 1115.

Mr. SOURWINE. May that be inserted?

Senator O'CONNOR. That will be inserted in full.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 460" and is as follows:)

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION HEARINGS BEFORE A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Pt. 1, pp. 518-519]

Mr. MORGAN. Now, going back, Mr. Budenz, to a further matter, I believe you have presently with publishers a book; is that correct?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the title of the book?

Mr. BUDENZ. Men Without Faces.

Mr. MORGAN. And who publishes it?

Mr. BUDENZ. Harper & Bros.

Mr. MORGAN. What theme have you developed in this book?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, the name suggests the theme. The name is not arbitrary. It is because of the fact that we were forbidden to photograph most of the leaders of the Communist Party—that is, Biddleman, Tractenberg, or the secret heads of the Communist Party—we had a rule we were forbidden to photograph them. That is why the name of the book, because it indicates the Soviet fifth column in this country. The book exposes the Soviet fifth column in this country. I know, because I am in it.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you develop in this book this picture which you are giving us today, this picture about the 1937 and the 1943 and the 1944 incidents?

Mr. BUDENZ. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you refer to Mr. Lattimore in this book?

Mr. BUDENZ. No, sir; I did not, and there is a specific reason, because if I were to refer to Mr. Lattimore I would be in the same peculiar situation I was in in the Wallace situation. In fact, the Wallace situation was the cause of my not putting Mr. Lattimore in this book. The only time that I put Mr. Lattimore in the book was to identify Mr. John S. Service.

Mr. MORGAN. What was that?

Mr. BUDENZ. Mr. John S. Service. Service. And because I made a slight error of fact about Mr. Service, saying that he had advised Mr. Wallace, I corrected that to say "advised Mr. Wallace in the Government with Owen J. Lattimore." That is being made because of the error. Now, the thing—

Senator SMITH. That will not be admitted in.

Senator FERGUSON. No, that will just be inserted into the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. This paragraph at the bottom of page 4, sir, where you say that the personal history and character of Louis Budenz was thoroughly gone into in the hearings before the Tydings committee in

1950, by whom was that gone into? Who testified with regard to the personal history and character of Louis Budenz? Not in addition to anything, but who testified in regard to it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There was some testimony by Budenz in examination, I believe, and then there was also the official transcript of the deportation proceedings.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are talking about the Santos transcript that you mentioned at the top of the next page, that is what you are referring to when you say it was thoroughly gone into?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Partly that and partly, I believe, the interrogation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Mr. Budenz himself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Himself, yes. I haven't got that reference exactly at the moment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with offering that Santos transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That Santos transcript, Mr. Sourwine, was submitted to my counsel, Mr. Fortas, and I would prefer to have him answer on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where he got it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know where he got it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he ever tell you where he got it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Did you ever tell me where you got it?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, we are asking you.

Mr. FORTAS. May he consult with counsel?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, he didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was there any cross-examination?

Mr. FORTAS. I can make a statement as counsel, on this, if you want me to.

Senator FERGUSON. I think we ought to let the questioning go on and find out what the witness knows first, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether there was any questioning about that Santos transcript as such?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I remember, it was handed up in a sealed envelope with the suggestion that the Tydings committee should consider it, and advising them to consult their discretion on putting it into the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it printed as a part of the record of the Tydings hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe it was.

Senator FERGUSON. Who handed it up, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I remember, sir—I can check with my counsel, but my memory is that my counsel handed it to counsel of the committee.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Fortas handed it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To Mr. Morgan, I believe, or to the chairman of the committee. You can ask him.

Senator FERGUSON. Had you seen it before?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had not seen it.

Senator FERGUSON. You had not seen it before it was handed up in a sealed envelope?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you ever seen it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Then how do you make this statement in this record if you have never seen this matter?

Mr. FORTAS. Do you want a statement of counsel?

Senator FERGUSON. No; I want to know how he makes this statement.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Fortas, I think at this juncture it is proper for the Senator to ask that.

Senator FERGUSON. What is the page number that you are reading from?

Mr. LATTIMORE. From page No. 5.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it summarized, Mr. Lattimore, before the Tydings committee?

Senator FERGUSON. You accused him of being an immoral person, a man of immoral life, and you give a proceeding in a record that you have never seen. Do you not indicate to this committee, when you make that statement, that you did see it and you were testifying to that as a fact, that that record did show it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I can check with my counsel to see what his memory of this is, but my recollection is that he handed this up to the counsel or to the committee, and that I asked him what that was, and he said something about it is too filthy for you to need to read, or something of that sort.

Senator FERGUSON. But here you make a specific charge from a document, and it now turns out that you had some information from your counsel which would be hearsay, that this was too filthy for you to read or to bother with, as your words go.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, this is hearsay. It can be checked very easily. Get the documents and look at them.

Senator FERGUSON. No; I am asking as to what you say to this committee. You are asking this committee to believe this document. You are reading it as testimony and you are past that point, and you ask this committee to believe you when you said that that document contained this information. Now it turns out that you never saw that document.

Senator O'CONNOR. Let the record show that the witness consulted with his counsel in the meantime. Proceed with your answer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have just consulted with my counsel and he reminded me of something that I had forgotten, that Senator Chavez had made reference to this on the Senate floor.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you then quoting Senator Chavez?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will be glad to add that reference to the testimony in my statement.

Senator FERGUSON. It still makes it hearsay, as far as you are concerned.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I don't know exactly what fine distinction you are driving at, Senator. But I think the matter is easily settled. Get a hold of the transcript.

Senator SMITH. I think the point, Mr. Chairman, is that this witness here has put in a statement, sworn to as sworn testimony, and now he admits that he had never seen the document about which or from which he was quoting or making statements.

If that is the way most of this statement of yours has been made up, then I can see we are justified in thinking that this is jumbled as well as the testimony in the rest of the proceedings has been jumbled, as

you suggest. Why did you make that statement, Mr. Lattimore, if you did not know, of your own knowledge, it was the truth?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, if you would like me to read it and make it direct testimony—I understand it is a rather distasteful thing to read—I will go through with it.

Senator SMITH. I am not asking you that. I am not asking you that, Mr. Lattimore. I am asking you why did you put in here a statement that you are to introduce as sworn evidence when you had not even read the statement to which you are referring?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because the record of the Tydings committee shows that it was submitted.

Senator FERGUSON. But you do not know is in it yet, do you, of your own knowledge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of my own knowledge.

Senator SMITH. All right. Then you are swearing to something you did not know. You made that statement here.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know that Senator Chavez said that he was a man of immoral life.

Senator SMITH. Senator Chavez can speak for himself.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will be glad to add him.

Senator SMITH. You made a statement of fact there that you did not have in your possession at the time you made it; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I made the statement that this document exists, and that its contents are of a certain character, and I am perfectly prepared to have my statement tested by a checking of the contents.

Senator SMITH. And you say that it showed he was already, before becoming a Communist, a man of immoral life?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my understanding.

Senator SMITH. You made that statement without even reading the document to which you refer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have made that statement, Senator, with reference to a supporting document, which is a great deal more than has been done in the case of some of the evidence offered against me before this subcommittee.

Senator SMITH. But you had not read the supporting documents?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I knew of the existence of the supporting documents.

Senator SMITH. But you had not read it. Will you answer a simple question? You had not read it, had you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. Senator, do not badger me like that.

Senator SMITH. I am not badgering you.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, it was a question you could answer "yes" or "no." Nobody is badgering you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have already answered, I have done it several times, and he is badgering me to say it again.

Senator O'CONNOR. The answer is "No," that you did not read it prior to making this statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, you say that Senator Chavez used statements upon the Senate floor in relation to that document; is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In relation to Budenz and this document was among the references that he made.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; now I will ask you the question as to whether or not you know where Senator Chavez received this information that he repeated on the floor, or that he stated on the floor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you read his speech?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I read his speech.

Senator FERGUSON. And you have not any idea where he received the information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not recall now, after 2 years, whether he stated where he received it or not. I can just make reference to these proceedings.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not he received it from your counsel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge and belief, no.

Senator FERGUSON. Had you talked to the Senator before he made the statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk to him after?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you do not know where he received the information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. And you are quoting this here, that Budenz was of immoral life, without ever seeing the document or to know actually of your own knowledge what was in it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; with very specific references to the document making it easily identifiable and verifiable.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think that it is worse to accuse a man, without personal knowledge, of immoral life than it is to accuse him of being a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, I am referring to a specific document which can easily be verified. That is not in the same class as the kind of hearsay evidence that has been offered against me.

Senator FERGUSON. You think it is different?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it is very different.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that document available to you, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not know if I could get it by going to the archives of the Tydings committee or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may we inquire of counsel with regard to that document?

Senator O'CONNOR. As a matter of fact, I think counsel volunteered or desired to state how it was procured.

Mr. FORTAS. I should like to make a statement. The rules of this committee say, whatever that means, that counsel may not testify; but this is a statement of counsel, that I ask to be allowed to make on this subject.

The procedure before the Tydings committee in which I represented Mr. Lattimore included a provision to the effect that counsel for any witness might hand to the committee counsel written questions and supporting material. In the course of the hearings which were highly publicized, as you will recall, concerning Mr. Lattimore before the Tydings committee, a lawyer here in Washington telephoned me and said that he had a transcript which would be of interest to me. I told him that I should be very interested to receive it.

The transcript came over. The transcript was the one referred to on page 5 of Mr. Lattimore's statement here. I read the transcript. The transcript was of such a nature and made reference in intimate detail to a man's personal life, that man being Budenz. The character of the transcript was such that I concluded that it had a bearing upon Mr. Budenz's credibility as a witness. But it was also such that I concluded that I did not want to have anything to do with making it public.

I consulted with Mr. Lattimore about that. I do not recall whether he read the transcript or not. I do remember, I am certain that I described to him the contents of the transcript.

I then put the transcript in a sealed envelope and handed that transcript to Mr. Morgan, who was then counsel of the Tydings committee, and I believe that I—I haven't checked this, but either informally or on the record the Tydings committee was advised that the transcript that was in this sealed envelope, that its nature was such that I felt that it should be examined by the committee—perhaps this was in Mr. Lattimore's statement, perhaps he said it—that it should be examined by the committee privately and should not be automatically made a part of the record. The reason for that, again, being that the transcript contained matters relating to Mr. Budenz's private life which I found to be quite distasteful, but also quite relevant to the issue of Mr. Budenz's credibility, that being a legal judgment.

That is what happened, and I handed the transcript up and I don't recall whether there was any further reference to it in the Tydings committee proceeding.

Senator FERGUSON. Did it become a part of the record?

Senator O'CONNOR. Would you wait just a moment?

Mr. FORTAS. If I am making a statement as counsel, I wish to finish.

Senator O'CONNOR. You will be permitted to. Go ahead. I think, Senator Ferguson, he ought to be permitted to finish the statement.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to know, first, before we get the statement, whether it became part of the record of the Tydings committee?

Mr. FORTAS. I assume so, Senator. I don't know. I haven't checked the records.

Senator FERGUSON. Did it ever appear in the press?

Mr. FORTAS. No. I was going on to the next part of the story.

Senator SMITH. May I ask you, Did Mr. Budenz ever hear of it, or was he ever faced with it? That is to say, did he ever have a chance to deny it, or what?

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, I don't recall. I haven't checked the Tydings committee records.

The next part of the story is that Senator Chavez made a speech on the Senate floor attacking Mr. Budenz. Perhaps I should not characterize the Senator's speech. But the Senator made a speech on the Senate floor in which he made reference to Mr. Budenz, and made reference to this transcript. I believe—I haven't checked it—that he used the words that Mr. Lattimore has used in this statement.

I did not see Senator Chavez before that. Senator Chavez did not obtain the transcript from my office. We did not have the transcript. As a matter of fact, the transcript was never returned to us.

Now, Mr. Morris wrote an article for the Freeman Magazine—is that the name of it?—in which he said that Mr. Lattimore must have

obtained this transcript from a—I don't have the article, and this is not a precise quote—the effect of it was that Mr. Lattimore must have obtained the transcript from a Communist lawyer.

Mr. Lattimore did not obtain the transcript at all. The transcript came into my possession in the manner that I have described. It came to me from a Washington lawyer; and if the committee is insistent upon it, I will give the committee this lawyer's name, with his permission.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Sourwine, had you asked that?

Mr. SOURWINE. I had not asked who the lawyer was who offered you and subsequently gave you this transcript.

Mr. FORTAS. With the permission of the lawyer concerned, I state that the lawyer who gave me this transcript is Joseph F. Fanelli, of this city.

I hasten to say that I have known him for many years; that in my opinion he is a highly reputable, very fine, non-Communist member of the bar of this city.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has counsel completed his statement?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand first a telegram addressed by the chairman of this committee to Mr. Edward Shaughnessy, district director, immigration, 70 Columbus Avenue, New York, N. Y. I ask permission to read it into the record.

Senator O'CONNOR. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is dated February 25, 1952, and reads as follows:

Re your DD files letter to Victor Lasky, New York World-Telegram, May 18, 1950, reading: "Dear Mr. Lasky: Reference is made to your letter of May 16, 1950, relative to a story appearing in the New York World-Telegram and Sun of May 16, 1950, which stated, among other things, that only one copy of the hearings involving John Santo was ever released by immigration authorities and that went to Harry Sacher. Our records here disclose that only one copy of the deportation hearings in the John Santo case was furnished to any one not an official of the Department of Justice and that was to Harry Sacher, attorney for John Santo. I do not have any definite knowledge as to how, if Mr. Lattimore's attorneys procured a transcript of the Santo hearing, it was accomplished. Sincerely yours. Edward J. Shaughnessy." Confirm contents of letter by reply wire.

Senator PAT McCARRAN,
Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

I now have, Mr. Chairman, the teletype which has been delivered to the committee this morning, bearing the receipt date February 26, 11:26 a. m., 1952, marked with the stamp of the General Services Administration, confidential copy, reading as follows:

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate:

Answering your telegram of yesterday, content of my letter referred to is hereby confirmed.

EDW. J. SHAUGHNESSY,
District Director, Immigration Service, New York City.

Senator O'CONNOR. They will be admitted into evidence.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits Nos. 461 and 462," and were read in full.)

Senator O'CONNOR. As previously announced, we will take a recess at this time for 1 hour. The committee is in recess.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:35 p. m., the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

Senator FERGUSON (presiding). The committee will come to order. You may proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, at the recess I had begun asking Mr. Lattimore several questions covering pages 5 through 8 of his statement which he had just completed reading. We were discussing the matter of the Santos transcript. It might be well if we conclude the discussion of that.

I should like, in order to clear up one point with regard to the Santos transcript, to ask a question of counsel, since counsel for the witness has made a statement about that matter. Will the Chair permit that?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to inquire whether you know whether Mr. Fanelli, from whom you got this transcript, was associated with Mr. Sacher in the Santos case?

Mr. FORTAS. I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Lattimore, is it your testimony that the Santos transcript was handed up to Mr. Morgan at the Tydings committee hearings by Mr. Fortas?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my recollection. I am not sure whether it was handed to Mr. Morgan or directly to the chairman.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, did you not hand that transcript up to the Tydings committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Maybe I did. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did you not tell the Tydings committee what they would find on certain pages of that transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I may have.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you did, were you telling them about those pages from hearsay or had you examined those pages?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had not examined those pages. I was told by my counsel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you tell the Tydings committee that you had been told by your counsel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I did. It could be checked by reference to the transcript.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes; we have the reference to the transcript.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to ask to read it at this time, but I request that it be marked, the paragraph beginning a little below the middle of the page 812 of the Tydings hearings and continuing through the paragraph that ends at the top of the next page, and be inserted in the record at this point.

Senator FERGUSON. It may be inserted.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 463," and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 463

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Pt. 1, pp. 812-813]

The history of this man's participation in questionable ventures did not begin—as it certainly did not end—with his party membership. Before he joined the party in 1935 he was a radical, left-wing agitator. He has been arrested

21 times, tried and acquitted 21 times. I assume that he was not guilty, but he was most certainly remarkably active.

If you are not yet convinced of this man's unsavory character, I suggest that you read his sworn testimony on cross-examination contained in the official transcript of the deportation proceedings entitled "*In the Matter of Desideriu Hammer, alias John Santo*, Respondent in Deportation Proceedings, file No. A-6002664."

I do not wish to discuss the matters contained in this transcript, but I hand a copy to the subcommittee.

Senator TYDINGS. It will be put in the record as exhibit 83.

Dr. LATTIMORE. I suggest that the committee should not, in advance of examining this transcript, make it part of the public record.

Senator TYDINGS. It will be kept sealed and noted in the record as an exhibit but not spread in the testimony until the committee can look into it.

Dr. LATTIMORE. Beginning at page 143 of the transcript, which is page 36 of the typewritten copy, Budenz admits that even before he joined the Communist Party he engaged in certain personal activities which, to say the least, are offensive to accepted standards of decent and conventional behavior. Beginning on page 170 of the transcript, which is page 50 of the typewritten copy, Budenz refuses to respond to a series of questions relating to his personal behavior on the grounds that his answers might incriminate him. These questions, gentlemen, relate to two different alleged relationships; and they all concern Budenz' activities before he became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. FORTAS. May we see that, Senator?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, surely.

Mr. SOURWINE. On page 5 of your statement, Mr. Lattimore, you make the statement that Mr. Budenz weaseled and retreated. Did you intend by that to express your contempt of the witness who weasels and retreats?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I intended by that to characterize Budenz' manner as it appeared to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were not intending to express any contempt for Mr. Budenz?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was not intending to convey the impression that he was an Eagle Scout, if that is what you mean.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the bottom of page 5, you quote Mr. Budenz as saying, in the Tydings hearing, "I have never seen any vestige of his" referring to you, "Communist Party membership."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why did you not quote the next sentence after that, in Mr. Budenz' testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I see the transcript on that?

Mr. SOURWINE. The next sentence after that reads:

What I have received is these official reports which are quite binding and were binding on me as a member of the Communist Party.

Is that not correct? If you cannot find it in your transcript, you will find it at page 527, the fourth paragraph from the end, of the transcript I just handed you, the printed transcript. I am sorry, the chairman has that now.

Do you have it now? It is on page 527, the fourth paragraph from the end.

Mr. LATTIMORE. 527, which paragraph did you say?

Mr. SOURWINE. Maybe I have the wrong page reference. It is possible.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Fortas, did you know Harry Sacher?

Mr. FORTAS. I may have met him some time. I know that I have not seen him within my present recollection.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not he has been disbarred as far as the Federal court of New York is concerned?

Mr. FORTAS. I have seen that in the press, Senator; yes. The case may be on appeal. I don't know.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. But there had been an action concerning him in at least the lower court?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes; that is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that he was sentenced for contempt of court in the so-called 11 Communist trial that was presided over by Judge Medina?

Mr. FORTAS. I read that in the press; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. And sentenced to 6 months?

Mr. FORTAS. I don't remember that.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not it has been confirmed by the appellate court?

Mr. FORTAS. I think that is right. I think it is before the Supreme Court now.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is on page 527, the fourth paragraph from the end.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I find that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you read that whole paragraph there? That is Budenz's testimony; is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

The point is this: I would say of course the question of personal knowledge is a legal question in a certain way, but I would say, so far as meeting Mr. Lattimore, as seeing him in meetings, that I have never done so, that I have never seen any vestige of his Communist Party membership. What I have received is these official reports which are quite binding and were binding on me as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all. The question I am asking, sir, is why, when you quoted the sentence "I have never seen any vestige of his Communist Party membership" and quoted it in the context of showing that Mr. Budenz was admitting, as you contend, that he had no basis for any assertion with regard to your Communist Party membership, why did you not go on and quote the next sentence in the same paragraph of Mr. Budenz's testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I have no objection whatever to the next sentence being included in the record.

Senator FERGUSON. That was not the question. The question was why you did not put it in, not whether you have an objection to it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because I thought that the point that Budenz admitted that he had never seen any vestige of Communist Party membership on my part was the pertinent point I was trying to make. I had been trying to write a statement not longer than absolutely necessary.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think it was modified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This other statement—there are other statements that appear at other points in the Tydings transcript, and it is part of the hearsay part of Mr. Budenz's evidence.

For instance, on page 1137 of the Tydings-typed transcript, Budenz says:

Outside of what I was officially told by the Communist leaders, I do not know of Mr. Lattimore as a Communist.

I did not quote that either.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think that the statement you gave was modified by the next sentence?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Modified by the next sentence?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; the one that was read.

Mr. LATTIMORE. They are two separate sentences.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever inveigh against anyone for quoting things out of context, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that this committee has introduced a great many quotations out of context; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever inveigh against anyone?

Senator FERGUSON. You did not answer the question at all, did you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know that I would use the word "inveigh." I have pointed out that people have used statements out of context.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever expressed your disapproval of using statements out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have expressed my disapproval of using statements out of context. I do not think that this particular point, if that is what you are referring to, is the point out of context.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I was going to ask you, whether you think you have quoted this thing out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I think I have given a fair connotation of Mr. Budenz's testimony over all.

Mr. SOURWINE. On page 6 you referred to an article by a Chinese Communist published in Pacific Affairs, which you say was the single exception to a rule.

Are you there referring to the article Agrarian Democracy in Northwest China, by Ma Ning, do you recall?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that is probably the reference. Incidentally, I don't mean—you use the word "rule" there. I don't mean rule in the sense that the magazine had any rule against presenting the views of Chinese Communists. I mean, as it so happens, that is the only one we had that I have been able to find.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the top of page 7, sir, you say:

Now, it is characteristic of this man and of this dark world of intrigue, that your counsel, Mr. Morris, carefully refrained in the hearings before you from asking Budenz whether he had read my writings.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you realize, sir, that the plain meaning of that language is a charge that something which Mr. Morris did is characteristic of Mr. Budenz?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is that your interpretation of it?

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you if you realize that that is the plain meaning of the language.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My interpretation of the meaning of the language is that Mr. Morris, with every opportunity to straighten out the Budenz record, did not do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you deny that the plain meaning of that language is the statement that something Mr. Morris did is characteristic of Mr. Budenz?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am stating that it is characteristic of this man, in this dark world of intrigue. I mean, the whole way in which Budenz has been allowed to make his accusations, broadcast, with no checking or verifying of his credibility, no testing questions whatever.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are talking about something Mr. Morris did; are you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I go on to—

Mr. SOURWINE. No, not going on, sir. In this particular sentence you are talking about something Mr. Morris did.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, it is characteristic of this procedure.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are talking about something Mr. Morris did; are you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That Mr. Morris carefully refrained in the hearings—

Mr. SOURWINE. And you are stating that what Mr. Morris did in that regard is characteristic of Mr. Budenz; are you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If you would like to interpret it that way.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you deny that you intended it that way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right, if you want to put that word in my mouth, I will intend it that way.

Mr. SOURWINE. Please do not intend it that way for me, sir. I am asking you what you did intend. I think it is germane to this committee to know whether the plain import of what you said is something which you intended to say.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, the use of the words "this dark world of intrigue" is in itself a statement on my part that there are things here that I cannot fathom, that I think that the proceedings would have been much fairer and clearer if there had not been this mystery and this atmosphere of intrigue. Precisely what characteristics Mr. Morris and Mr. Budenz shared in this dark world of intrigue is something that I don't know. If I had known, I would have said it.

Senator FERGUSON. What do you mean by "intrigue" here, as used?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean this manner of presenting evidence when it had been clearly shown in the Tydings hearings that Budenz was unreliable and evasive, to present him all over again before this subcommittee without a single question to check his credibility.

Now, I am not saying, Senator, that my view of Budenz is necessarily correct. I am not saying that the evidence in the Tydings transcript is all the evidence there would be. I am merely saying that I think that, in view of the nature of the accusations made by Budenz, some check should have been made before this committee. And did your committee ask your counsel if they had checked Budenz' credibility?

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any knowledge, sir, of any checks that may have been made?

Mr. LATTIMORE. All I can see is an absence of any check.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that Budenz had been used by the Justice Department on many occasions in court and had been vouched for as to credibility by the Justice Department of the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was not brought up, Senator, in the Tydings hearings.

Senator FERGUSON. My question was did you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is something pertinent to this that I have on the record before, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you like to return to that later?

Mr. FORTAS. Mrs. Lattimore is looking for it now.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say Mrs. Lattimore is looking it up now?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. You may proceed. We will return to it later.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask this question, Mr. Lattimore? With regard to this sentence we are discussing, the first sentence at the top of page 7 of your statement, now that we have had some discussion of it here and now that you have reread it, is there anything that that sentence appears to you to convey that you want to disavow here or in any way circumscribe or amend?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I considered that sentence carefully before I wrote it, and I will stay with it as it stands.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sure you did. Now at the end of that first paragraph at the top of page 7 you say:

Mr. Morris and Budenz sought to achieve just as good a general effect.

By that statement do you mean that Mr. Morris and Mr. Budenz had a common purpose?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean that the record as it stands certainly looks like that.

Mr. SOURWINE. In your opinion, Mr. Morris and Mr. Budenz had a common purpose; is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In my opinion, Mr. Morris brought on Mr. Budenz and asked him questions which, as I stated just above, enabled Budenz to avoid the choice of plain, not fancy, perjuring on confessing that he had no basis for his charges. At this moment, Senator, I have found the point which I was looking for.

Senator FERGUSON. You may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is in a statement made by me before the Tydings committee. I don't have the page reference to the printed hearings:

Third, I am informed that the Department—
that is, the Department of Justice—

does not vouch for the general character or credibility of its witnesses. At most, it impliedly represents that the use that they are qualified to testify on matters upon which they are questioned; for example, in appropriate cases it calls as Government witnesses narcotic peddlers, gangsters, racketeers, confessed murderers, and thugs.

Senator FERGUSON. Does it not vouch for the fact that when they call a witness such as they used Budenz for in these cases, they at least believe what he is going to say to be true and not perjury?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably on the point for which they are calling him. But Budenz was not called by the Department of Justice to testify against me.

Senator FERGUSON. No; I am not talking about you now. I tried to eliminate you as much as possible out of the case.

But if they call him in one of these other cases, they vouch for the credibility of what he is going to say in that case; do they not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. You may proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you, sir. If we can get back to the question of your statement that Mr. Morris and Budenz sought to achieve just as good a general effect, did you intend by that to imply any prearrangement between Mr. Morris and Mr. Budenz?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no knowledge how much they may have prearranged things between them. I wrote that sentence simply

because it looked to me as if both Morris and Budenz had skirted around difficulties known to both of them from the previous hearings before the Tydings committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. But to put it bluntly, were you not then, and are you not now, charging conspiracy between Mr. Budenz and Mr. Morris to achieve what you call just as good a general effect?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My counsel tells me that he believes that that is a question of legal opinion on which I don't have to express myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there anything in that statement, that sentence that I read, which you now want to disavow or amend or circumscribe in any way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not at all.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you say the innuendo is there, that you are charging Morris and Budenz in a conspiracy to bring about perjury?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I said above that this whole thing appears to me to be a dark world of intrigue. The point has just been brought up that the definition of conspiracy is a legal question. I don't know about conspiracy, collusion, anything of that kind. I have simply made the point that the record shows that both men skirted around points of difficulty well known to both of them.

Senator FERGUSON. Let us leave the word "conspiracy" out and use the word that they just combined to have perjury committed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. To have what?

Senator FERGUSON. To have perjury committed in the proceedings. Is that not what you say?

If he had, Budenz would have had the choice of plain, not fancy, perjury or confessing that he had no basis for his charge. Instead, Mr. Morris and Budenz sought to achieve just as good a general effect.

Mr. LATTIMORE. What I was pointing out was that the line of questioning followed was one which permitted Budenz to evade the whole question of perjury.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, you say Mr. Morris obligingly asked. Who was he obliging, in your opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Mr. Sourwine, in view of the fact that no questions were asked that would cause Budenz the slightest difficulty, in view of the fact that Budenz was enabled to go further and be even more outrageous in his accusations than he was before the Tydings committee, obliging—that is, obliging Mr. Budenz—is the only term I can think of.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I wanted to find out, how you intended it. And when you say a little further on, "Budenz obligingly replied," who did you intend to say Mr. Budenz was obliging?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether Mr. Budenz was obliging Mr. Morris personally or obliging the committee. But he was apparently giving an answer that he thought would be well received.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the next paragraph you refer to a conference with the editor of Collier's magazine.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether that conference was face to face or over the telephone?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection of the discussion before the Tydings committee is that it must have been face to face, and with a stenographer present.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think the Tydings committee record shows that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my recollection. I would be glad to have it verified.

Mr. SOURWINE. We would be glad to have you verify it, sir, if you can find anything in the Tydings record that indicates that.

Mr. FORTAS. May the witness take a look at it?

Mr. SOURWINE. No.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I have found it here.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have before me, sir, the page of the printed record which confirms that. I wanted to question you about it. I will be glad to wait, if you finish.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think perhaps we could save time. We have had a 4- or 5-minute pause here. If you would look at this page which I hand you, which is, I believe, the printed record of that transcript, it might save time. I simply want to ask you a question about it.

Mr. FORTAS. Do you want to skip this point?

Mr. SOURWINE. It is a relatively immaterial point, sir. It is our worth holding up the proceedings over. I simply wanted to ask about the nature of this conversation.

Was not this the case of the editor of Collier's, or one of the editors, or editorial board members of Collier's, talking with Mr. Budenz about an article he had written for Collier's and a draft of which was then in the possession of Collier's and in the possession of this editor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. So I gather from the transcript, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And was not the editor of Collier's asking Mr. Budenz about what he said in that article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he not saying "You say this here, now how about that? You do not say this here." Is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the sort of conference it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was not asking Mr. Budenz "What do you, Mr. Budenz, say to me now about the question of whether anyone is or is not a Communist?" He was asking Mr. Budenz "Do you, in this article, say anything about Mr. Lattimore?"

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, he was apparently—my name was brought in there, and the editor suggested this—that the way Budenz had put it made it look as though I had been a Communist agent, and Budenz backed off and said he was not stating that I acted as a Communist agent in any way.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is your interpretation of what took place; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my answer to your question.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right.

That is quite correct, Mr. Fortas, that is what I asked him for.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that this material in small type, which appears on page 512 of the State Department employee loyalty hearings, the Tydings hearings, may be inserted in the record of this committee at this point. That is what I asked Mr. Lattimore to read and what we were discussing.

Senator O'CONNOR (presiding). It will be so inserted.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 464" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 464

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION HEARINGS BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES
SENATE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Pt. 1, p. 512]

Question. You tell about Browder saying that the followers of Mao Tse Tung had to be presented in a new light. It's easy to see that this was an idea the Communists had to push. Don't show that they invented this idea, show that they fostered it.

Answer. I'll do that.

Question. You have done one thing here that I think is not good. By inference you implied that Joe Barnes and Lattimore are not Communists exactly but are fellow travelers. You say the Communists supposedly endorsed Roosevelt.

Answer. I think probably what we ought to do is to leave out those names entirely. Perhaps we can rephrase it some way. I said it merely to show that they would add meat to what I was saying.

Question. From our standpoint it seems that you were damning these people. This might put us in an embarrassing legalistic position. We have no particular reason to smear Lattimore. The same thing applies to that thing about Roosevelt on page 5. Why did you use the word "supposedly"?

Answer. It was only because from time to time they were supporting Browder inferentially. They didn't come out and say they were for Roosevelt. Their arguments were for Roosevelt but their candidate was Browder. The Communist support of Roosevelt was not an actual support but only a way of winning the people over that were undecided.

Question. On page 7 you say "This idea of the 'upstanding Chinese Communists, the great agrarian reformers,' was peddled everywhere from that time on." You haven't given a single instance that it was peddled or that the idea was planted by the Communists. Give at least one instance, or more than one if possible.

Answer. Lattimore and Barnes became champions of some of these ideas as time went on.

Question. You're not saying that they acted as Communist agents in any way?

Answer. No.

Question. That ought to be quite clear.

Answer. Oh, yes.

Mr. FORTAS. May I make the point that the hearings before the Tydings committee included the entire transcript of this conference between the editor of Collier's and Mr. Budenz. I point that out to you. I do not know what this segment is to be introduced, but the committee may want to consider whether you want the entire transcript.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is counsel suggesting that an effort is being made here to take something out of context?

Mr. FORTAS. Of course not, Mr. Sourwine. I haven't seen what you are offering. Customarily, when evidence is offered in any proceeding that I know of, it is shown to opposing counsel in advance. I am not asking you to do that.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is material with which it was assumed counsel was thoroughly familiar, having participated in the Tydings hearings.

Mr. FORTAS. I have never seen the printed transcript, and neither has Mr. Lattimore. I don't know what the pages are.

Senator O'CONNOR. You may proceed to the next question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of cluttering this record, there are only a little over two pages of the entire transcript that is referred to, and they appear beginning on page 513. May those pages now be inserted at this point in the record?

Senator O'CONNOR. All right; they will be inserted.

Mr. SOURWINE. And leaving the previous excerpt which was inserted in the record at that point so that anyone may compare to see if they were taken out of context.

Senator O'CONNOR. It will be so included.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 465" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 465

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

[Pt. 1, pp. 512-516]

BUDENZ ARTICLE RED MYTHS, STARRING CHINA

(By Mr. Leonard Paris)

Question. The main problem, Mr. Budenz, was that we felt that your thesis of this piece wasn't entirely proved. Let me tell you what I think of it: We need more documentation on some of the things. On the second page you say the whole idea of coalition government was concocted by Soviet Russia in order to defeat America in the Far East. I don't doubt that their support of coalition government was a contributing factor, but who first suggested coalition government?

Answer. The Communists.

Question. Before it had been publicly mentioned anywhere else?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I think you ought to mention when and where and by whom coalition government came to public attention.

Answer. It was the Communists who pushed it and made use of it. I will get the authority for this.

Question. On page 3, the sentence reading: "These Moscow agents, pledged by their own declaration," etc., you quote "a sort of nonpartisan leaguer." Where does this come from?

Answer. This comes from Browder. That is to say I don't know of anyone who used that phrase. It was used for an argument that the Communists in China are different. However, I will get authority for that statement. I used it because it was pushed by the Communist Party.

Question. Here is an example of the sort of thing that needs more incidents and instances. On page 4 the sentence which reads "At every turn of history, the Chinese Communists, etc." I think it would be well for all readers if you gave some examples of that, other than just the pact between Russia and China. You're talking about the Soviet nonaggression pact. We need more examples to support that.

Answer. I'll get you that.

Question. You tell about Browder saying that the followers of Mao Tse-tung had to be presented in a new light. It's easy to see that this was an idea the Communists had to push. Don't show that they invented this idea, show that they fostered it.

Answer. I'll do that.

Question. You have done one thing here that I think is not good. By inference you implied that Joe Barnes and Lattimore are not Communists exactly, but are fellow travelers. You say that Communists supposedly endorsed Roosevelt?

Answer. I think probably what we ought to do is to leave out those names entirely. Perhaps we can rephrase it some way. I said it merely to show that they would add meat to what I was saying.

Question. From our standpoint it seems that you were damning these people. This might put us in an embarrassing legalistic position. We have no particular reason to smear Lattimore. The same thing applies to that thing about Roosevelt on page 5. Why did you use the word "supposedly"?

Answer. It was only because from time to time they were supporting Browder inferentially. They didn't come out and say they were for Roosevelt. Their arguments were for Roosevelt but their candidate was Browder. The Communist support of Roosevelt was not an actual support but only a way of winning the people over that were undecided.

Question. On page 7 you say "This idea of the 'upstanding Chinese Communists, the great agrarian reformers,' was peddled everywhere from that time on." You haven't given a single instance that it was peddled or that the idea was planted by the Communists. Give at least one instance, or more than one if possible.

Answer. Lattimore and Barnes became champions of some of these ideas as time went on.

Question. You're not saying that they acted as Communist agents in any way?

Answer. No.

Question. That ought to be quite clear.

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. You say that the entire history of coalition governments was that Russia took over eventually. We need concrete instances, and examples very much more effective. They must also be complete enough so that they can be quickly identified and so that the reader can see that they are true.

Answer. It will be very brief.

Question. On page 10, "On December 7 last, it was discovered in Washington that there had been a tragic lag in the delivery of promised war material and other goods to Nationalist China, etc." Isn't the reason for that simply because Congress didn't appropriate more than that? Isn't it true that more aid went to Greece and Turkey than China simply because more had been appropriated?

Answer. I have to check on that. This was pointed to by the New York Times in an editorial.

Question. On page 11 there is a dubious slam on the unions. "A special secret order was sent out to the Communists, to be pushed in unions and in every occupation where sympathizers were engaged, etc." It sounds as though you can expect to find Communist sympathizers in every union.

Answer. We can change that. It's a document that I'm referring to there. I will look it up. It may be the way it is phrased. The unions are the chief opponents of the Communists. Communists are always trying to work within the unions. In a number of unions they do have Communists as they do in all fields.

Question. "Arrangements were made whereby the legs of book reviewers were to be pulled so that those works which gave a break to the Chinese Communists would receive favorable notices." etc. We need an instance of this. Make the article much more effective by getting an actual case.

Answer. In previous articles my statements were specific; then they were made very general.

Question. Any documentation?

Answer. No. I can't prove it legally. That's why I use a general phraseology.

Question. Best thing to do is leave it out.

Answer. The trouble is I did have a host of specific examples and then had to take them out.

Question. On the Amerasia case, refresh most of our readers as to what actually happened. Did the defendants get off without any difficulties? How did it work out?

Answer. Jaffe was fined and one other defendant, Larson (I have to check up on this) got a small suspended sentence. Nobody went to jail. Mitchell was not given punishment of any kind.

Question. Can you indicate how Communist pressure was exerted?

Answer. I'll make an effort to check this. This is pretty well known. That's why I didn't go into it.

Question. But people forget details. The actual outcome of the case should be stated and the definite part that the Communists played.

Answer. Definitely. I should tell more of what these documents contain. The plans of Chiang Kai-shek's army and the economic plans of the Chinese Government were in those papers.

Question. On bottom of page 16, "In his address Mr. John Carter Vincent indicated Nationalist China as a place unsound to invest private or public capital." You're not trying to imply that this was a Communist idea, are you? Hasn't it been pretty well demonstrated that Nationalist China was unsound?

Answer. The State Department was supporting Nationalist China.

Question. The point is, Mr. Vincent's quotes on Nationalist China may or may not have been the result of the Communist lie.

Answer. I'll have to link it more closely. It was accepted in the Far East division. I'll bring you more information on this.

Question. If Mr. Carter's advice were taken, you claim there would be an awful fiasco. Isn't there any possibility that part of the trouble in China is the Chinese Government itself?

Answer. Surely.

Question. Never in any part of the article was it admitted that Chiang Kai-shek's government was weak and corrupt. You're trying to show the Communist influence.

Answer. Let me take hold of that. I'll present more examples of Communist activity and show how the activity played its part.

Question. We shouldn't try to convince our readers that Chiang Kai-shek was all white and that Communist propaganda led to what happened over there.

Answer. As a matter of self-defense, America was completely unaware of what was taking place in China.

Question. You have to prove that General Carlson was a party liner—back it up.

Answer. He was such a striking example. He was a Communist many years. I can be stronger. I can give you instances. I can show you who was associated with him on this committee.

Question. On page 21: "It was out of all these pressures, Moscow-directed, that President Roosevelt was persuaded to amend our solemn pledge of China's integrity made at Cairo to the Yalta promise that Soviet Russia would get Outer Mongolia and even a chance at Manchuria, et cetera." Moscow-directed pressures were not solely responsible; that is putting it a little too broadly.

Answer. It shouldn't be solely.

Question. "It is from such creation of confusion in the American mind that we have promised aid to China and not given it in the measure it was pledged." You were referring to the New York Times editorial, I presume. Show actual figures.

Answer. I'm glad you raised this about Roosevelt. I can tell more in this piece. The reason I don't go more into the Communist activities is because I don't want to sound repetitious of some of the other articles. The methods used by the Communists have a somewhat similar tone. The tactics described sound like it happened before.

Question. On these things, the more instances you can show to bear out what you say or what your thesis is, the better it will be. It has to be more than just implied or inferred. Make it as definite as you can possibly make it without getting into libel.

Answer. There is a terrific job in writing this. I know certain connecting links which I dare not say. I try to bring them out, but they become somewhat broken, because I cannot give the link. I will make some of these definite changes that you suggest. I will enlarge the information on the Chiang phraseology.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the top of page 8, sir, and this is the last point I wish to inquire about before you go ahead with the reading of your statement, you say:

This same Mr. Morris is the one who invited Budenz to testify that I received instructions as a member of a Communist cell.

I would like to ask you how did the question that Mr. Morris asked at that point invite any particular testimony from Mr. Budenz?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, that second sentence was written after careful consideration, and after reading the part of the transcript in which Mr. Morris was questioning Budenz.

Incidentally, the smooth way in which Budenz was allowed to present his accusations forms rather a startling contrast with the questioning of accused witnesses before this committee.

The only conclusion I could come to from that reading was that the entire method of Mr. Morris' questioning constituted an open invitation.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. You were not referring to the particular question that you have here cited in your testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am referring to the whole of the questioning.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. I have no more questions up to this point where the witness concluded reading his statement.

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you proceed? Again, just by way of expediting the proceeding, it appears to me that there is a natural break at the end of page 14, before taking up the several points that the witness indicates were used in a certain matter. It occurs to me that, from this point on, until the conclusion of page 14, which may be a natural segment or just a segment, that you might want to proceed and read it entirely.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am entirely with you, Senator.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right, go ahead. You may proceed from the middle of page 8.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As for the Institute of Pacific Relations, your chairman has already publicly proclaimed that he has prejudged it, and I do not suppose that anything I say will change his mind. In a printed interview, while the investigation is still in process, he has already stated, as his "curbstone opinion," that the institute "was taken over by Communist design and made a vehicle for attempted control and conditioning of American thinking and American policy with regard to the Far East." It was also used—he said—"for espionage purposes to collect and channel information of interest or value to the Russian Communists" (United States News and World Report, November 16, 1951). It sounds almost as if the curbstone from which the distinguished Senator delivered this opinion had been imported from one of the countries in which accusation is accepted as conclusive of guilt. My own relations with the IPR were gone into quite thoroughly before the Tydings subcommittee, the record of which your counsel, Mr. Morris, has so sedulously kept out of sight. I therefore ask permission to submit as an exhibit a copy of my statement of May 2, 1950, to the Tydings committee, and I particularly call your attention to the analysis, beginning page D1, showing that my writings have not followed the Communist line, have conflicted with the Communist line, and have been bitterly attacked by Communists.

May I offer that, Senator?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes; that will be received and marked for reference.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Thank you.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 466," and is filed in the committee file for reference.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. The proceedings before this subcommittee have created so much confusion and mystification about the IPR that I want to repeat, in plain English, that I never had any administrative responsibility in the American IPR, or any supervision of its staff. I have been for some years a trustee, and for a short time after the war I was a member of the executive committee of the American IPR; but as I do not live in New York, my attendance at meetings was infrequent. I also want to say clearly that in my own work as editor of Pacific Affairs from 1934 to 1941 I was not dominated or directed or influenced in any way by Communist or pro-Communist people or attitudes. Pacific Affairs was not an American publication. It was an international publication. I was not responsible to the American IPR, but to the international council.

Articles appearing in Pacific Affairs were circulated in advance to readers in a number of countries. Articles dealing with current con-

troveries were always shown in advance to someone representing the other side of the controversy, in order to maintain a high standard of debate and discussion, while eliminating mere propaganda as far as was humanly possible.

I call your attention to my analysis of Pacific Affairs during the years I edited it which appears on pages C-1 to C-5 of my statement of May 2, to the Tydings committee, which I have just handed to you, and from which I wish to quote a few paragraphs:

May I remind you that throughout this period there was nothing reprehensible or even unusual about the occasional publication of significant left-wing views or the analysis of left-wing movements in far eastern countries^o. Such views and analyses appeared in all the leading journals of the United States and the whole Western World. In those days, before Kohlberg, McCarthy, and Budenz undertook to revise the American tradition of free inquiry and free speech, nobody dreamed of accusing an editor or publisher of being a Russian spy because such views were printed.

I have made a new tabulation for you of all material published in Pacific Affairs under my editorship. Of a total of 250 contributions, only 17—written by 11 persons—could possibly be called, by anyone, left of center because of facts or opinions favorable to Russia, Chinese Communists, guerrillas, or leftist movements in Asia. Remember this was an international magazine; 94 articles were definitely right of center, and 143 either dealt with nonpolitical and noneconomic subjects or presented purely neutral points of view. There was nothing even remotely like a "mobilization" of Communist or leftist writers.

I would also like to point out that the same 11 people who contributed the 17 articles I have mentioned as representing left-wing positions contributed, during the same years, a total of at least 204 articles to reputable non-Communist periodicals including the Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, Literary Digest, American Mercury, Fortune, and the Atlantic Monthly.

And in the same period we published at least 94 contributions that were definitely to the right of center, which means about seven times as much right-wing material as there was material presenting left-wing views or information. Among our right-wing or anti-Russian contributors were Sir Charles Bell, British authority on Tibet and Mongolia; L. H. Hubbard, a Bank of England economist specializing on Russia; Prof. Robert J. Kerner of the University of California; Nicholas Roosevelt; Elizabeth Booddy Schumpeter, who was against a tough policy toward Japan; Arnold J. Toynbee; F. W. Eggleston, later Australian Minister to China; G. E. Hubbard, right-wing British authority on China; William Henry Chamberlin, and a strong representation of Kuomintang writers.

I expect that during the same period, hardly any serious and objective magazine devoted to analysis of political problems, could show a fairer or more representative sample of current thinking.

By promoting the publication and discussion of important facts and opinions the IPR, in my opinion, was making and is still making a valuable contribution to our shockingly meager information about the Far East. To use political intimidation to curtail or eliminate the free market of facts and ideas to which the IPR has contributed would be a catastrophe to the best interests of this country.

In a free country, the discussion of foreign policy cannot be monopolized or patrolled by the government. The people of a democracy, and the officials who handle foreign policy in the government need to be able to draw upon a wide field of academic and private research, done by people who are not subject to bureaucratic controls. It is right that the Congress should interest itself closely in both the issues and the conduct of foreign policy, but it is not right that the Congress should make itself the censor of academic research and personal opinion.

Beginning in 1938, and continuing for several years, the Institute of Pacific Relations carried out a special project, called The Inquiry, financed by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Nothing about

The Inquiry was secret. The whole background of war and political and economic conflict in the Far East was covered, and so were questions of future peace settlements. More than 30 books were published as an "inquiry series." These books went straight into public circulation. They could be bought and read by anybody, including Government officials.

Another research enterprise was carried on in the same years by the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. This research was also financed by a special grant from a private foundation, and its results were submitted to the State Department.

I did not contribute to the Institute of Pacific Relations inquiry. I did contribute to the Council on Foreign Relations research. I took part in more than one of the "study groups" and for a time was chairman of one of them. I wrote memoranda and expressed opinions.

If this subcommittee is interested in my views, its investigative staff is open to the charge of extraordinary incompetence for trying to investigate me through the Institute of Pacific Relations. They should have looked into my connections with the Council on Foreign Relations.

In fact, I think that several memoranda which the Council on Foreign Relations asked me to write in October and November, 1940, were forwarded by the Council to the State Department. The memoranda had no effect whatever, I'm sorry to say. In them I predicted that the Japanese would find it easy to come to terms with the Russians and that Russia would not act jointly with America. Accordingly, I urged that we strengthen our position by increasing aid to China, and I warned that "there is grave danger that we shall get into a war with Japan, with Russia joyfully neutral and uncooperative."

My warnings of a Russian-Japanese get-together were justified when they signed a neutrality pact in April 1941. It turned out that I was right in foreseeing that war between Russia and Germany was more likely than war between Russia and Japan, in expecting Japan to turn south, toward Singapore, and not north toward Russia, and, finally, in warning that this could only be prevented by simultaneously boosting military supplies to China and cracking down on economic supplies to Japan. But the record shows that between the time of these memoranda and Pearl Harbor, a year later, these views of mine had not the faintest effect on the conduct of American foreign policy. We continued to aid the Japanese war machine and to hope that Japan would be kept busy with Russia.

In the good days of freedom when I edited Pacific Affairs for the IPR, no one was being bullied for having an inquiring mind or independent opinions. Every magazine and scholar was eager to get facts and to publish or read diverse opinions on the issues of the time. In those days it is regrettably true that nobody—and I mean nobody—had a crystal ball so that he could see into the future with unerring success. The nature of Communist infiltration was not known. It never entered our heads to set up a private FBI or security screening to determine the exact political affiliation of IPR staff members or contributors to IPR publications. It didn't enter anybody else's head, either. The Saturday Evening Post, the Luce publications, and the Wall Street Journal didn't work that way, either.

As a matter of fact, we had the best protection against being manipulated or duped that a private organization could possibly have—complete openness of discussion of facts and ideas.

Senator FERGUSON. Could I ask a question there? Did I understand you to say back further that you had really nothing to do with the policy or the setting up of what you say now is protection? And where did you get this information about the best protection?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not say anything about setting up anything. I merely said that we did not set up, and that nobody knows—

Senator FERGUSON. But you say back here further that you did not have anything to do with the policy of the IPR.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I said I never had any administrative responsibilities in the American IPR, that is quite true.

Senator FERGUSON. Where did you get the information, then, about "We have the best protection."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because I participated in it, Senator; because I knew that as editor of Pacific Affairs my articles, the articles I published, were circulated all over the place before they were published, and the manuscripts of other articles and also books were circulated all over the place, including some of them coming to me sometimes.

Senator FERGUSON. So that you did know what was going on, you were being consulted about what was going on in the IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, I was not being consulted about what was going on. I was receiving some of the material that was thus circulated.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that any of these people that have refused to testify before this committee as to Communists, when they were writing the articles and books for the IPR, did you know those persons at the time these contributions were being made?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I knew some of them. I knew of others. I did not know of any of them as Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you make any inquiry or did you know of any inquiry about their communist leanings, or being Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I just said, Senator, that it never entered our heads to set up a private FBI or security screenings as of those years of the 1930's.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you mean by that statement, as a matter of fact, "we had the best protection," do you mean in the light of not being of the opinion that there was penetration by Communists? Not having that knowledge, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What we were concerned with at that time was the general question of propaganda or biased presentation of views, any propaganda, any bias. As a matter of fact, what most people were concerned about in those days was Japanese propaganda more than anything else.

Senator FERGUSON. Can we agree that the Communists are very clever in giving out their propaganda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly we can agree on that. I have already stated that in those days, I think, most people were not yet aware of the danger of Communist conspiracy or long-range operation.

Senator FERGUSON. All right. Then do you not think that with the lack of knowledge, that it may have been possible for the Communists to penetrate IPR, and carry on their propaganda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. All I am saying is that the output at that time did not impress me or other people to whom the material was circulated as Communist propaganda.

Senator FERGUSON. Going back now to this problem as to whether or not it is innocence rather than knowledge that they did penetrate IPR, do you think that we ought to disclose to the public, if it was a fact, that, innocently, as far as anybody that was honest about the thing in the IPR, allowed penetration to be had, not knowing that it was being had? Do you not think that if it was penetrated we should disclose that to the public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There was a part of the beginning of your question that I did not get, Senator. I will ask to have it read back.

Senator FERGUSON. No; I will give it again. Suppose we assume for the next question that there was no permission or knowledge upon any of the managers of the IPR—I want to exclude Mr. Field—but that as far as you were concerned, as far as Carter was concerned, as far as Holland and the other people were concerned, that it was because it never entered your head that anybody would try to penetrate, but that they did penetrate, should not that fact now be brought out to the public so that in the future it would be very difficult for penetration to be had without knowledge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no objection whatever to that information being brought out, Senator. In fact, I highly approve of it. What I disapprove of, in the way in which the evidence has been stacked before this committee, is the impression that, because certain people may have been Communists at one time, and I don't know whether they were Communists at that time or later, that certain people who may have been Communists at that time were in the IPR, that they also controlled the policy of the IPR and the output of the IPR.

Now, there are two points there: First, there was no IPR policy to control; second, any honest review of the output of the IPR will show that it did not, in fact, serve Communist interests.

Senator FERGUSON. But of course, now, that is your judgment and you are giving that as your judgment to this committee of seven members, hoping that they will adopt your judgment. But if they come to a different conclusion, are you going to accuse them of bad faith, and is not that what you are doing in this?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I am saying that this committee has thus far admitted an overwhelming amount of accusations and allegations to state, imply, or insinuate that the IPR was an instrument of the Communists, that that evidence is not adequate, that the other side has not been shown, that the enormous output of the IPR of a perfectly normal and even conservative character has been disregarded, and that the result is a distorted picture.

Senator FERGUSON. They have also permitted this record to show today that you, purely on hearsay, have branded Louis Budenz as an immoral person, and other than a Communist, is that not true?

Should we immediately censure you and strike from this record that statement? Or should we let it stand?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The only thing you could do there, Senator, would be to refuse to permit me to quote an official document.

Senator FERGUSON. You have never seen the official document.

Senator O'CONNOR. How do you know what was in the official document if you admit yourself you have never seen it or consulted it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know what my counsel would say to this, but my feeling is that the relationship between counsel and client is of such a kind that I was entirely entitled to take his word for it.

Senator SMITH. Do you know Harry Sacher?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever had any conversation or correspondence with him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever had anybody go from you to him or from him to you and ask for any of this information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Do you know who he is?

Mr. LATTIMORE. From the hearings, from the mention that has been made here.

Senator SMITH. You know from the press who he is, do you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall seeing his name in the press.

Senator SMITH. You do not recall reading about the trial of the Communists in New York City, with Judge Medina?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read some of the stories of the trial about the Communists. I confess I didn't make any minute study.

Senator O'CONNOR. You are at the top of page 14, at the end of the second paragraph.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As a matter of fact we had the best protection against being manipulated or duped that a private organization could possibly have—complete openness of discussion of facts and ideas. All research data, and opinions about the data, were constantly being circulated to, and commented on and criticized by, people who were authorities on the subject and who had, among themselves, many differences of opinion. Under that system, a research organization simply cannot be slanted or controlled to promote communism or any other single and exclusive policy.

If it was party strategy to infiltrate the IPR, I did not suspect it. Nor as a matter of fact, did Senator Ferguson, who was a member of and contributor to the IPR from 1936 to 1944—years when I was active in it, or Ray Lyman Wilbur or Newton D. Baker or Joseph B. Chamberlain or Jerome B. Greene or Robert Gordon Sproul.

Maybe a few Communists or pro-Communists did work for the IPR. I suppose that a few worked for the United States Government, too, and for some of our leading papers and great corporations. It does not follow that this made them communistic, that is, the employer, or that their other employees or executives were infected with the virus. In the case of F. V. Field, I had no reason to consider him a Communist during the period when he was secretary of the American IPR in the 1930's, although I have no doubt he became one during the 1940's. I have been shocked and surprised to learn recently that five other people connected in one way or another with the IPR have refused to say whether they were ever Communists. If they were Communists when I know, or knew of them, then I saw no evidence of it. And certainly an honest and complete review of the IPR will show that it was never controlled or dominated by Communists.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. You speak of five other people, sir. Do you know that in fact, up to this date, there have been 11?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Field, Moore, Rosinger, Kathleen Barnes, William Mandel, Mildred Price, Len DeCaux, the two Keeneys, Deane, and Allen.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Are those all connected with the IPR?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Your knowledge is greater than mine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, because of your reference to your shock and surprise to learn that certain people had refused to answer, I would like to ask this: Do you think that refusal to answer that question indicates that the person refusing is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that that is the general presupposition at the present time. I am informed that people sometimes do refuse to answer that question out of principle.

So far as I know, the five that I have mentioned here, nobody even mentioned that principle. Therefore, I must make the inference that they probably are or were once Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, do you not know that the Constitution would not allow them to claim exemption from testifying only on principle, that they must invoke the fifth amendment which is the one that provides that he shall not testify against himself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your authoritative statement on that.

Mr. SMITH. Who are the five that you referred to here? That is, in this particular spot.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Field, Harriet Moore, Kathleen Barnes, Len DeCaux, Rosinger, and Allen, besides Field.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you not know that by the time those persons you named had testified there were many more than five who had refused to answer that \$64 question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What relation did they have to the IPR or to me? I can only speak of people that I know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not know all of these 11 people I named?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Read them over. I think there are several I never knew.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Field?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I knew him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Harriet Moore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Lawrence Rosinger?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Joseph Barnes?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know William Mandel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Harriet Price?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Len DeCaux?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Len DeCaux, I think I have met him; but I wouldn't recognize him if he walked into the room.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know the Keeneys?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have met them casually; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Deane?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Deane?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know James S. Allen?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, that establishes who you know.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that any of these witnesses refused to testify that they knew you on the grounds it might tend to incriminate them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Here goes some hearsay evidence, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you if you ever heard of it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Somebody told me that James S. Allen so testified. But I didn't see the press report myself, and I heard about that after this statement was prepared.

Senator FERGUSON. How long ago was this statement prepared?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It has been in preparation for several months.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; but when was it finished?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was finished, maybe, 6 or 8 hours before it was delivered to this committee.

Senator FERGUSON. Then why was not Allen's name used here to make it six? You had known that Allen refused to testify.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was confining my remarks to people that I know. I can only be shocked and surprised about people I know.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know Allen?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I corresponded with him, I never met him. At least, I don't believe I did.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you mean by "know" that you knew them personally?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Or had some contact with them; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Writing and corresponding is contact, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; that is right. Well, I have included him, haven't I?

Senator FERGUSON. Have you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. The witness did name Mr. Allen.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right. I was confused here because I first mentioned five people besides Field.

Mr. SOURWINE. You then testified that you did not know Mr. Allen.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not in the sense that I don't believe I ever met him. If you want to say that corresponding means knowing, that is all right, I will accept that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Just so the record shows how you mean when you say.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In this case I am trying to oblige you by meaning what you say.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, you say here on page 14, "I suppose that a few," meaning a few Communists, "worked for the United States Government, too, and for some of our leading papers and great corporations."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any knowledge of any Communists who have worked for the United States Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I could probably provide you with some names, if I searched newspaper files. I can't recall offhand. I am not an expert on the subject.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am speaking of your own knowledge. Do you have, yourself, any personal knowledge of any Communists who have worked for the United States Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any personal knowledge of any Communists who have worked for any of our leading papers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Leading papers? No; I don't think I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any personal knowledge of any Communists who have worked for any of our great corporations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. If we may go back to page 12, sir, where you say, "The investigative staff of this subcommittee is open to the charge of extraordinary incompetence for trying to investigate me through the Institute of Pacific Relations." I ask you, do you know that this subcommittee began this particular investigation because of its interest in the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that is in the record; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that the subcommittee started out with a very substantial mass of documents obtained from the files of the IPR in a manner which you have here characterized as illegal?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It has been given a fair amount of publicity, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you blame the staff of the committee for the fact that after we got into those files we found your name on document after document?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, the point that I was making here, and this is my principal concern with your inquiry into the Institute of Pacific Relations, is that this committee or its staff have tried to use the Institute of Pacific Relations as a stick to beat me with. And I was merely pointing out that if they wanted to beat me up they could do it better with the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does your ego, sir, compel you to the conclusion that this subcommittee is after you rather than investigating the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not my ego; my epidermis.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have come to the conclusion that the committee is after you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Do you think that any other conclusion would be possible to a reasonable person?

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you what your conclusion is. If no other conclusion is possible to a reasonable person, I assume you will say "Yes," that is your conclusion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; that is my conclusion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, that is all of the questions I have at that point.

Senator O'CONNOR. Are there any other questions?

If not, then will you continue, Mr. Lattimore? It occurs to me that another natural break would be at the top of page 19, that that would be a statement that might be taken up at one time.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Fine. The committee staff has used against me letters and interoffice memoranda from the files of the IPR. I have two points that I want to make about the evidence selected from these files.

(1) Each and every item is, in the context of its time and subject, completely innocent and explicable, and certainly not evidence of subversive activity.

(2) The method in which these letters and memoranda have been used is, to say the least, a startling departure from any possible standard of fairness or objectivity. They have been presented to witnesses who did not have access to the full text, and to witnesses who, though they were neither the writers nor the recipients of this "evidence", have been asked to interpret what the original writer meant.

As the outstanding example of the way in which my connections with the IPR have been exploited by this committee, I want to take up a letter that I wrote to Mr. E. C. Carter on July 10, 1938, because of the unnecessary and rather silly mystery which has been built up concerning it. Mr. Carter, as well as a number of people who had nothing to do with the letter, have been asked to comment on it before this subcommittee, whereas I, the author of this letter, was questioned by this subcommittee for between 5 and 6 hours, in executive session, 2 weeks before the public questioning of Mr. Carter, and was not asked a single question about it. If the subcommittee's intention had been to get an explanation of this letter, I could easily have given it to them. Instead, Mr. Carter was asked to explain from memory, after 13 years and without being allowed to see the full text, much less the full correspondence of which it was a part, what he thought I might have meant by a number of expressions that I used.

I therefore wish to make a rather extended comment.

An obvious effort has been made to try to convey the impression that I was giving Carter instructions, but the fact is that I did not take the initiative in writing this letter. Mr. Carter wrote to me, and to a number of other people, asking for comments on the Inquiry, a special research job to be undertaken by the IPR, to which I have referred. In his letter, Mr. Carter had said:

Asiaticus has been employed to prepare a major monograph on certain determining factors in the Chinese situation. Dr. Chen Han-seng will undertake two important sections of the Chinese study. An invitation has just been extended to Mr. Ch'ao-ting Chi to undertake two other sections.

The Inquiry was really none of my business. As I have said I did not contribute to it, and had no administrative or supervisory responsibility for it. Mr. Carter, however, frequently invited comments or advice on particular IPR enterprises from people who had no connection with them.

A great deal has been made of the fact that Asiaticus, Chen Han-seng, and Ch'ao-ting Chi, the three men mentioned by Mr. Carter, have, many years later, been identified before this subcommittee as Communists. Asiaticus was reported killed during the war. The two Chinese are reported to be now working for the Chinese Communist Government, but that is true of a great many Chinese who were loyal to Chiang in earlier years. As it turned out, eventually none of these three men completed a contribution to the Inquiry series.

My reply to Mr. Carter was that he was cagey to invite these three men to contribute. I thought that Mr. Carter was cagey in exactly the same sense that a newspaper columnist once described Senator Homer Ferguson as "benign and cagey." I think that Mr. Carter can be very aptly described as a benign and cagey man. In his work for the IPR he has always tried to increase international knowledge

and understanding, which is benign, and he has always tried to do so by mixing together in the free-market place of discussion as many different points of view as possible, which is equally commendable in my opinion.

I also stated to Carter that the three men suggested would bring out "absolutely essential radical issues." Gentleman, you must remember the year 1938, and the context. I used the word "radical," of course, in its dictionary sense of "fundamental." What I had in mind—as Carter and anybody else would have known, were the radical problems of reform in China and China's relations with foreign powers. In the course of Japanese aggression, there had been conspicuous examples of the Chinese of invaded territory refusing to support the war-lords who oppressed them. They passively accepted the Japanese, because they had nothing to fight for. This had led to widespread demands for reforms in order to give the Chinese people something to fight for, including drastic economic reforms, especially in rural taxes and in the relations between landlords and sharecropper tenants.

If China won the war these radical issues would continue to exist and perhaps might be even more pressing. As we found in every country that was a victim of aggression in the Second World War, soldiers who have just defeated a foreign aggressor and people who have suffered from invasion are likely to demand a better standard of life.

Radical international issues were also looming on the horizon. Chiang Kai-shek had already been pressing for revision of China's international treaties. With China victorious, the Chinese people were certainly going to refuse to go back to the old status under which China was in effect a tributary country to the United States and Britain as well as to Japan and other countries. China was certainly going to demand a place among the great powers of the world. Once we got into the war, the United States recognized this, and over Churchill's objections we voted for China as one of the Big Five of the United Nations.

In my letter to Mr. Carter I went on to say that—

for the general purposes of the inquiry it seems to me that the good scoring position, for the IPR, differs with different countries.

By "different countries" I meant, of course, the different National Councils of the IPR.

For China—

I wrote—

my hunch is that it will pay to keep behind the official Chinese Communist position, far enough not to be covered by the same label but enough ahead of the active Chinese liberals to be noticeable.

The situation as of 1938 was as follows: The Communists were taking, for them, a very moderate position. They were urging rent reduction and other economic reforms. The Chinese liberals were urging a wider political representation and an end of the Kuomintang one-party system, but were hesitating at economic reforms. I thought economic reforms were essential (and I remind you that it is now a generally accepted thing that such reforms, especially rural reforms, are an imperative necessity all over Asia if disastrous Com-

unist revolutions are to be forestalled); and in this respect my position was in advance of the Chinese liberals. However, as I was not a Communist, Carter was not a Communist, and the IPR was not Communist, I did not want the IPR to play into the hands of the Communists by advocating the same economic reforms and allowing them to claim the credit. The Communists were already claiming that they and they alone were bold enough to demand economic reforms. I thought that approval, among foreign friends of China, of the idea of fundamental reforms, especially rural reforms, might encourage the Chinese liberals to speak up and to break the Communist monopoly of claiming to be progressive.

I also wrote: "For the U. S. S. R., back their international policy in general"—

Senator SMITH. The U. S. S. R., is that the Soviet Russia that you are talking about?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Soviet Russia, yes [reading]:

But without using their slogans and, above all, without giving them or anybody else an impression of subservience.

This period, 1938, was the period of maximum Soviet cooperation with the United States, Britain, France, and the League of Nations. It was the stated policy of the U. S. S. R.—almost universally credited at the time as in good faith—to support international unity and to resist Japanese and also German and Italian aggression. Even by 1938, however, I had learned through my experience in dealing with Russians as editor of Pacific Affairs, that it is a standard Soviet maneuver to try to make every act of agreement between equals look as if it were acceptance of Soviet leadership. I did not believe in any such subservience to the Russians, and I did not want the Institute to make the mistake of allowing the Russians to claim, or anybody else to believe, that agreement as to international unity and against aggression was an act of subservience to Russian policy.

Senator FERGUSON. You have one statement here in relation to the letter that indicated to me, and I do not know whether it is right, that Mr. Carter was prohibited from reading this letter, the total of the letter, the whole letter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Where are we now?

Mr. SOURWINE. On page 15, near the bottom, the sixth line from the bottom.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the impression I got from the transcript, Senator. If I am wrong, I should be glad to be corrected.

Senator FERGUSON. Without being allowed to read the full text. I show you the transcript on page 36, where the letter was identified and Senator Eastland asked, "Who is the letter from or to?"

Mr. MORRIS. It is from Mr. Owen Lattimore to Mr. Carter, dated July 10, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the witness should do it.

Senator WATKINS. He probably can identify it better than anyone.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to read it later, but identify it as having been written by Lattimore to me, that I received it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Carter, I would like to read two paragraphs from this and ask your comment on them. This is Mr. Lattimore writing to you.

Would that indicate that he was not allowed to read it? That is, when he had it, identified it, and said that he would like to read it later, and then it goes in in its entirety 3 pages later as exhibit 4?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Later means after the questioning, does it not?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; it becomes a part of the official record; it is put into the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. But he had not read it in full before he was questioned.

Senator FERGUSON. But that is not what you said. You indicate that this committee kept him from reading it and would only allow him to see two paragraphs. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your correction on that, Senator. All I can say is that only part of my time is available, and with very limited means I have tried to make this statement as accurate as possible, and I think it compares favorably on the subject of accuracy with the investigation that has been carried out by this committee with many, many thousands of dollars of the people's tax-paying money.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, you can keep repeating that, and the committee is going to allow you to keep repeating that, as to what you think about the committee.

I know of nobody on the committee that is going to interfere with you if you put that into the record with every answer.

Senator SMITH. Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, this question.

Mr. Lattimore, did you know that this very letter that you are talking about, the cagey letter, that that was in Mr. Carter's barn up in Massachusetts on his farm in Massachusetts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume that is where it came from.

Senator SMITH. I say, Did you know that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't say that from offhand. I presume so, from the point that it was in the record.

Senator SMITH. Did you know that those records of the IPR were taken out of New York City and taken up to Mr. Carter's farm and put in his barn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. So I understand; yes.

Senator SMITH. Did you know at that time they were taken up there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator SMITH. You never heard about that until the public press announced it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire briefly as to another point? On page 15 of your statement, Mr. Lattimore, in the—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before you go on, Mr. Sourwine, may I point out that my reference about being allowed covers more than the question of the full text referred to by Senator Ferguson. I refer also to "much less the full correspondence of which it was a part."

I believe it is true, is it not, Senator Ferguson, that officers and members of the institute have not been allowed to have access to the files while they were in your custody?

Senator FERGUSON. I know of no such rule.

Mr. MORRIS. No, that is wrong, Mr. Lattimore. Mr. Carter has been invited down to look at that particular correspondence you are talking about, by written letter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Has he been allowed full access to all of the files that you hold?

Mr. MORRIS. I answered that particular question, Mr. Lattimore. Mr. Carter asked about that one, and he was invited to come down

and look at it. He has never availed himself of the invitation. That is in writing.

Senator SMITH. I think Mr. Lattimore's question pointed to the fact as to whether or not we would be willing to turn over the files to Mr. Carter and his cohorts, and we have not been willing to turn them back to them because we had enough trouble getting them in the first instance.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might I inquire, Mr. Chairman?

On page 15 of your statement, Mr. Lattimore, in the third paragraph from the top, near the end of that paragraph, you use the word "evidence." You say:

They have been presented to witnesses who did not have access to the full text, and to witnesses who, though they were neither the writers nor the recipients of this "evidence"—

you put the word "evidence" in quotes. When you were reading the statement you read the quotation marks.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your purpose in putting that word "evidence" in quotes?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To emphasize the highly selective nature of the material on which witnesses have been questioned before this committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you use the word "evidence" in the legal sense?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether that is the legal sense or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the word "evidence" have a connotation other than the legal sense in your mind?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Mr. Sourwine. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had no purpose in using those quotation marks to indicate your feeling that the documents in question were not evidence, or did you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My intention was to indicate that they were a mere fragment of the evidence.

Mr. SOURWINE. Over on page 16, you refer to a newspaper columnist who described Senator Ferguson as benign and cagey. Will you tell the committee who that was and when the column appeared?

Mr. LATTIMORE. John O'Donnell, in his column "Capital Stuff," in the—what is the name of this?

Senator FERGUSON. By "this" you mean a newspaper?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. It is the Daily something or other. It is dated Washington, D. C., August 9, and was published in this particular paper, the name of which is not on the top, on August 10, 1948.

Mr. SOURWINE. And how did you come across this particular column? How did you find it or who gave it to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember. I have an enormous stack of clippings at home. I clip as much as I can referring to the Far East, and it is impossible for me to identify where individual clips came from.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that a clipping from your files?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is a clipping from my files; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been in your files since approximately the date on which it appeared?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Not specifically called to your attention in connection with this hearing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it was not called to my attention. It was found by me by accident when pouring through a stack of stuff.

Mr. SOURWINE. On page 17, sir, of your statement, at the end of the first paragraph on that page, you refer to reforms in the relations between landlords and sharecropper tenants.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say you were referring to agrarian reforms?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say I was referring to agrarian reforms; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And on page 18 you use the term "rural reforms" twice. Were you there referring to agrarian reforms?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that is a little bit of a quibble, isn't it, Mr. Sourwine? "Rural reform" and "agrarian reform" are virtually interchangeable terms.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I thought. And the answer is "Yes," is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all of the questions I have.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, in your reference here to Mr. Carter not being allowed to see the full text of the letter, you have known all of the time, have you not, that until those records were seized in Mr. Carter's barn, that the possession of all of those records, including that letter, were in him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably, yes.

Senator SMITH. Now, did you know anything about the difficulty and the delay that the committee experienced in getting some other records that turned out to be in Mr. Field's basement and unbeknown to the committee, and some that were not in the barn? Did you know about those records?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I saw some reference to it in the press.

Senator SMITH. Did you know anything about those records being put in Mr. Field's basement at the time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not a thing.

Senator SMITH. You had severed your connection with IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had no connection—no, I was connected with the IPR, but I was not consulted on the disposal of back files, dead files.

Senator SMITH. So you disclaim any knowledge or responsibility for the records that were taken out of the IPR office and put in Mr. Field's basement in New York City?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no responsibility for it whatever.

Senator SMITH. Did you have anything whatever to do with the suggestion that these records of the IPR be taken from New York and transported to Mr. Carter's barn in Massachusetts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had nothing to do with it.

Senator SMITH. Were you connected with the IPR at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was probably at that time—I would have to know the exact year, but I was very likely a trustee at that time.

Senator SMITH. As a trustee, you had full access to the records of the IPR, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably, if I wanted them.

Senator SMITH. And you availed yourself of that right at any time that you wished to examine IPR records?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I ever availed myself of it.

Senator SMITH. You do not think you did?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator SMITH. Did you ever go to Mr. Carter's farm?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have been to Mr. Carter's farm, yes.

Senator SMITH. When did you go to Mr. Carter's farm?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't remember. It must have been years ago, the last time.

Senator SMITH. You know the barn in which these papers were placed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know the big barn on his place. It is probably the same one.

Senator SMITH. Did you ever go in that barn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I have been there.

Senator SMITH. Did you ever go to the barn while any of these papers were in there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea whether they were there or not.

Senator SMITH. Did you examine any of the files of the IPR in Mr. Carter's barn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't.

Senator SMITH. Did you ask for any of those papers to be brought from his barn for you to examine, either in his house or elsewhere?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator SMITH. So you never saw any of these records after they were taken to Mr. Carter's barn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge, I never saw any of them.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right, Mr. Lattimore, would you proceed. It would appear that a natural break would occur at page 24, so will you continue until that point? It would move things along.

Senator SMITH. Before we leave that, on page 18, where you describe what your hunch was, that you wanted to keep behind the official Chinese Communist position far enough not to be covered by the same label, you meant by that that you did not want this group to be known as associates of the Soviet Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I meant that I didn't think that independent investigation should be conducted in the way that would enable anybody to say that any outside influence was directed.

Senator SMITH. And then you cautioned "far enough not to be covered by the same label."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Did you think it would be detrimental to the organization to have the Soviet label placed on its activities at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, it is very difficult for me to say in 1952 exactly what I had in mind in 1938, in writing an obviously hasty and informal letter.

Senator SMITH. I can quite appreciate that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can say that the best of my recollection at that attitude on questions in China—this was after the all-out Japanese attack on China had begun—my feeling at that time was that the more liberal representatives of the Chinese Kuomintang and other Chinese

who were not members of any party had a great opportunity at that time to carry on reforms along with the war, that would put the whole question of the modernization and postwar, wartime, and postwar development, of China on a footing of progress in a democratic direction, and not allow these very simple and necessary reforms in China to be captured by the Communists or have the Communists claim that they dominated the whole business.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, I asked you what I thought was a very simple question in its form, and I think the answer would be simple.

I asked you whether or not at that time, when you were referring to this same label, you regarded that it would be detrimental to this group to have the Communist label placed on them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Again; with all of the reservations that are necessary in trying to think up exactly what I meant in 1938, 14 years ago, I would say that my feeling was probably quite as much about the nature of the problem in China as it was about the nature of the problem lying before the IPR.

Senator SMITH. I was not asking about the problem. I was asking you the one simple question: Did you at that time regard the Soviet label as detrimental?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should have regarded any approach to a monopoly to the labels of progress, reform, democracy, and so forth, by the Communists in China as highly detrimental.

Senator SMITH. I was asking about the Soviet label which you apparently are referring to here. You cautioned them to keep far enough not to be covered by the same label. But enough ahead of the active Chinese liberals to be noticeable.

Now did you not mean by that that you did not want the Soviet label to be put on in the first instance, and yet you wanted them far enough ahead of the Chinese liberals so that it would be noticeable that you were not going along with the Chinese liberals?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I made it fairly clear that what I wanted to do was to spur on and encourage, if possible, the leadership of necessary reforms in China by the non-Communist Chinese. And again, speaking after 14 years, my supposition would be that what I was referring to was not to let the Communists put their label on reforms, and not a question of just the general public thinking that this is Communist.

Senator SMITH. Further down on page 18, you also wrote:
for the U. S. S. R.—

and you mean by that Soviet Russia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH (continuing):

Back their international policy in general, but without using their slogans and, above all, without giving them or anybody else an impression of subservience.

In other words, you were suggesting that they follow the international policy of the Soviets, were you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. I was speaking then in the context of the fact that this was the most cooperative and internationalist period of Soviet foreign policy, when I think most people accepted the idea that the Soviet line at that time, which was the indivisibility of peace and

so on, was in good faith. And I thought, and so did many people in this country and in Europe, that this was a good kind of policy to follow.

But I certainly did not want—I would not do it myself, and I would not want any organization with which I was connected—to encourage the Russians to think that we had no minds of our own and were letting them make up our minds.

Senator SMITH. Why were you counseling Mr. Carter to back their international policy in general?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The policy at that time was a policy of resistance to aggression, both in Europe and in Asia. And if that had been at the time the over-all policy of Britain or of France, I would have said back their policy.

Senator SMITH. I said back their international policy, Russia's policy, in general.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That policy at that time, as of the late 1930's, was, in my opinion, a very good policy of united international resistance to aggression. I approved it when the Russians followed that policy just as I disapprove of it, of the Russians, now when they are guilty of aggression.

Senator SMITH. That was not their international policy in general, was it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1938; yes.

Senator SMITH. Were they not still pursuing the Communist policy then?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1938 they were pursuing a policy of maximum cooperation with the then League of Nations, with Britain and France, and so on.

Senator SMITH. Yet their general international policy was Communist, was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, you are going into questions of what people knew or thought about Soviet Russia in the 1930's from the point of view of what we know and think about Russia in the 1950's. I do not claim that in the 1930's I knew as much about the character of Russian or Communist policy as I think I know now.

I have this feeling of the possibility of cooperation with Russia is not one that is peculiar to me. It lasted well after the 1930's. As late as 1942, General MacArthur said "The hopes of civilization rest on the worthy shoulders of the courageous Russian Army."

In 1943, the New York Times—

Senator SMITH. He did not say anything about the political policy of Russia, did he? He is talking about the army. He is talking about the fighting qualities of the army, is he not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should have said that in 1942 a major part of the Russian policy was expressed in the actions of its army. But I may be mistaken.

In 1943, the New York Times, in an editorial, wrote: "We can do business with Stalin, and that business will help our political relations with the Russians. A tenth of the human beings of the world are on the way to higher living standards in Russia."

In 1946, in the Catholic Quarterly, the Reverend George H. Dunne wrote: "If Europe moves all the way to communism, it will not be because of Russian intervention but because of the obstructionist tactics of die-hard reactionaries."

In 1942, the Chicago Tribune wrote—

Senator SMITH. None of those people wrote such letters as you did here to Mr. Carter; did they? I am asking what you said, what you meant, not what the New York Times said or what anyone else said.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am merely trying to make a little bit plainer the fact that I think is fairly plain: That I showed at that time an optimistic view of the possibility of cooperating with Russia and with a number of other nations against the kind of aggression that the Germans, Italians, and Japanese were putting on.

It seems to me a little bit—I don't know quite what the word is, but perhaps a little bit inconsistent—to demand that I prove that everybody who felt the same way that I did also wrote to the same people that I wrote to.

Senator SMITH. I was asking you about your language. But if that is your answer, that is all right. I was asking you about your specific language which was quoted in that statement.

Senator FERGUSON. You indicated that back in the late 1930's and the early 1940's you did not have knowledge of the Communist infiltration; is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is correct.

Senator FERGUSON. Would not this letter that Senator Smith has just been asking you about, that part, indicate that you did have some knowledge of the operations of Communist infiltration and Communist tactics?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, Senator; that is a little bit far-fetched.

Senator FERGUSON. You say it would not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had had experience with the Russian representatives in the IPR, that they were a highly combative bunch, and that any time there was agreement or even approach to agreement with the Russians they claimed it was because other people had agreed with them and not because they had agreed with other people.

The difference between that and political infiltration seems to me to be fairly obvious.

Senator FERGUSON. You were considered as a student of international law, of international affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. In those years I was not considered a student of either. I have never, in fact, been a student of international law, and so far as I was a student of international affairs, my primary qualifications, in 1938, were based on my specialized work in the Mongol border regions of China.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you did not look into the question of strategy and the tactics of communism?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; at that time I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. I show you a report here headed "Under Trojan horse tactics," what was printed as of 1935 about their tactics. If you did not know about that, how do you account for no one in the IPR, which was interested in international law and international politics, and problems in the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't answer for other people in the IPR. Senator Ferguson. All I can say is that as of 1938 I did not regard myself, and was not regarded by anybody else, as an expert on any kind of communism.

Senator FERGUSON. I ask the research director of the committee to read that into the record at this place.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right.

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, you will identify it?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. It is part of the transcript, as I understand it, the identification.

Senator O'CONNOR. Suppose when reading it, you give the identification first.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a quotation from the House Committee on Un-American Activities report dated 1939. On page 27 the annual report reads as follows:

In 1935, the Communists changed their tactics, their strategy and tactics, to what is now known as the Trojan horse tactics. Georgi Dimitrov in an address to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow, in August 1935, said: "Comrades, you remember the ancient tale of the capture of Troy? Troy was inaccessible to the armies attacking her, thanks to her impregnable walls, and the attacking army, after suffering many sacrifices, was unable to achieve victory until, with the aid of the famous Trojan horse, it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's camp. We revolutionary workers, it appears to me, should not be shy about using the same tactics."

Printed from the Workers Library Publishers, New York City, a Communist publishing house, in reporting the full text of the Dimitrov address to the Communist International, July 25 to August 21, 1935.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't see what earthly relevance that has to what we are talking about. But I do think it is a pity that Georgi Dimitrov didn't go into the question of whether wooden horses didn't have wooden horse feathers.

Senator FERGUSON. That is your answer to no question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is a comment.

Senator O'CONNOR. As I have stated before, it would appear to be a connected statement from pages 19 to 24. If we proceed to read that uninterrupted it would be more expeditious. All right, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The personal damage that has been done to me by the way in which this subcommittee has allowed malicious testimony to be stacked against me is probably beyond repair. But much more important is the damage that has been done to my country, the country of which I am only one private citizen, and the damage that has been done to the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

When China fell to the Chinese Communists, it was a grave set-back to the interests of this country, an unmitigated tragedy. This particular outcome of the Second World War, the establishment of a Communist government in China, was the result of complex causes. Some of these causes go far back in history. Some were the results of the changing balance of power produced by the Second World War. Some were due to the decay and internal corruption of the previous government of China.

I have been, to the best of my ability, a careful student of the causes, course, and outcome of this great contemporary catastrophe. I believe that in part it could be foreseen and was in fact foreseen by various individuals. I believe that, with the advantage of hindsight, a number of mistakes can be pointed out in the handling of the American policy that attempted, at various stages, to forestall, to avoid, and finally to mitigate this catastrophe.

It would be useful to analyze these mistakes of the past, as a guide to the future, but it certainly serves no patriotic purpose to distort mistakes, or, more accurately, lack of success, as if they were signs of

guilt. The attribution of personal guilt for the mere purpose of providing political scapegoats is not civilized or democratic behavior, however widespread it may be among primitive groups of men.

But what I emphatically do not believe is that the catastrophe was brought about by the treachery or incompetence of those entrusted with our foreign policy. By and large, I believe that our China policy was handled not only loyally but as competently as could have been reasonably expected, considering the many forces and circumstances in the situation that were beyond our control.

I believe that it is as important to the welfare and safety of this country to have a strong State Department and an able Foreign Service in our diplomacy as it is to have effective military forces. I believe that the usefulness of our Foreign Service personnel has already been jeopardized by the work of this committee—both directly by attacks on irreplaceable personnel, and indirectly by impairing the confidence of the Nation and our foreign allies in our State Department and by instituting a reign of terror among our Foreign Service personnel.

First, as to the direct injury: It is a fact that almost all the few men with outstanding experience and knowledge of China have already either been eliminated from the Department of State or are working in other parts of the world, in the hope of keeping them out of the line of fire of a bitterly partisan political fight and out of range of the venom of men who are determined to find evil where none exists.

Senator O'CONNOR. The parties will kindly desist from any display of approval or disapproval while the hearing is in progress, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The three outstanding—

Senator O'CONNOR. Would it be desirable to take a recess at this point?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I may.

Senator O'CONNOR. We will take a recess for 5 minutes.

(A brief recess was here taken.)

Senator O'CONNOR. The hearing will please be in order.

All right, Mr. Witness, will you proceed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The three outstanding examples of men sacrificed to the hysteria that has been whipped up in this country by the China lobby—a hysteria to which this committee, I am sorry to say, is contributing—are John Stewart Service, O. Edmund Clubb, and John Carter Vincent. Any one of these men would have been capable of holding, in our far-eastern policy, the kind of respected position that is held with regard to Russian policy by George Kennan; but where are they now?

John Stewart Service, an exceptionally able career diplomat, after being cleared six times by the State Department Loyalty Security Board—and I believe I am in error there; I believe it is more than six times—and after a careful statement that he was not guilty of disloyalty, has been summarily dismissed for “reasonable doubt” of disloyalty, under a new ruling.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that not a Presidential order, and is that not the wording of it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As to “reasonable doubt”?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. I have not made it specific in my statement here, but the thought in my mind in referring to this is that whoever

is responsible for this ruling, it constitutes a new ruling on past cases which has been given retroactive force and conveys to some members of the public, of whom I am one, a flavor of cruel and unusual punishment, the pursuit of a man until you have completely failed to get him under existing rules, and then saying, "All right, we will get him; we will make a new rule."

Senator FERGUSON. Well, the President made the rule; did he not? It is his Presidential order.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not informed in detail on that, Senator. I should consider it a part of the general disastrous and pusillanimous retreat of the State Department under the bludgeoning to which it has been subjected. I regret it, but I consider it a fact.

Senator FERGUSON. You charge the State Department with cruel and unusual punishment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, is that not just exactly what you said?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is the Loyalty Review Board a part of the State Department?

Senator FERGUSON. No; it is part of the executive branch. And you said it was because the State Department had been cowed or bludgeoned.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not an expert, Senator, on the structure of the Federal Government. Perhaps I should have informed myself more carefully on this, particularly as I am vitally concerned about it.

Senator FERGUSON. You are trying to give this committee some advice and opinion, and I would have thought you would have sought accurate information before you would swear to it, that we would rely upon it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have certainly tried to give this committee my opinion. If I had thought that this committee was susceptible to advice, perhaps I might have thought out my terminology more carefully in that context.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, of course, you know what we want is not just opinion advice. We want facts. Now, I will ask you—and I think perhaps I can clear this up and I can understand how you may not be familiar—you say here "cleared six times by the State Department Loyalty Security Board."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. That is a board, as I understand, composed of State Department employee officers or employees. Now, I did not understand you referred to the President's Loyalty Board, which is the over-all Board, which is a review board. Which are you referring to in this language?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I am correct in saying that his summary dismissal by the State Department was mandatory immediately upon the rendering of the verdict of the Loyalty Review Board.

Senator SMITH. That is the over-all Board. So that what you say here was with reference to the State Department Board itself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I am referring to the general—

Senator SMITH. The over-all Loyalty Board, the President's Loyalty Review Board?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, it was responsible.

Senator SMITH. You understand that each department has a loyalty board, and then there is the President's Loyalty Review Board which

hears appeals from these different departments, which among others is the State Department? I am just trying to get it clear which you had reference to.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you read the opinion by the Review Board, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I read it at the time.

Senator SMITH. And did you find any evidence in that opinion that they were of the opinion that Mr. Service had or had not given some secret papers or documents to Amerasia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I remember that their conclusion, which I have quoted here, was that he was not guilty of disloyalty.

Senator SMITH. Well, do you remember the other, that they had found as a matter of fact that he had delivered secret documents to any member of the Amerasia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection of that differs from yours, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you, and I am not making a statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection is that he had in his possession only declassified papers.

Senator SMITH. Did they not mention that he had given papers to Amerasia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If your information is better than mine, I will accept it. What I remember is the conclusion of the Loyalty Review Board that he was not disloyal.

Senator FERGUSON. Did they find that under the rule that the President had laid down, that there was reasonable doubt of his disloyalty, and therefore he should be discharged?

Mr. LATTIMORE. They found, they very carefully stated, that he was not disloyal, and then they said that they felt entitled to consider him as—what is it—

Senator SMITH. A bad security risk?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. Something about reasonable doubt of loyalty.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you are placing—

Mr. LATTIMORE. It seems to me a shotgun sort of rule, under which to try to run a government.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, then, your criticism is of the Presidential order, on that statement; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In this connection, my criticism is of the entire policy of the executive branch, which I think has been brought about by a disastrous attempt to appease the China lobby and others attacking the foreign policy of this country.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. O. Edmund Clubb, a political observer and reporter of outstanding conscientiousness and ability, with a unique experience combining China, central Asia, and Russia, was publicly suspended for 7 months, without pay and on the flimsiest of charges, while his loyalty was being investigated. After finally being vindicated and reinstated, he has resigned. He has taken to heart the now obvious lesson that the State Department is not a safe place for a man who has been cleared.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, did you know what the charges against Mr. Clubb were?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as they appeared in the press, I had a general knowledge of them, and I considered them extremely flimsy and I have so stated here.

Senator FERGUSON. Could you repeat any of them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. One was about going to the New Masses, visiting the New Masses; and another one was about knowing the late Agnes Smedley.

Senator FERGUSON. Any others?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall offhand.

Senator FERGUSON. And you describe them as "the flimsiest of charges?"

Mr. LATTIMORE. I consider those to be extremely flimsy charges for questioning the loyalty of a State Department man who, as a servant of the State Department endeavoring to qualify himself by knowledge of factors important in foreign policy, should be able to consider it a duty to know, converse with, and have discussions with people of the most varied kind.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever have any discussion or talk with Mr. Service after his discharge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Since his discharge, I haven't seen him, I don't think.

Senator FERGUSON. While matters were pending?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have seen him occasionally; yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk over what the charges were?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In a general way; yes. I did not ask for his confidence, and my purpose in seeing him was to show that as a friend of his, I was not going to be scared off.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I assume that you were not a witness for Mr. Service?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was not a witness.

Senator FERGUSON. Or Mr. Clubb or Mr. Vincent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Or Mr. Clubb or Mr. Vincent.

John Carter Vincent, a man of ambassadorial seniority, has for several years been removed from work in the area of his unique specialty—the Far East—and has been assigned to North Africa, because, in the prevailing temper of the times, the administration dares not return him to work where he belongs and is needed.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Lattimore, you have named three men here whom you think have been unfairly treated; that is, John Stewart Service, O. Edmund Clubb, and John Carter Vincent.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I modify one word there, Senator? I think "scandalously" would be better than "unfairly."

Senator JENNER. I will accept your word.

Now, going back to another period in history in the Far East, would you be kind enough to tell this committee what you thought of the way Joseph Grew was treated?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know very little, indeed, about the resignation of Mr. Grew, and I couldn't tell you offhand by whom he was replaced.

Senator JENNER. Do you know anything about Stanley Hornbeck, what happened to him, and why?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have known Stanley Hornbeck for many years.

Senator JENNER. Would you tell the committee about his career in the Far East, and what happened to it, and why?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I understood that he served the last assignment as Ambassador to the Netherlands, and then retired in the ordinary course.

Senator JENNER. And Mr. Dooman?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know very slightly.

Senator JENNER. Could you tell us anything about his career?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know anything about his career.

Senator JENNER. Or Patrick Hurley, or his experience in the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know what I have read in the press.

Senator JENNER. Lieutenant General Wedemeyer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know what I have heard in the press.

Senator JENNER. Adolph Berle?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Practically nothing.

Senator JENNER. Is it not a fact that these men, too, were either removed from office or assigned to diplomatic posts or military posts of no importance because they did not go along with the policy of the State Department in the Far East? Is that not true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know about the details of reassignment or retirement of any of these men, Senator.

Senator JENNER. Well, you have made a reference here about "attacks on irreplaceable personnel." Now, these men that I have named were all replaced, and do you know who replaced them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, can you inform me whether any of the men that you have just mentioned were ever pilloried for months on end in the press as Communists, or Communist stooges, or agents of the policy of a foreign—

Senator JENNER. No. As a matter of fact, they were just the opposite. They were anti-Communist, and then walked the plank because they were, and that is what I am trying to get at. You are supposed to be an expert on this situation, and I assumed that you knew about all of these facts.

Now, would you tell me what you mean by "irreplaceable personnel," "both directly by attacks on irreplaceable personnel"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that personnel like Vincent, Service, and Clubb are very difficult to replace.

Senator JENNER. Would you say that Joseph Grew and Stanley Hornbeck and Adolph Berle and Patrick Hurley and Lt. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer would be hard to replace?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know enough about the details of their qualifications to have an opinion, Senator.

Senator JENNER. Well, I think another thing should be brought out here, Mr. Chairman, this question of reasonable doubt, this new rule that the witness says he does not care for.

Reasonable doubt; "has been summarily dismissed for 'reasonable doubt' of disloyalty, under a new ruling."

Are you trying to tell this committee that if there is a reasonable doubt about a man being loyal to this country, that he should remain in the office of public trust and handling secret papers, and so forth? If there is a reasonable doubt about it, do you believe he should be retained in that kind of a position?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I believe that the question of loyalty in our Government service is of paramount importance.

Senator JENNER. I noticed you stated that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is of such importance that I think it should be handled strictly on grounds of proof or disproof; that vague words like "reasonable doubt," which may mean one thing to one man and

something else to somebody else, are not the words of a ruling under which a high morale can be maintained in the Department.

May I read, Senator, something of what I mean here, and it is an editorial from the American Foreign Service Journal of August 1951. This generally represents the point of view of the Foreign Service men in the Department of State. I quote:

Another direct cost of this baiting is the toll it takes among members of the coming generation, who have talents and capabilities to contribute in the future formulation of a wise foreign policy for our country, but who are frightened away by the sort of hatchet work which seems on the way to becoming accepted as commonplace. In 1949, there were 1,128 candidates who took the foreign service examination; and in 1950, candidates numbered 807. This year— that is, 1951—

despite extra solicitation, only 760. The draft, competitive job opportunities in a booming economy, and administrative problems of enlarging the service were partly responsible. Nevertheless, this change, which was made the subject of methodical inquiry, clearly demonstrated that regardless of interest in or qualification for the field of foreign affairs, young people simply do not see any valid reason why they should put their persons, careers, and reputations in potential jeopardy by joining the State Department.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who wrote that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know John K. Emerson is one of the editors of the publication from which you have just read?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't know that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think that he might have written that article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Senator FERGUSON. Could I inquire whether it is a State Department magazine?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know what its connection with the State Department is.

Senator FERGUSON. Could I see it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe it is generally considered the fraternity journal of the Foreign Service of the United States.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not know at what expense it is being published?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Or at whose expense?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator JENNER. I come back to this same question, and I do not know whether the witness answered it or not: You deplore these men being attacked and you call them irreplaceable men, and I am going to ask you if a man was anti-Communist, such as Joseph Grew, Stanley Hornbeck, Mr. Dooman, Patrick Hurley, Lieutenant General Wedemeyer, you would also abhor replacing those irreplaceable men, too, would you not, because they were anti-Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have no idea of the grounds upon which any of those men resigned or were replaced.

Senator JENNER. You are not acquainted with these men and their careers and their position on the Far East and you are a far-eastern expert?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Some of them I have met very slightly, and you have mentioned several who are concerned primarily with Japan, which is not my field of specialization, and the assertion that they

were fired because they were anti-Communists is your assertion, Senator, and I never knew that before.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, it is a fact that at the time Mr. Grew and at least some of these other men were fired, we did not have the same situation in the Far East with respect to the Communists being in dominant control that we have today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume you are right. This was some years ago, wasn't it?

Senator SMITH. Yes. So that since these men who were known as anti-Communists were relieved of their duties and their positions communism has made great advances in the Far East?

Senator JENNER. That is why they were removed.

Senator SMITH. I am just asking for the facts.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is your argument, Senator, a post hoc, ergo propter hoc?

Senator SMITH. I believe you said you did not want to indulge in legal or technical language, so I am asking you in plain language if, after these men were removed, it is not a fact that there have been great advances by communism in the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. Of course, the advances of communism since the death of Julius Caesar have been even greater.

Senator SMITH. And that is the relation that you think, or the attitude that you think you ought to have in discussing a current matter?

Senator FERGUSON. Could we have an answer, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I confess, Senator, I see no connection between the points you are making.

Senator SMITH. But the fact remains the same, that we did have a great many millions of friends who were anti-Communist in the Far East, but sometime after these men, as Senator Jenner referred to, were released, then some kind of influence got in there by which today we do not have the same number of friends and that section of the world has gone Communist; and you say that there is no connection, in your opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A large part of the Far East has gone Communist. I don't know exactly how to take your expression that we had many millions of friends there. A question would arise there of how far they were actually friends, and how far they might have become friends or stronger friends under a different policy, and the question of whether they were merely sitting on the sidelines and waiting for things to happen, and so forth.

Senator SMITH. There was a change in our policy in the Far East, was there not, after Mr. Grew and these others who have been mentioned were relieved of their duties?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure that I could point to any change in our policy, Senator, that could be accurately coordinated with the service of these particular men.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know Mr. Davies when he was in the Far East, John K. Davies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. John P. Davies, and I knew him, not very well, but I knew him.

Senator FERGUSON. You have not used his name here. Is there any reason? You have named three, but you did not name Mr. Davies.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I named these three particularly because I know them better, but I would include Mr. Davies among those who have been sent to hide out in non-far eastern countries by the State Department, presumably hoping they will be there safe from snipers.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you hear the testimony of Mr. Munson, a former CIA agent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. And you do not know what the testimony might be in the hearing here about Mr. Davies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I saw some reference to it in the newspapers, but that part of the transcript of this committee's proceedings had not become available when this was written.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you read it in the newspapers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read it in the newspapers.

Senator FERGUSON. And after reading that, would you say that you would still include him as one of these persons?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I also read a statement—

Senator FERGUSON. Answer my question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Excuse me; I am answering it, Senator. I also read a statement in the newspapers from Mr. Davies, something to the effect that the whole matter had been taken up previously and cleared in the hearings, or something of that sort.

Senator FERGUSON. And then you placed your reliance on his statement, and not on what the CIA man had testified to under oath?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am in no position to place my reliance on either statement, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. But you are including him now as one of those that you think have been unjustly discharged?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The accusations had not been made when Mr. Davies was sent to Germany, or when I wrote this statement.

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you as of today.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As of today, I have no opinion.

Senator JENNER. Referring to your statement here:

But much more important is the damage that has been done to my country, the country of which I am only one private citizen, and the damage that has been done to the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

Now, I will ask you, could you possibly conjure a set of facts where our foreign policy could have been more mishandled, from Yalta down to the present time, in the Far East? You are a student of this, sir, and it is a fact that at Yalta we gave Manchuria to Russia and the northern half of Korea, and the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands; and it is the fact that we sent General Marshall to China with the specific mission to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his government and into his army and to have a united-front government; and it is the fact that when World War II ended, there was only about 175 million Communists. And as a result of Yalta, and confirmed at Potsdam, and the Marshall mission, and the replacing of these loyal Americans who were anti-Communists in the Far East with men who were following, I will say, at least the pro-Communist line, could you think of any more damage that your country has suffered than that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am afraid that I can agree with hardly a word that you have said.

Senator JENNER. You think our policy in the Far East has been successful?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that our policy, or I think that our interests in the Far East have suffered extremely serious setbacks, and I do not believe that those setbacks were a consequence of our policy.

Senator JENNER. That was our policy, was it not: Yalta, the Marshall mission, replacing these men who were fighting the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, you have made a characterization of Yalta and of General Marshall's mission with which, I am sorry, but I don't agree.

Senator JENNER. I think that that is the whole crux of it. That has been our policy; and if it has been successful, you think it has been successful. Certainly I do not think it has been successful.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should like to read you the words, Senator, of somebody who has expressed this problem better than I—

Senator JENNER. I do not care to hear someone else's words. I want your words on it, and you stated that the policy has been successful.

Senator O'CONNOR. I think we can settle this very well.

Senator JENNER. He has answered my question, and I do not care for a dissertation on the speech—

Senator O'CONNOR. If Mr. Lattimore wishes to adopt the language used by someone else, it is perfectly permissible for him to read it.

Senator JENNER. He said he thought it had been a successful policy.

Senator O'CONNOR. I thought he wanted to elaborate on it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I want the reporter to read back and see if I said anywhere that we had a successful policy.

Senator SMITH. Did you say that, or not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly not.

Senator O'CONNOR. I did understand that you wished to elaborate somewhat.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is from Mr. George F. Keenan, our newly appointed and confirmed Ambassador to Russia, in his recent book, *American Democracy—1900-50*:

It is similarly incorrect to portray the Yalta Agreement as a terrible betrayal of Nationalist China. The agreement was that we should recommend certain things to the Chinese Government. The leaders of that Government were not averse to these things at the time. They had asked us long before Yalta to help them to arrange their affairs with the Soviet Government. They later expressed themselves as well satisfied with what we had done. And in the subsequent negotiations, which they themselves conducted independently with the Russians, and which actually constituted the controlling arrangement for the future of Manchuria, they went in some respects further in the way of concessions to the Soviet Union than anything that had been agreed upon at Yalta and recommended to them by us. They did this despite the fact that they were warned by us that in doing so they were acting on their own responsibility and not at our recommendation.

I should like to add a point, and this I quote from the Reporter magazine, the issue of February 19, 1952:

"In the treaty"—

and this is the treaty between the Chinese and Russia direct—

"the Chinese Nationalists, who seemed eager to court Soviet friendship"—

and this is the Chinese Nationalists who were eager to court Soviet friendship—

"made concession which went beyond the provisions of the Yalta Agreement, and were prevented from going even further only by the persuasion of Averell Harriman, who was then United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Ambassador Pat Hurley reported that Chiang Kai-shek was generally satisfied with the treaty, and thanked me"—

that is, thanked General Hurley—

"for the basis that I had helped him to lay for reapproachment with the Soviets."

Madam Chiang, then in the United States, called on President Truman to compliment him on the result of the conversations between the Nationalists and the Soviet representatives, and thank him for the United States help in bringing them about.

Life magazine as of that time, which seems to have changed its mind, hailed the treaty as "as great a victory for common sense as the defeat of Japan was for armed might" and indicated that it was "a vindication of American policy in Asia for almost 50 years."

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who wrote that, Mr. Lattimore?
Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

It forecast a warm brotherly collaboration between Chiang and Mao Tze-tung.

From Life magazine: "Peace, lively but genuine peace," they cried, "is therefore the outlook."

Senator JENNER. Do you know who wrote that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you adopting it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am adopting it as far as it is an accurate quotation of the people who are quoted, the—

Senator FERGUSON. Are you adopting it as being the correct view?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am adopting it insofar as it may quote correctly from the people from whom it quotes.

Senator FERGUSON. That is not answering my question at all.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is as far as I can answer it.

Senator FERGUSON. You can answer my question.

Mr. FORTAS. I think if you will clarify what you mean by "adoption"—

Senator FERGUSON. Are you adopting it as your testimony, or are you only quoting somebody else?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am quoting from original sources which have been cited in a secondary source, which I have not yet had time to verify or check. If the quotations are accurate, I am willing to present it as my testimony that they are accurate.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I am not asking you that. That was not my question at all. Do you agree with what is said in the articles or the matter that you have just read?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I agree that that was said.

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask you that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At the time it was said.

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask you that, whether you agreed it was said. I asked you whether you agreed with it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't agree, or automatically agree, on the correctness in 1952 of things that were said in 1949.

Senator FERGUSON. Why did you put it in the record?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because the Senator here had made a statement implying that everything that had been done in American foreign policy in those years was the work of American traitors.

Senator FERGUSON. He did not indicate and ask you to bring out evidence of what somebody else said, did he? He was asking for your opinion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My impression is, Senator, that he was making a rhetorical statement, at the end of which he asked for my agreement, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; your agreement, and not someone else's agreement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I told him I couldn't agree, and then I produced this evidence from the period as an indication of why I couldn't agree.

Senator JENNER. Could we get the record straight? It started like this: I was reading from the statement of Professor Lattimore—

But much more important is the damage that has been done to my country, the country of which I am only one private citizen, and the damage that has been done to the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

And I asked the witness if he could think of any greater damage that could be brought about as a result of our policy, and that is how the question started.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is where we disagree, you see. I don't think it was brought about by our policy.

Senator JENNER. That is all I want. That was an answer to my question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. You are entitled to your opinion.

Senator JENNER. You are quoting people, and you do not know who they are, and you referred to a treaty in this quotation that you just read, and that was the treaty between China and Russia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator JENNER. When was that treaty entered into?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see, the Yalta agreement was in February of 1945, and was followed within a few months, I think, by a direct Chinese Nationalist Treaty with Russia.

Senator JENNER. In other words, the treaty you are reading from followed the Yalta agreement. Now I will ask you: Was Chiang Kai-shek or the Chinese Government represented at the Yalta agreement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator JENNER. And if you were the leader of a country and you had been "sold down the river," would you not begin fighting for your life, and do you suppose that had anything to do with this treaty that you have been reading about, as to which you do not know who wrote it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have just quoted from George Keenan, who was in the State Department—

Senator JENNER. I remember that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Handling these affairs, which I was not, and therefore better informed on the subjects than I am, stating presumably as authoritatively as it can be stated that before Yalta, Chiang Kai-shek had asked us to undertake these conversations.

Senator JENNER. Was Chiang consulted about Yalta and the agreements reached at Yalta?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My understanding is that Chiang asked us to undertake discussions with the Russians, which led up to what was decided at Yalta.

Senator JENNER. And he was not at Yalta, and he was not consulted about the future interests of his country, and he was one of our allies, was he not, Professor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, the evidence that I have just read is a clear indication that he was not only consulted, but that he was consulted at his own initiative, and consulted before Yalta.

Senator SMITH. Was there not a refusal to him to have him present at Yalta?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My memory of that, Senator, is somewhat hazy, and I think it could be looked up in the white book that there was an agreement between the Americans and the British before going to Yalta, not involving the Russians at all but an American-British agreement, that in view of the proved leaking security of Chungking, where top secrets were steadily being reported to the Japanese, it was inadvisable to have a Chinese Nationalist representative at a conference where we hoped, as the outcome, to get the consent of Russia to enter the far eastern war against Japan, because if that had leaked to Japan through Chungking, it would have been a disaster.

Senator JENNER. And at that time, that particular time, is it not correct that the military leaders were telling us that Japan was a defeated nation; and that we entered into an agreement with Russia, unbeknownst to Chiang Kai-shek, to equip an army, a Siberian Russian Army of 1,250,000 Russian soldiers, to fight with us 6 days in a war against Japan? Is that correct, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe it is, Senator.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe the record shows that the pressure at Yalta to accept anything that the Russians might demand as a condition for entering the war against Japan, came primarily from the armed services.

Senator SMITH. Well, there were efforts made by at least someone in the American forces to keep the Yalta agreement from being entered into, with respect to Russia coming to war for that short period of time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I have read something about an effort on the part of some group within the Armed Forces to change that decision.

Senator SMITH. Was Mr. Keenan there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At Yalta? I believe he was, but I am not sure.

Senator SMITH. Who was the main man representing the State Department at Yalta? Was it not Mr. Alger Hiss?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, I believe Mr. Hiss had a rather subordinate position at Yalta, and if Mr. Keenan was there he certainly far out-ranked Hiss.

Senator SMITH. But you do not know whether Keenan was there, and you do not know if he was there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. Let me see, I think Stettinius was there.

Senator SMITH. But Hiss was the confidential man dealing with Stettinius and the President at Yalta?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know how confidential the position held by Hiss was, Senator Smith. My understanding is that at that time his position in the Department of State was rather low.

Senator SMITH. Well, there is no doubt but what Yalta sealed the doom of Nationalist China, did it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should question that very much, Senator.

Senator SMITH. You think it had nothing to do with it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should say that on the contrary, as far as the direct effects of Yalta reached, they favored the early entry of Chiang Kai-shek's troops into Manchuria.

Senator SMITH. In any event, after the Yalta Agreement, the Nationalist cause got continuously worse, did it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, it didn't get continuously worse, Senator. In the first period after the surrender of Japan, there was a steadily increasing expansion of the territory occupied, military power, and military authority of the Nationalist Government, and the decline came after that expansion.

Senator SMITH. How long after that expansion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, let me see. I think it began, the decline began—I am not sure of my memory here, and I would have to look up the record—but I believe toward the end of 1948, and I do recall that General Wedemeyer, who has been cited here, attributed the weakening of the position of Chiang Kai-shek partly to unwise military overexpansion, against which Wedemeyer himself advised, but in vain.

Senator JENNER. You would not agree, Professor, that the decline of Nationalist China started after General Marshall went over and we talked with the Communist troops and tried to get them into a united-front government; and failing that, for the next 15 months after Marshall returned from his mission we did not give Chiang any aid, although the money was appropriated for it. And you would not mark that as the beginning of the decline of Nationalist China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I would not agree that the decline of Nationalist China came because of General Marshall's mission.

Senator JENNER. As a result of the mission.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Or as a result of the mission.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Senator SMITH. Did you hear the testimony of Admiral Cooke before this committee, about how he sat there in command of the United States naval forces in Chinese waters and saw this disintegration of the Nationalist forces brought about by the policy that we had then adopted? I am just asking you if you know about that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read that testimony, and I was struck by the fact that nobody asked Admiral Cooke whether, in his present activities, he draws any financial advantage from operations associated with Chiang Kai-shek.

Senator SMITH. What do you mean by that? Do you want to ask him that question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that Admiral Cooke is associated with a corporation of some kind doing business on Formosa, partly in military supplies.

Senator SMITH. You think that influences his activities back there, or his judgment back there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that it is a question, at least in view of the kind of questions that have been asked of me before this committee, that it would have been a proper question to have asked of Admiral Cooke.

Senator SMITH. Is anybody questioning what you are doing now, and how you are earning your living?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It seems to me that the entire assault upon me by this committee or its counsel—and I don't know where the responsibility is distributed—is predicated on a prejudgment that I am a man of bad faith.

Senator SMITH. I was asking you about Admiral Cooke's testimony, and you read it and you know what he said, do you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that it is a usual procedure, when people are questioned about problems of this kind, to determine whether they are or are not interested parties.

Senator SMITH. Do you have any doubt as to the patriotism and loyalty of Admiral Cooke?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have never met Admiral Cooke, and I am merely saying that a question of that kind would have been proper, in my opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think that you are helping your position, sir, by attacking the honor of Admiral Cooke?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I am not attacking the honor of Admiral Cooke. I am making some comments on the procedure of this committee.

Senator O'CONNOR. It is very evident that we will not be able to conclude, and I thought that we would get to a natural breaking point.

Senator FERGUSON. May I just ask one question? Did you know that Mr. Hiss, Alger Hiss, testified before the Un-American Activities Committee that he was proud to be closely connected with the Yalta agreement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't know that, Senator.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before the record closes, Mr. Chairman, I think this comment should be made at this point: that at the beginning of Admiral Cooke's testimony, he was asked about his present connections, and his present business, and he testified with regard to it.

Senator SMITH. I wonder if the witness would like to reiterate his statement that Admiral Cooke was not asked about it or did not tell us about it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He was not asked if he drew any financial advantage from it.

Senator SMITH. What do you mean by that? You mean you are charging Admiral Cooke with converting or embezzling Government property?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Just what do you mean by "financial advantage"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am simply raising the question of the value of showing in discussions of this kind whether a man may or may not be an interested party in the opinions which he expresses.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I read the testimony, just a half a page here, at the outset of Admiral Cooke's testimony? He was asked:

Will you give your full name and residence to the reporter?

And he said:

Charles Maynard Cooke. My permanent residence is in Sonoma, Calif. The last 2 years I have been living in Formosa.

Question. What is your present military status, Admiral Cooke?

Answer. I am a retired admiral, United States Navy.

Question. When did you retire from the United States Navy?

Answer. The 1st of May 1498.

Question. Admiral Cooke, will you tell us what your present occupation is?

Answer. My present occupation is that I have just terminated a tour of service as an employee of the Commerce International-China, which has been furnishing technical services to the Chinese in Formosa.

Question. Is that an American corporation, Admiral Cooke?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What was your position with that corporation?

Answer. I occupied a position of coordinator of this group of technicians that served in Formosa.

Question. Who were those technicians, Admiral Cooke?

Answer. They were some retired officers, some Reserve officers, some ex-officers of the services of the United States, and some enlisted men, too.

Question. They are all United States citizens?

Answer. Yes.

Question. They were all employees of Commerce International-China?

Answer. Yes; CIC, as it is referred to.

Question. Admiral Cooke, have you ever been in the employ of the Chinese Government?

Answer. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Now, Dr. Lattimore, you are willing, after your criticism of the committee, you are willing to sit here and impugn the motives and blacken the character of a retired naval officer, against whom you know nothing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not impugning Admiral Cooke's character.

Senator SMITH. What did you mean when you interjected what you did?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am merely pointing out that when this committee has before it myself or Mr. Holland, or Mr. Carter, or Mr. Vincent, the record shows that we are asked the most searching and probing questions of every kind; and that no witness who has been brought before this committee making charges of the disloyalty of individuals or the incompetence of American foreign policy, has been asked any questions of an even remotely comparable kind.

I wish to add specifically that I am not impugning the motives or the character of Admiral Cooke.

Senator SMITH. Will you answer this question? Why did you say what you did about Admiral Cooke?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because I thought that it was pertinent to the question of the procedure of this committee.

Senator SMITH. What did that have to do, whether or not Admiral Cooke had been employed by these other people, what did that have to do with the procedure before this committee, unless you meant to impeach him and his character?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not mean to impeach him or his character, Senator. It is a well-known fact that, I believe, a man's judgment may be unconsciously affected by the point where his personal interest or advantage lies.

Mr. FORTAS. May I respectfully suggest this witness has been on the stand about 2 hours and 25 minutes, with just a 5-minute break?

Senator O'CONNOR. I was undertaking to make a comment on that very point. We have been advised that the Senate is about to vote on a very important issue. As a matter of fact, there may be a series of votes, and it appears impossible for us to continue at this point. I was going to ask my colleagues, and of course counsel, as to their convenience in returning.

May I ask, in view of all of the developments, do you consider that it would be proper to put in the record the entire statement at this

time, and consider it as having been submitted and incorporated in the record in toto?

Mr. FORTAS. It is Mr. Lattimore's judgment; but since you have asked me, it seems to me that your ruling allowing him to read segments of it is a very wise one.

Senator O'CONNOR. It has not progressed as far as I thought it might.

Mr. FORTAS. I think we have made pretty good progress, and if Mr. Lattimore asked me my opinion, I would suggest that we continue on that basis; and it is his decision.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have already tried to make the suggestion to you that we should continue on the same basis.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right. I thought that I would make possible the introduction of the entire statement, which of course is already a matter of public knowledge, anyhow, because it has been distributed, and I thought it might just expedite the questioning. But if you feel that it is necessary to do it this way, we will do so.

We will recess until tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Thursday, February 28, 1952.)

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran, O'Connor (presiding), Smith, Ferguson, Jenner, and Watkins.

Also present: Senator McCarthy; J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; and Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel.

Senator O'CONNOR. The hearing will please be in order.

We will now resume the hearing of the witness, Owen Lattimore.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS

Senator O'CONNOR. It occurs to me, Mr. Lattimore, that you were on page 21 of your statement, just at the beginning of the fourth paragraph, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I might ask one question, and I won't interrupt Mr. Lattimore for a while then.

Yesterday, Mr. Lattimore, you quoted at some length from the Reporter, a magazine. Do you know whether that magazine has actively advocated the recognition of Communist China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I do not.

Senator O'CONNOR. The paragraph, I think, starts: "Each of these men * * *"

Mr. LATTIMORE. Each of these men is a loss to the State Department—and there are few men of the same caliber left. The indirect damage to the conduct of our diplomacy is even greater. The more politically controversial our problems of diplomacy are, the more vital it is that the experts in the State Department should be able to discuss them fully, frankly, and without fear, and should be free to consult with academic experts. But we have reached a point of general intimidation at which our diplomatic representatives must feel under great pressure to report back to Washington only what it is safe to report, and make only those policy recommendations that they feel sure will not result in political attacks on their careers.

I am reminded, Senators, of something that once happened to the Russians. In 1939 they invaded Finland, sure that they were going to have a walk-over, but suffered serious military defeats and tremendous damage to their prestige. Does anybody doubt that this was because political intimidation had made yes-men of the Soviet diplomats reporting to Moscow? Communist doctrine and the party line required them to report that the Finns were groaning under bourgeois-capitalist oppression, and would welcome the Russian invaders. They dared not report the truth, that the Finns were a democratic people, willing to fight against even the Russian colossus in defense of their liberties. The consequence was that Russia walked into a booby trap.

The anger of the American people will be great, Senators, if the political reporting of the State Department degenerates to this point because of political persecution, intimidation, and the demand that the China lobby be empowered to lay down a line to the State Department. What booby traps is the China lobby laying on the road ahead of us?

There are three interpretations that have been made of the records of the State Department victims of the China lobby:

Senator FERGUSON. Would you name the China lobby?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The China lobby, Senator, is, I think, something that has been characterized, in a political rather than legal use of terminology, as an open conspiracy.

Senator FERGUSON. I understood yesterday you did not know what a "conspiracy" was.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is why I said this morning "in political rather than legal terminology." I don't know what a conspiracy is in legal terminology.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know what it is politically?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The expression "open conspiracy" is one that is fairly frequent in the writing of political scientists.

Senator FERGUSON. What is it? What is an "open conspiracy," politically?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was just trying to get to that, Senator. An open conspiracy may be said to exist when people who are leagued together, not as members of an organization but because they have a common purpose, do not claim to be a membership organization but openly state what their objectives are and openly advertise their sympathies with each other, and quote each other's opinions and works, and so forth.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you give us the common purpose of the China lobby?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The common purpose of the China lobby is to make support of the driftwood government on the beaches of Formosa a primary objective of American foreign policy, subordinating other questions of policy to the consideration of all-out aid to Chiang Kai-shek; the activation of a campaign, based on Formosa, for the recovery of the mainland, and so forth.

Senator FERGUSON. As I understand it, then, you speak of the Nationalist Government as the "driftwood" government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that that is a fair circumstantial characterization, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. You once worked for Chiang Kai-shek.

MR. LATTIMORE. It was not a driftwood government at that time. I worked for Chiang Kai-shek and I did the best I could for him.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you know that the Communist line changed in July of 1943, and that your magazine carried the change of the party line, as far as Chiang Kai-shek's government was concerned?

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator, in the Tydings hearings, it was repeatedly asserted—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is: Did you know it? That can be answered "yes" or "no."

MR. LATTIMORE. I know it only by the assertions that were made before the Tydings committee in 1950. As for the second part of your question—

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you know that Mr. Bissell, in July of 1943, in your magazine—I do not think you were editor at that time, were you?

MR. LATTIMORE. I was not editor.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you know that the party line changed; and that the magazine carried the change of the party line?

MR. LATTIMORE. May I ask for the name of the magazine, Senator?

SENATOR FERGUSON. Pacific Affairs, the one that you had been editor of.

MR. LATTIMORE. Aren't you wrong, Senator, and aren't you referring—

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question. That is not the question.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Did you know Bissell wrote an article in July of 1943, on the change of the party line, as far as Chiang Kai-shek's government was concerned?

MR. LATTIMORE. If I may make a slight correction, I believe the gentleman's name is Bisson and not Bissell.

The CHAIRMAN. I ask that he answer these questions "Yes" or "No."

SENATOR O'CONNOR. Just a second. Where the question admits of a direct answer, as such a question does, it would expedite matters, we think, if you would answer it directly, and then any explanatory statement that might be made can be admitted.

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; I knew of it as of 1950.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Now, when did you change against the Nationalist Government, against what you called the "drift-wood government"?

MR. LATTIMORE. I, Senator, did not change against any government. I would find it hard to document my answer here exactly, but I think about 19—oh, by the end of the war, I had grave doubts whether the Nationalist Government could survive a civil war; and by 1947 I was sure that they couldn't win a civil war; and I think by about 1948 I was convinced they were going to lose the civil war.

SENATOR FERGUSON. Do you know now that your own Government, the United States Government, is supporting what you class as the "driftwood" government?

MR. LATTIMORE. I do, and I think it is a mistaken policy.

SENATOR FERGUSON. And you are challenging the opinion and the honesty of people who you claim are assembled together as the China lobby, who are supporting the very thing that their Government is supporting, that is, the Nationalist Government of China; is that not a fact?

MR. LATTIMORE. No, sir, not exactly. I am maintaining my own opinion as an expert, so far as I am an expert, that the Government on Formosa is not viably for a long period. I think any policy based on that assumption is a mistaken policy that will lead us eventually into great difficulties. You have said that I have challenged the good faith—

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

MR. LATTIMORE. Of the China lobby. I have just said that the China lobby is a rather amorphous thing, and I would certainly not challenge the good faith of every person associated with the China lobby.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, now, do you mean to say that what you say in here is praise of the principles of the China lobby?

MR. LATTIMORE. What I say here is that the consequences of submitting to intimidation which characterizes as a traitor or an agent of Russia or the Chinese Communists, or a fellow traveler of the American Communists, anybody who voices his opinion that the China lobby is wrong, is one that is disastrous to the conduct of foreign policy in this country.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, when you say in your statement that the State Department is the victim of the China lobby—

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you not impugning the motives of the China lobby in advocating the support of what you call the "driftwood" government?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am impugning the tactics of the China lobby in its resort to intimidation instead of fair argument based on analysis and discussion of facts.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think if the State Department followed your philosophy that you have stated here this morning, that they would be victims and would you call them victims of you?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is a hypothetical question, "of you"—

Senator FERGUSON. You do not think that they will follow it?

MR. LATTIMORE. Because the Department has never followed my advice or opinions.

Senator FERGUSON. This morning you indicated that the State Department should call in academic people, such as you, for consultations, is that right?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is quite right; and if I may qualify that a moment, I believe that the State Department should call in people who hold my point of view, and who hold all other points of view.

Senator FERGUSON. Even including the Communist point of view?

MR. LATTIMORE. I think that the State Department should certainly familiarize itself with the Communist point of view. The Communist point of view may be a dangerous factor in our present political life, but nobody can deny it is important.

Senator FERGUSON. But do you not think if a man is called in as a consultant on the Communist point of view, he should be openly known to every member of the State Department and the public that he is a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am not sure, Senator, how I would handle a difficult problem of this kind. I have never been faced with it. In government, it is obviously necessary to have a very careful and au-

thoritative study of Communist aims, methods, and so on, and my inclination is to believe that that kind of study can be made best, not by consulting Communists, but by the study of people who never have been Communists, and are neither Communists nor ex-Communists, but are trained experts in political science, economics, and so forth.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you would say that the State Department was not proper in calling in, for instance, Mr. Rosinger, as an expert, and then find that he comes before this committee and when asked the question as to whether or not he was or was not a Communist at the time that he was called in as an expert by the State Department, that he refuses to answer on the ground it would tend to incriminate him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You mean the State Department should have known before what other people only knew afterward?

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think that that is an answer to my question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I do not.

I asked whether you thought it was correct——

Senator O'CONNOR. The question was whether you approved of that procedure.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I approve of the State Department calling in anybody who at the time he is called in holds a reputable position in the field of writing and publishing about foreign policy in this country, and I do not think that they should automatically adopt the opinions of any one person. I think that they should, and I believe that they do to the best of their ability, subject to the present atmosphere of intimidation, try to assemble opinion, sort it, and come to considered conclusions themselves.

Senator FERGUSON. Is it your considered judgment that the Secretary of State now is intimidated? You charge it many times here in this statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should say the indications run that way, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, will you give us what the intimidation is? You see, Mr. Lattimore, as I understand it, you are one of these men that insists that there should not be any reflections cast upon anyone or his character without real proof, and now, what is your proof that the Secretary of State is being intimidated? That is a very serious charge against a Cabinet officer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should say that the drift of our policy for the last couple of years shows that while the State Department still, to a certain extent, protests that it is following its own policy, it is largely following, in fact, the policy of its most intemperate critics.

Senator FERGUSON. And you call the State Department, then, the victim of its critics because you personally do not agree with the opinions of the critics, is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say that, no, it is not a question of whether I agree with the opinions of the critics; it is a question of an observed phenomenon which has been frequently referred to in the press of this country, as well as in the press of Great Britain, as saying that the State Department has become the prisoner or the captive of its critics.

Senator FERGUSON. You objected very strenuously to some remarks about you, as to the State Department being the victim of your philosophy, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have objected to having it represented that my opinions influenced the State Department when in fact they did not; and if my opinions had influenced the State Department, that would be part of the record, and I would have no objection whatever.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you not advocate that we allow it to appear that we had lost Korea?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. What did you state?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wrote a syndicated newspaper article in which I attempted to analyze what I thought was the then state of discussion of foreign policy in Washington, as of the end of 1949, I think.

Senator FERGUSON. What was your remark on that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. And my remark, which has been used out of context by many people and I think is one of the most unscrupulous cases of using my writings out of context that I know of, contained not a word of advice to Washington policy makers. I said as clearly as I could that in the previous case of China, Chiang Kai-shek had fallen, and Chiang Kai-shek had been supported by this country, and as a result the State Department had been accused not merely of letting Chiang Kai-shek fall but of pushing him over.

In the case of Korea, as of the summer of 1949, it had been widely advertised that Korea was not considered an essential part of the defense periphery of the United States; as it appeared in the press it was stated that a line had been drawn which included Japan and Okinawa but did not include Korea or Formosa, as I recall. I said that as soon as the American military forces had been completely withdrawn from South Korea, it was likely that South Korea would fall; and, with the China lobby accusations in mind, I warned that Washington policy planners did not want the eventual fall of South Korea to be turned against them in an accusation that South Korea had not merely fallen but had been pushed by the State Department.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, have you ever worked for or been in the employ of any other government than the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I qualify that answer, Senator? I worked for Chiang Kai-shek.

Senator O'CONNOR. The question is as to any other government. It admits of a direct answer: You were or you were not. And if you were, and then desire to make any explanation, that is perfectly in order. But you ought to answer the question directly first.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I can, Senator. I want to ask for the opinion of you gentlemen on this subject. I was in the employ of Chiang Kai-shek, who was at the head—

Senator FERGUSON. Please answer: Were you or were you not in the employ of any other government?

Mr. FORTAS. Point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no right to ask for a point of order.

Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. Just a minute. I object to that way of proceeding. This gentleman has no right to ask for a point of order, and he is no part of this body.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me rephrase the beginning of my reply. I do not believe—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Senator O'CONNOR. Just a second, Mr. Lattimore.

The question is one which, in the opinion of the Chair, does admit of a direct answer. He either was or was not. Now, he can make any explanation he desires after he has answered the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, just a second, before that goes any further.

I advised this gentleman when he first come in here of what his province would be. Now, that was no part of it, your breaking in with any point of order. Now, if you do that again, you are going to be excluded from this committee.

Mr. FORTAS. That is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right, and don't do it again.

Mr. FORTAS. That is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. I will certainly do it.

Mr. FORTAS. You have the power.

Senator O'CONNOR. Proceed, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, you have stated that in the opinion of the Chair, the question is susceptible to a "yes" or "no" answer. May I state that, in my opinion, it is not susceptible to a "yes" or "no" answer, and I want to explain why. However, as I have said before, if the committee or any member of the committee insists on putting words in my mouth, I will use those words.

Senator O'CONNOR. Are we to understand, then, Mr. Lattimore, that you do not know whether you were or were not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Now I will ask the next question. Your answer is that you do not know.

Senator O'CONNOR. If that is correct, you can proceed.

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment.

My next question—that answers that question, and you do not know. I will ask you whether or not any of your trips have ever been financed by any foreign government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The answer to that question depends on the previous one and, therefore, I will have to answer again I do not know.

Senator FERGUSON. I will now exclude from my question the Nationalist Government of China, and as to any other government, have any of your trips been financed in any amount or in any way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I think I should yes to that.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, will you give us the nations or the governments that have financed your trips?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, in 1929, when I was traveling in Manchuria, I was allowed to buy tickets at rebate rates on the South Manchuria Railway, which was Japanese-owned and I believe partly a private corporation and partly a Government corporation. This was a usual practice of the South Manchuria Railway at that time, a privilege that they offered to all writers and journalists.

In 1936, when I traveled home from China to this country via Siberia, and spent some days in Moscow, I made a side trip to Leningrad; and as I recall, the expenses of that trip were paid by the Soviet branch of what was then the Soviet Council of the IPR.

Senator FERGUSON. That would be the Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In Russia, that would be either a branch of the Government or an organization subsidized by the Government, and we needn't quibble about that.

Then perhaps to be absolutely scrupulous, I should say that when I accompanied Vice President Wallace, as he then was, on his mission in Siberia and China in 1944, I do not know, but possibly a part of the local expenses in Siberia and China of the party as a whole, not of me individually unless I was included in the whole, may have been borne by the Russian or Chinese Governments.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you ever in the employ of the British Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you ever employed by any British subjects to make trips or financed by them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was employed in a British firm which was registered as a British firm, although it had other nationals in its employ; and in the course of ordinary business work I traveled fairly extensively in China on firm expense accounts.

Senator FERGUSON. What was the firm?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The firm was the firm of Arnhold & Co., registered as a British firm, operating at a number of places in China, and it was an import and export and engineering firm.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever do any writing that was directly or indirectly financed by the British Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Neither directly nor indirectly, as far as I know. I worked for a newspaper once which was British owned.

Senator FERGUSON. What paper?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Peking and Tientsin Times, of Tientsin, China.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever work for any British subjects on writings that were financed by the British subjects, directly or indirectly?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have contributed to British publications.

Senator FERGUSON. In no other way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever make a trip into Mongolia for the British?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think so. Oh, at one time when I was traveling in Mongolia, I had a supplementary grant—which was considered an honor award, but took the form of a financial grant, which I used for expenses of my traveling—from the Royal Geographical Society.

Senator FERGUSON. Of Britain?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you write anything for that compensation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Frequently for the publication of the Royal Geographical Society.

Senator FERGUSON. For the particular grant that you had from the Royal Geographical Society?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe so. I don't believe that there was any publication.

Senator FERGUSON. Going back to my asking you about what you said in relation to Korea, I take from the Sunday Compass—you know what that is?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a paper in New York, I believe.

Senator FERGUSON. This is an editorial. I think they quote you here as saying:

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. If the Compass quoted me to that effect, they misunderstood what I wrote in the original article, and I should like to have the original article put in the record, if I may.

Senator FERGUSON. I will ask that it be made a part of the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. When I wrote that article, my intention—and I believe it was clear from the text—was to say, not that this was my advice, but that this was the problem that confronted policy makers in Washington.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you approve that policy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not entirely. I don't know whether this is in writing at any time, but I certainly remember my attitude at the time, and that was that if we were going to withdraw from Korea and leave a situation in which I was sure that the South Korean Government was going to fall, then if you are getting out, the thing to do is to get out and not stay there with one foot to be caught in a trap.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, do you have the original article from which you said that quotation was incorrectly drawn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have it at home.

Senator SMITH. I would like to know if that is a signed article by you. It says "By Owen Lattimore."

Senator FERGUSON. I want to correct it. I took that as being part of this editorial, and I do see now, as Senator Smith points out, that there is a division there and it is not part of the editorial.

It looks like your language.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is my language, and this paragraph at the end has been taken without reference to the article as a whole. And I submit the article as a whole means exactly what I have just said.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you paid for this article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This, incidentally, I should like to make clear, Senator, is not an article, in minor detail, it is not an article written for the Sunday Compass. It is an article written for a syndicate which sold the article to whatever papers—

Senator SMITH. Did you write the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Certainly I wrote it.

Senator SMITH. All right, then, that speaks for itself.

Senator FERGUSON. This is your language?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is my language; the whole article is my language.

Senator FERGUSON. What were you asking, and I consented, to put in the record?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The whole article.

Senator FERGUSON. And you say that that is not in the whole article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I say that this concluding paragraph is only a part of the whole article, which sums up what I considered at the time to be the discussion of policy toward Korea in Washington at that time.

Senator FERGUSON. What did you mean by the last line: "Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000."?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I look over the article as a whole?

Senator O'CONNOR. You may; yes, indeed.

It might help us all in evaluating it if you were to give the date.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The date is July 1949. It is a little earlier than I thought.

Senator, since several people are participating in this discussion, and since not everybody has a text, may I read the full text so that we all have it in our minds?

Senator O'CONNOR. We had intended, or I had at least, to put the entire article in the record, but I think that you are entitled to quote any part of it that you think gives a different impression than that which is contained in the paragraph there.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think, Senator, in order to make it clear that I am here quoting opinion rather than stating opinion, it would be advisable to let me read the whole article, because the article is linked, paragraph by paragraph, and I don't think that any isolated paragraph gives the full—

Senator O'CONNOR. You have been given the article. You may read it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. "Washington," and this is July 17, 1949.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you paid for that article by the Compass?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not by the Compass.

Senator FERGUSON. By a syndicate. And so you were really, in effect, paid, then, for the writing of this article; and what syndicate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Overseas News Agency, and it is marked here. "ONA." [Reading:]

WASHINGTON (ONA).—It is a foregone conclusion that the Truman administration and the Department of State are going to have a rough time with their Korean policy. By the same token, Republicans in Congress, together with Democrats who are critical of United States policy in Asia, are going to have a fine day sniping at the official presentation of the policy of granting President Syngman Rhee's South Korea \$150,000,000 for a "recovery program."

As the record stands, it is now revealed that Secretary of State Dean Acheson made a strong appeal for the \$150,000,000 grant before a closed session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Unless South Korea gets the money, he warned, it will fall within 3 months.

Simultaneously with this urgent appeal, however, it is also revealed that the evacuation of American occupation troops from South Korea, where they have been sitting on the lid ever since the end of the war with Japan, has now been completed. All that remain are about 200 officers and men who have the dismal and unpromising mission of attempting to train an anti-Communist and anti-Russian defense force.

There is an ominous comparison between this mission and the MAGIC force—

That is capital "M," capital "A," capital "G," capital "I," capital "C"—

or military advisory group in China, which found itself completely baffled by corruption and personal warlordism in Chiang Kai-shek's China.

Yet there is logic to the course of action advocated by Secretary Acheson. It is, moreover, a perfectly convincing logic. What makes the utterances of the Secretary of State sound absurd is not the logic of United States policy, but the fact that the policy is now conducted under rules of protocol which have become as rigid as tribal taboos.

For the logic we must go back to the sad precedent of China. The sad truth is that Gen. George C. Marshall—

Senator FERGUSON. Wait a minute. "Sad" is not in there on the "truth."

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was "sad precedent" —and I reread the word "sad" [reading]:

The truth is that Gen. George C. Marshall, on his mission to China in 1946, before he became Secretary of State, became convinced of several unpleasant

things which, because of the state of political opinion in America, could not be stated out loud.

Senator FERGUSON. Now you are going to name all of those things.
Mr. LATTIMORE (reading) :

First, he was convinced that the Kuomintang would not be able to triumph over the Chinese Communists unless it took American advice.

Second, he was convinced that politically and militarily America could not handle the situation in China by taking the Kuomintang by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the pants and making it behave. Yet he could not, as a statesman, advise what seemed sensible to him as a general—that the United States simply pull out and abandon an untenable position.

As a compromise, American policy took a course of relative inaction, but not complete inaction. As it became more and more obvious that Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang were doomed the conduct of American policy became increasingly delicate. The problem was how to allow them to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them. Such a policy never succeeds completely, and critics have done their best to make the public believe that the United States did push Chiang and the Kuomintang over the cliff.

Korea is another chapter in the same unhappy story. I have yet to meet an American who knows all the facts and believes that Syngman Rhee is either a popular or a competent President of South Korea. In spite of high-pressure elections, his legislature is more badly split against him than China's was against Chiang Kai-shek.

Senator SMITH. Than China's was?
Mr. LATTIMORE (reading) :

Against Chiang Kai-shek.

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000.

I submit that that is exactly what I said it was.

Senator FERGUSON. You did not put in quotes that this was somebody else's statement about letting it fall.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't put it in quotes.

Senator FERGUSON. That was your opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My opinion was—

Senator FERGUSON. Answer my question. That was your opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was trying to convey at that time—

Senator FERGUSON. I want to know what you did convey, and not what you were trying to convey. What about what you did convey?

Senator O'CONNOR. You are at liberty to state whether that correctly expresses your viewpoint, and whether you did use those words, and, if it admits of any other interpretation, you are free to express it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I think it admits of another interpretation than the one Senator Ferguson is trying to put on it.

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you whether anyone else used that phrase: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether anybody else used the phrase or not, Senator, but I think that that paragraph clearly implies that this is the problem with which the State Department is grappling in Washington as of July 1949, and is not my advice to the State Department.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you this question: Did you favor the granting of \$150,000,000 to South Korea, so when—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I said there, I say there quite clearly in the article, Senator, that I consider that there is logic to it; yes.

Senator WATKINS. To give them \$150,000,000 so when they did go over to the Communists, they would have \$150,000,000 to start off in supporting Communist causes?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I thought, as I think it is clear from that article, I agreed with people in Washington who thought that the South Korean Government would probably not be able to stand; but I thought that the only honest policy for the United States was to do what was humanly possible in the situation, to give the South Korean Government what it needed to stand, so that if it fell, or when, as I believed, it fell, it should not appear that there could be no honest accusation that the United States had simply abandoned Korea.

Senator WATKINS. You understand that if they were given \$150,000,000, knowing that they are going to fall, that they would be that much enriched and would have that much money to help out in the Communist cause and it would go into Communist hands, that \$150,000,000; is that not the logical conclusion from that recommendation of the Secretary as well as your own recommendation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I answer "yes" or "no," and then qualify? Senator WATKINS. That is the way we want you to answer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My answer is "No," and my answer is that the logic, on the basis of precedent in the case of China, is that out of that \$150,000,000, probably \$149,999,999.99 would end up in New York banks in the possession of rich Koreans.

Senator WATKINS. Then you favored giving over \$149 million to go into the hands of some private people who would graft that much from the Korean Government, and you still recommended it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I recommended that we do our best to give the Koreans a chance, and if they misused that chance, that was their responsibility.

Senator WATKINS. You did not want it to come in to the Communist group; you wanted them to come in pretty well fixed up?

Senator O'CONNOR. I think that he ought to be permitted to answer Senator Watkins' question at this point.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believed that we had done the best we could in Korea, or we had tried to do the best we could in Korea, with a certain amount of bungling; that Syngman Rhee and his crowd were pretty hopeless, but that the only honorable thing in the circumstances, when we had announced that we thought the situation was untenable by us, was to stake them to a chance in life; yes.

Senator JENNER. Did the Government follow that policy, Professor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Government—may I answer "Yes," with qualifications?

Senator JENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My impression, just from recollection, is that the Government was in the course of following that policy, which had been determined before I had anything to say about it, and therefore was not influenced by me; and that before it had been completed, the North Korean Communist aggression occurred, and our whole policy, in my opinion quite rightly, was immediately switched to resistance against armed Communist aggression.

Senator JENNER. You stated that you feared that the corrupt Koreans would get—I forget; \$149,999,999.99, or something—and that the balance would probably go to Korea. Now, is it not a fact that out

of the moneys that Congress appropriated to help the Syngman Rhee government in South Korea, actually your figures are almost correct, except about all we gave the South Koreans in the way of aid was about \$200 worth of bailing wire?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, the concluding paragraph which we have read, and I quote from your concluding paragraph, says:

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000.

Well, now, who did you expect South Korea to fall to, and what force or power were you thinking of when you said, "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I presume at that time—and remember, I am not stating my own opinion, I am quoting opinion in Washington—I assume that the conclusion must have been that it would fall to the Communist-dominated North Korean Government.

Senator SMITH. And you understood at that time that the North Korean Government at that time was Communist-dominated?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I certainly understood it, and my feeling on that subject, Senator Smith, was not a hasty conclusion; it was based on a considerable previous course of events—statements of opinions by authoritative persons.

For instance, on June 24, Congressional Record, 1949, page 8297, Senator Knowland read into the Record the following quotation from Way of a Fighter, by General Chennault:

Gen. George C. Marshall told Congress in the spring of 1948 that if Manchuria were lost to the Chinese Communists, the United States position in Southern Korea would be untenable. Manchuria has been lost to the Chinese Communists.

On July 5, Congressional Record, 1949, page 8821, Senator Knowland stated his belief that—

It will not be possible for the southern half of Korea, which is the Korean Government recognized by the United States and the other Western Powers, set up under the general auspices of the United Nations, to retain its freedom.

Therefore, it was apparently the well-considered opinion of people in a position to know the inside of government workings much better than I, that this was an untenable situation. If a situation is considered by both the top military and the top political authorities to be untenable, then my reaction would be, "All right, it is untenable, and the thing to do with an untenable situation is to get out and get back to a situation that is tenable."

Senator SMITH. And with that in mind, you said to let South Korea fall, and you meant fall to the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. With that in mind, I summed that up as my reading of Washington opinion at the time.

Senator SMITH. Well, could you answer my question? You meant "to fall to the Communists," and let Korea fall to the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant that my interpretation of Washington opinion was that they were prepared to let Korea fall to the Communists.

Senator SMITH. You did write this language yourself: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall," and there is no mistake about that being your language; is there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the language in which I expressed my summing up of Washington opinion.

Senator SMITH. And then you go ahead and say:

Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Now then, you meant by that, did you not, for the Government of America to throw away \$150,000,000 on the South Koreans, after you had recommended that it be allowed to fall to the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not recommend that it be allowed to fall to the Communists.

Senator SMITH. Well, you said:

Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of \$150,000,000.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I stated my summing up of Washington opinion.

Senator SMITH. So that you do not say you recommended the \$150,000,000?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. You did not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Now, the quotation that you read from the Record, the Congressional Record, was more than a year prior to this date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Now, when did you conclude that Korea, South Korea, had to fall to the Communists—before this article? How long before?

Mr. LATTIMORE. When I wrote this article, the discussion of this \$150,000,000 grant was being discussed in Washington. I therefore looked up the newspaper records to see what had led up to the situation, and I attempted to write an article summing that up.

Senator SMITH. Now, you were familiar, were you not, with the speech that Mr. Acheson made on January 5—I believe it was—1950, in which he referred to the fact that Korea and Formosa, I believe he put it, were beyond the defense periphery of America?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Did you approve of that policy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I understood—may I answer the question and then qualify it?

Senator O'CONNOR. You may do that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I approved of that policy because I understood that it was not solely a State Department policy but one that had been arrived at after authoritative military surveys of the problems by the military forces—the representatives of the military forces of the Government.

Senator SMITH. Whom did you understand that from—the State Department officials or the Defense Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I understood it from the press, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Only from the press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Only from the press.

Senator SMITH. You had no discussion with anyone in the State Department about that policy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not believe I did.

Senator SMITH. Well, now, are you sure whether you did or did not discuss it with anyone in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure, I say. Yes, in 1949, I would have seen various military and civilian friends of mine, but whether I discussed this particular problem with them, I don't recall.

Senator SMITH. You would not say that you did not discuss it with some of the people in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I might have, and I would have considered it a perfectly legitimate subject to discuss—

Senator SMITH. Well, then, was—

Mr. LATTIMORE. For any newspaperman to discuss.

Senator SMITH. Was that partly your conclusion, too—that Korea and Formosa were beyond the defense periphery of America?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My conclusion, Senator, was that in view of what I knew from the press, and the public discussion, they were right, or right enough so that I wouldn't attack it.

Senator SMITH. Did you not regard that statement or enunciation of policy on January 5, 1950, as really an invitation for the North Koreans to immediately move into South Korea, when we announced we were not going to defend Korea and Formosa, and was that not tantamount to an invitation to go into Korea, for the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is a question of subjective judgment, Senator, and it wouldn't be my conclusion, and it would be a perfectly fair conclusion for anybody who wanted to draw that conclusion.

Senator SMITH. In other words, the Communists of North Korea, when they saw that announcement of Mr. Acheson, that was tantamount to saying, "We aren't going to defend South Korea"; was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Communists, or anybody else, could read that the United States had said this was outside the defense perimeter.

Senator SMITH. That meant they were not going to defend it; did it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That presumably implied—

Senator SMITH. Was it not what you and everybody else would understand from that language?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, is that the conclusion that you drew?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The conclusion I drew is that if a position is considered untenable, then it is wise not to try to defend it.

Senator FERGUSON. I asked you whether you drew the conclusion that the United States Government had announced a policy, and therefore would not defend Korea?

Senator O'CONNOR. Your knowledge, in other words, of the attitude of the Government in that respect.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I must confess that one thing that did not enter my mind at that time was the North Korean armed aggression—marching into a country to conquer it by force of arms and forcibly change the system of government. If it is put on the question not of supporting the South Korean Government, but of resisting external armed aggression, I should have said. "Certainly; we should resist external armed aggression in Korea or anywhere else in the world."

Senator FERGUSON. You felt that we should let them penetrate it and take it over, and not do anything about it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is always difficult, Senator, even so recently as 3 or 4 years ago, to maintain that you can recall verbally exactly what you thought at the time.

Senator FERGUSON. You wrote an article advocating something, and we have read it to you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that my anticipation at the time, based on the political news that was coming out of Korea, was that the South Korean Government was going to be changed from inside by the discontent against Syngman Rhee that was already evident, and that a different kind of government was going to come on the top.

Senator FERGUSON. That would be a Communist government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not necessarily, no.

Senator FERGUSON. Would it have had Communists in it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, you were writing as a foreign expert; and, Mr. Lattimore, you knew that this article was going to be distributed throughout the world, and it was for that purpose, was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, may I speak to your use of the word "expert"? I notice that it was worked very successfully on Mr. John Carter Vincent when he was here. I would like to point out that "expert" is only a relative term. Experts are not infallible. If experts were infallible, we would not have any; we would have a series of numbers on a telephone, and you would just dial and find out what is going to happen. Experts differ from each other, and among each other.

My feeling at the time was that we had considered that Korea was untenable; that the Government, as it stood at that time, was going to fall; and that this would probably lead to some form of amalgamated government between North and South Korea, which we had always stated was our policy. And I must say that I still hoped at that time that a modified government would be possible that would not be entirely dominated by the Korean Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. When you say here, "Let South Korea fall," you meant more, did you not, Mr. Lattimore, than just the Government changing by a vote? South Korea was to fall and not the Government; and therefore, the only way it would fall would be to arms, is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, not necessarily correct.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I ask you whether this article was not circulated throughout the world?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wish I could say that anything I ever wrote, Senator, was circulated throughout the world. I am not such a fantastically popular author as all of that.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you say that Russia, Communist—

Senator SMITH. What does that mean, Overseas News Agency?

Senator FERGUSON. It was to be distributed outside the United States, was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe they sold, or tried to sell, their service abroad, just as AP and UP and other services do.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, now do you not think it is a fair interpretation of your remarks here that you, Owen Lattimore, were telling the world that the thing to do for America, therefore, was to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as though we pushed it, and it was an

invitation that America would not intervene in case they attempted to make it fall?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The answer to that, Senator, is "No," with qualifications, if I may.

Senator FERGUSON. All right, qualify it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was telling the world what it already knew: That the United States was considering that Korea lay outside our defense perimeter, and was untenable. In that situation, I thought that the South Korean Government was bound to fall, and that there would take place an amalgamation between North Korea and South Korea, under circumstances obviously disadvantageous to us, but we had faced that fact by saying that the position was untenable.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, did you not also indicate to the public and say to the public that we had done the identical thing in relation to China: That we had let it fall? "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall," and you had stated before: "Korea is another chapter in the same unhappy story." And right about that you say that we in effect allowed Chiang to fall, but we also made it look as if we did not push him.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I answer that question "No," with qualifications?

Senator FERGUSON. All right, give your qualifications.

Mr. LATTIMORE. China had fallen primarily because China was also a situation that we could not control. When we could not control it, we began to withdraw our support, but in fairness to the still existing Chinese Government we were, I think, honorably careful to make it clear that the fall of China was not due to our pushing it over, as was being said by either ill-informed or ill-intentioned critics.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, you did use the same language, did you not, and I will read it to you:

As a compromise, American policy took a course of relative inaction, but not complete inaction.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON (reading):

As it became more and more obvious that Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang were doomed, the conduct of American policy became increasingly delicate.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON (reading):

The problem was—

and now you are saying our Government—

The problem was how to allow them to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them. Such a policy never succeeds completely, and critics have done their best to make the public believe that the United States did push Chiang and the Kuomintang over the cliff.

In other words, you say that the State Department was not able to put it over, as far as the public was concerned, that we did not push them; and then you seem to criticize some people for bringing it out to the public that we really did push them, is that not a fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My answer to your exposition of what you think I said, Senator, is "No," with qualifications.

Senator FERGUSON. All right, qualify it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it is fairly obvious that the language used in that syndicated article was sardonic language.

Senator FERGUSON. I assume you made it that way so that the public would understand it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I thought it was understandable, Senator, and I was not writing for purposes of being obscure.

Senator O'CONNOR. Just continue with your explanation, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was sardonically describing a situation in which a course of withdrawal had become, in the opinion of those who were directing our policy, inevitable because the situation had become untenable. A policy of withdrawal is always full of pitfalls, as far as public opinion is concerned. Misunderstanding is very easy, and very natural, and manipulation of that misunderstanding for political purposes is always tempting.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever know that there were some of the nations in the United Nations that advocated that after we started the war in Korea, it would be a good thing if we could be pushed out gracefully?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, Senator; I don't think I know that.

Senator FERGUSON. You never heard that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. That would be along the same line of allowing it to fall but not let the public know——

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator——

Senator FERGUSON. Would it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The war in Korea began in 1950, after a date at which I have been forced to neglect a great part of what should be my professional activity in keeping abreast of the details of news in the Far East because of the continuing malicious attacks to which I have been subjected, and so I cannot claim to be as well informed as perhaps I should be.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of questions.

Mr. Lattimore, this Overseas News Agency is the one that distributed this article, and did they ever distribute other articles by you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir; they distributed other articles.

Senator SMITH. How was that Overseas News Agency set up, and who were the personnel there that managed it, and who did you deal with? Those questions I would like to have answered.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Overseas News Agency is a small syndicate in New York, and I was approached by somebody working for that agency at the time that I was leaving the Government service, and I am sorry I don't recall his name, asking me if I would be willing to write an occasional column of comment on the Far East; and I think that I began writing for them occasionally in 1945, and continued until 1948 or 1949, I think it was 1949, when their finances were somewhat in difficulty, and they could no longer afford to pay me and, in fact, they still owe me a certain amount of money; and I ceased writing for them.

Senator SMITH. Was Mr. Thackrey, the editor and publisher, the man who talked to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge, Senator, I must say I have never met Mr. Thackrey, and I don't know him, and to the best of my knowledge he has nothing to do with the agency.

Senator SMITH. And how about Mr. Gold?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Are you reading from the letterhead of the company?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I never heard of Mr. Gold in connection with the Overseas News Agency. The head of Overseas Agency when I was writing for it was Mr. Jacob Landau, who has since retired; and who is the head of the agency now, I don't know.

Senator SMITH. Well, now, where did you understand that news agency circulated its articles?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It circulated its articles wherever it could sell them, as far as I know, and let me see if I can recall some of the papers in which articles of mine written for Overseas News Agency have been published. One would be the New York Herald Tribune; one is the New Republic; one is the Watertown Times of New York; and one is a small paper in Connecticut, something like Watertown; and the New Haven Register, I think; and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; and the Baltimore Sun.

Senator SMITH. How about foreign papers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Louisville Courier. Papers abroad, I don't remember ever receiving any clips on that it was published.

Senator SMITH. You do not know about any of the other foreign papers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sure you could get the record from Overseas News Agency.

Senator SMITH. When you were approached for an article to be sent out, were you given or was it suggested to you the subject that they wished you to write on?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator SMITH. You chose the subject? Did you write it and sell it to them, that is what I am getting at?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To use the celebrated phrase, Senator, I wrote as I pleased.

Senator SMITH. Then how did you write; with a view to selling, or did you first make arrangements for them to buy the article before you wrote it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What is that?

Senator SMITH. Did you write the article and then attempt to sell it to whoever would buy, this agency, or did you write as a result of their arrangement with you to write an article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Their arrangement with me was at one time that I should write an article—the arrangement was at first that I should write once a week, and later that I should write twice a week, and later I believe once again that I should write once a week.

Senator SMITH. But you chose your own subjects?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. And in this particular case, you chose as a subject of your article, "South Korea—Another China," and is that not true? Is that not the name of the article, the subject of the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the name that is printed there, but I may point out that I did not write the titles. Different papers published my articles under their own headlines.

Senator SMITH. You do not think that you chose the name, then, "South Korea—Another China"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so; no. I think that I usually sent by article in to the agency with a heading of some kind on it, but it very rarely appeared with the same headline in the different papers in which it was published.

Senator O'CONNOR. All right.

Senator WATKINS. I would like to ask one question.

The last paragraph in that article, about South Korea and China, I am not clear as to whether you have said that that was not an expression of your opinion, or merely a quote of other opinion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my attempt at a summation of Washington opinion.

Senator WATKINS. You did not mean that to be your own opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant that to be a summation of Washington opinion.

Senator WATKINS. Well, you could answer whether you meant it to be your own opinion or not.

Senator O'CONNOR. Was it similar to yours, or at variance with yours?

Senator WATKINS. Was that your opinion? Let us get it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the whole, I supported the policy.

Senator WATKINS. On the whole; and that included, of course, this paragraph?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I had been critical of the policy, I should have so stated it.

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, Mr. Lattimore, will you resume, and it occurs to me that this is one connected link, up to the top of page 24, if you might go on from where you left off reading, if we could just withhold any questions until you have reached that point.

Mr. LATTIMORE. There are three interpretations that have been made of the records of the State Department victims of the China Lobby:

1. That they sincerely and objectively reported the facts as they saw them at the time. In a reasonable climate, this would, of course, be the presumption; and although my knowledge is necessarily limited, I am sure that it is the fact.

2. That they are Communists and subservient to a foreign power. On the evidence that I have seen in your hearings and the newspapers, this is a contemptible and baseless charge.

3. That there existed in this country, and particularly in the Foreign Service of the State Department, a web of men who were attempting to serve a Communist cause, that I was a part of this web, and that the Government officials were either conscious parts of it or dupes.

Senator SMITH. Just a moment, there.

Senator O'CONNOR. Will you withhold questions until he finishes the top of the next page, if that does not interfere with your questioning?

Senator SMITH. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The central problem of this subcommittee, Senators, is to decide between these three alternatives. I am concerned directly in this problem as it touches State Department officials only because of the third possibility; only because Joseph McCarthy and some of McCarthy's fellow travelers have attempted to use me as a tool with which to discredit the men who have had much to do with determining our far-eastern policy.

Let us take a look—an honest look—at this preposterous theory of a secret spider web with me at the center of it.

First and foremost, my acquaintance with State Department officials can best be described as sporadic. I met some of them in China. Foreigners living in the small foreign communities of China saw each other frequently, and my wife and I were on friendly terms with them there. But it is also important that you recognize the limitations of our acquaintanceship with them and other Foreign Service personnel. When they were transferred to other posts we lost touch with each other, and when we again found ourselves in the same city, we were glad to see each other, but we seldom corresponded with them, or they with us.

As for my acquaintance with these men and other State Department people in Washington, I must again remind you that the people in this country engaged in far-eastern research are very few. For professional reasons, they need to see a good deal of each other. I have always circulated among far-eastern people in the State Department less than most academic specialists on the Far East, because my principal research interest is the frontier regions between China and Russia, especially Mongolia, and Mongolia has never been considered important in American foreign policy.

Parenthetically, I consider that the neglect of the Chinese-Russian frontier in American studies is a serious mistake. The lack of such studies makes it difficult to coordinate the study of American interests and policies in the Far East, Central Asia, and the Middle East. I have done my best to promote such studies and the Johns Hopkins University is now the leading university in the country in the teaching of contemporary spoken Mongol and research on the Mongol area.

Senator JENNER. May I ask a question?

Senator O'CONNOR. I did promise Senator Smith, who had attempted to ask a question before, that he could interrogate the witness.

Senator SMITH. You are using an expression that I have been hearing off and on ever since I have been here, for the last year and a half, and you say "victims of the China lobby." And I have never yet been able to get anybody to identify the China lobby. Who are the personnel of the lobby, now, would you mind telling me, not only for past understanding but also for future guidance? Who are the China lobby?

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator, your question follows on from a question asked me by Senator Ferguson a moment ago. However, I will do my best to amplify it.

As I say, I believe it is a rather amorphous body, an open conspiracy rather than a tight membership organization. I believe that one might say that it consists partly of professional or amateur lobbyists in the usual sense; that it has mercenaries, and that it also has occasional allies, sort of guerrilla troops skirmishing around the fringe; and, therefore, if one names any one person, that person might not be a member of the China lobby in exactly the same sense as another person. But I should say that one of the conspicuous members of the China lobby is a Mr. William Goodwin, who is or has been actually employed and registered as a lobbyist for the Chinese Embassy here. There is the well known Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, who is a man of private means and able to finance his interests in the discussion of China policy, and he also has or had financial interests in China. And I believe that some Senators may be considered to be part of the China lobby, or occasional allies of the China lobby.

Senator Knowland, for instance, whom I consider to be an absolutely sincere man, is frequently referred to as the "Senator from Formosa."

Senator FERGUSON. That is a Communist line, is it not, "the Senator from Formosa," Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my knowledge, Senator. They may have picked it up.

Senator FERGUSON. You have never heard that the Communist line is to call the Senator from California, "the Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I have never heard that, and it may be true, and of course, I don't follow the Communist press.

Senator SMITH. Go ahead and give us some more names, because I am interested in identifying this China lobby.

Mr. LATTIMORE. And then the China lobby—

Senator SMITH. Right there, before we leave Senator Knowland, because I have a very high regard for Senator Knowland, you do not mean that he has been a member of the China lobby working in a sinister way against the interests of America in behalf of China, do you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, Senator, I just expressed or stated my opinion that I have a high regard for Senator Knowland and consider him an absolutely sincere man, and that is why I prefaced my remarks by saying that when one man may be named as part of the China lobby, he is not necessarily the same as another man.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, when you referred to the Senator from California as "the Senator from Formosa," you were not treating him with respect, were you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator—

Senator FERGUSON. If you were repeating hearsay. You come in here and you charge people with blackening your character, and then you use an expression on this stand against a Senator as the "Senator from Formosa."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I should—

Senator FERGUSON. Now, I said yesterday that you could say anything you wanted to on the end of an answer, which you have been continuously doing, about all of the Senators on this committee; but when you bring in another Senator and charge him with being in the China lobby, and refer to him as "the Senator from Formosa," I think that you should be called to order.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, Senator. You may call me to order if you like. I was merely—

Senator FERGUSON. And you cannot gloss it over with a glib tongue as to what you feel about him.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I considered that I was merely citing an extremely well-known and partly humorous description of him that appears in the press and on the radio.

Senator O'CONNOR. It would seem in order, Mr. Lattimore, I agree, that the reference was uncalled for, and it was not becoming, and it should not have been made. He is a highly respected and honored official, and any sort of reference to that is belittling, and certainly it does not have any part in a serious discussion or consideration such as that in which we are engaged. And if, as you are now indicating, it was made a semihumorous way, that, too, has no part in this proceeding.

Senator JENNER. Might I add there that any man who stands up for America is to be belittled by such men.

Senator O'CONNOR. There will be no demonstration of either approval or disapproval.

Senator SMITH. Maybe this will help a little bit to clear it up, Mr. Lattimore. On page 22 of your statement you state or you say that "there are three interpretations that have been made of the records of the State Department victim of the China lobby."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. And so you regard those State Department people that you referred to as "victims," for instance, of Senator Knowland as one of the China lobby? Do you or do you not refer to Senator Knowland as one of the people who has made a victim of some of the State Department people?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I answer "No," with qualifications?

Senator SMITH. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge, as I recall, from the press, I do not believe that Senator Knowland has joined in this kind of clamor, and that is one of the reasons that I respect him.

May I advert to a remark made by your chairman? I was called upon to describe the China lobby, as I understand it, and I very carefully specified that there were many different kinds of people in it, and that the characterization of one was not necessarily applied to another. Then I thought that it would be the proper thing for me, since I believe that in the public mind a number of Senators and Representatives are associated with the China lobby, not to show any attitude of fear or cringing by avoiding the mention of the names of eminent men. I therefore deliberately chose the name of Senator Knowland because I thought that he was a man whom I could mention in a very respectful manner as showing that I have a difference of opinion with him, but that I respect him, but that I consider that his position represents one part of what this China lobby is.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, you are in a sense departing from the point made by the temporary presiding officer. I made no objection to your naming Senator Knowland, but I did think that you did go too far in describing him as representing other than the United States of America, which I am sure he represents alone, and will not be influenced by any foreign allegiance.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, Senator. Perhaps I should have left that to the press.

Senator FERGUSON. What do you mean?

Senator SMITH. You mean you have an arrangement with someone on the press to characterize these men, and you should have left that to the press? What did you mean by that statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I simply meant that this is a term under which Senator Knowland is frequently referred to, and I might have assumed that if I had only mentioned Senator Knowland, that the press, as they often do when they are identifying people, would have put in brackets that Senator Knowland has been referred to as the "Senator from Formosa."

Senator JENNER. In what press have you read that Senator Knowland was the "Senator from Formosa"?

Senator SMITH. The Communist press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I never follow the Communist press.

Senator JENNER. I want an answer to my question, and I want to know in what press the witness has read that Senator Knowland is referred to as the "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, Senator, I can't name offhand a specific paper in which I read it.

Senator JENNER. Not one, not even one newspaper?

Senator SMITH. And yet you make that statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a term that I have been reading for months, and also hearing on the radio.

Senator JENNER. What papers do you read, then? Maybe we can get at it that way?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read regularly the New York Times and the Baltimore—

Senator JENNER. Has the New York Times, to refresh your memory, ever referred to Senator Knowland as the "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Senator. It would have to be looked up.

Senator JENNER. You make this charge and yet you cannot name one paper that referred to Senator Knowland as the "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't name—I can tell you the papers I read.

Senator JENNER. But you do not recall any single newspaper?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I cannot recall.

Senator JENNER. You thought it was a humorous reference, and yet you did not get any humor and you cannot remember the humor that you got from reading some newspapers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, it is a very frequent reference—so frequent that I would not associate it with any newspaper.

Senator JENNER. Do you read the Daily Worker?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you read the Compass?

Senator JENNER. What paper do you read besides the New York Times?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was trying to tell you when you interrupted me.

Senator JENNER. Please do, with qualifications.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I read the New York Times regularly and I read the Baltimore Morning Sun regularly and I read the Washington Post regularly and those are the only ones I read regularly.

Senator JENNER. Thank you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Since I have characterized this also as a term that appears on the radio, the radio programs to which I listen regularly—

Senator JENNER. Now, maybe some commentator. What commentator have you heard who referred to it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The 6 o'clock news broadcast of the CBS in the evening.

Senator JENNER. Can you name one commentator, then, among all of your news broadcasts that you have listened to, who referred to the Senator from California as the "Senator from Formosa"?

Senator O'CONNOR. The witness should be allowed to answer.

Senator JENNER. He answered on the newspapers and now this is a new question and I am asking what commentators.

Senator O'CONNOR. I think that is in order, but the witness ought to be permitted to complete his answer.

Senator JENNER. He had completed the newspapers and switched over to radio news broadcasts.

Senator O'CONNOR. Now, the question is as to what radio broadcasts you customarily listen to, and the commentators.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The programs and commentators to which I customarily listen are the 6 o'clock CBS news program in the evening which includes a number of commentators or news broadcasters; and I listen to the 8 o'clock CBS news in the morning; and then going back to the evening, I occasionally listen at 7 o'clock to Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Senator JENNER. Did you ever hear Fulton Lewis, Jr., refer to the Senator from California as the "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't recall.

Senator JENNER. Can you recall any commentator on any of the news broadcasts—

Senator O'CONNOR. I do think, now—had you finished your answer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had not.

Senator O'CONNOR. I think that you should finish it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At 7:15 I usually listen to Elmer Davis.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever hear Elmer Davis say that?

Senator O'CONNOR. I think—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think, I wouldn't say for certain, I think it is quite likely.

Senator FERGUSON. I would think so.

Senator O'CONNOR. Let us be in order.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At 7:45, I usually listen to Mr. Ed Murrow's program, again on CBS. And that is all of the programs I listen to regularly and the papers that I read regularly.

Mr. FORTAS. Can you give this witness a rest, please?

Senator O'CONNOR. We will take a recess for 10 minutes.

Senator FERGUSON. I think he needs a rest. The record clearly shows he needs a rest.

Senator O'CONNOR. We will take a recess for 10 minutes.

(Short recess.)

(At this point Senator McCarran assumed the chair.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Is there any question pending?

Senator SMITH. I asked Mr. Lattimore to name the persons who constituted the China lobby and he named three or four, and I would like to get the additional names of those he regards first as to the China lobby.

The CHAIRMAN. You may answer, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I tried to begin my answer with great care—

The CHAIRMAN. Let us name the Senators who belong to the China lobby, is that the question?

Senator SMITH. The persons who constituted the China lobby, and among them he named one Senator, and I would like to have him name the others, because he said or he referred to the State Department victims of the China lobby, and I want to know who constitutes the China lobby, the personnel, and the names.

The CHAIRMAN. That calls for names, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right, Senator.

Before naming any further names——

The CHAIRMAN. That calls for names, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I'll mention any further names only with great reluctance——

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement in that regard will be stricken from the record. Name the names. That is what the answer is.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am naming these names with the greatest reluctance.

The CHAIRMAN. That is stricken from the record. Call the names.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have characterized people as being——

The CHAIRMAN. Call the names, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the lobby as being different——

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to answer the question or don't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, before——

The CHAIRMAN. I ask you to answer the question now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, yes, I will answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Your other statements will be stricken from the record, and you are called upon to name names, and now do so.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very respectfully, Senator, you are——

The CHAIRMAN. Let's name the names and answer the question of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have mentioned Mr. Alfred Kohlberg. I understand that an employee of the China lobby has been a Miss Freda Utley. I understand that there is a great deal of private Chinese money in this country——

Senator SMITH. Now, that does not answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The last part of the answer will be stricken from the record.

Senator SMITH. He says, "State Department victims of the China lobby." Now, "victim" is not a very nice designation of someone who has been the victim, and I want to know who are the China lobby?

The CHAIRMAN. You are calling for names.

Now, names is what your answer is.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I understand that, Mr.——

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer calls for names, please, Mr. Lattimore, and certainly you——

Mr. LATTIMORE. Members of the Chinese Embassy. And that is all of the names that I will name.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions, Senator?

Senator SMITH. So that those names are the names of the persons who constitute the China lobby—and I see you are getting reinforcement from your wife behind you. Now, I am asking you to name the names of the persons that constitute the China lobby, and you have given us three or four. Now, are they all that constitute the China lobby?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I speak to my counsel.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you for the names.

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer that question "yes" or "no."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have been told, Senator——

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please answer the question? Never mind what you have been told. Answer the question "yes" or "no," and then explain, if you wish.

Mr. FORTAS. The witness has asked permission to consult with counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. If he wants to consult with counsel, he may consult.

Mr. FORTAS. Now may he?

The CHAIRMAN. He certainly may. I have told you that.

Mr. FORTAS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not going to get fortification from the rear.

Senator SMITH. That has been going on all morning, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is going to stop.

I will have to ask for quiet in the rear of the room, please.

What is your question, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. I asked him to name the names of the persons constituting the China lobby to which he refers here in his statement on page 22.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should name Mr. George Sokolsky, a newspaper columnist, and I believe radio commentator. I should name the Chicago Tribune—

Senator SMITH. What names, individually?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Editorially.

Senator SMITH. Who? The persons, I called for, the names of the persons constituting the China lobby as referred to by you on page 22 of your statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I, Senator, again refer to the fact that I started out by saying that I consider that any individual may be classified with the China lobby in entirely different degrees and under entirely different connotations.

Senator SMITH. Any kind of degree. Mr. Lattimore, you have made a serious charge here, that the State Department employees have been made victims of the China lobby. Now, that is a statement you have made, manifestly for the purpose of prejudicing somebody. Now, I want to know who constitutes this China lobby that you apparently mean to say has been guilty of all sorts of insidious influence on the State Department. Now, who are the persons? Now, if you did not know any persons who constituted the lobby, manifestly this is an improper statement to put before the committee. If you do know who constitutes the China lobby, you are entitled to tell us; and that is all I am asking for, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That calls for names, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should name a Mr. Victor Laskey—

Senator WATKINS. Tell us where he lives, if you have that information.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know where he lives, sir. I have seen articles of his. I think that that is all I can recall at the moment, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Senator SMITH. The persons you have named are the persons to whom you attribute the influence that produced the State Department victims?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Those are all of the names that I can recall under this kind of hammering, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I think that that is uncalled for, to Senator Smith's question, and I think it ought to be stricken from the record, the remark that he has been hammered. He has had a recess to remember names. Certainly to request a man

over and over, when he refuses to answer and fails to answer, to get names of an organization, I do not think that that ought to be classed by any witness before this committee as "hammering."

The CHAIRMAN. I entirely agree with you, Senator. The remark will be stricken from the record. I hope that that will not occur again.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I think—and, of course, I have no objection how he refers to the questions I ask him, because I certainly started in this hearing with not any feeling against Mr. Lattimore whatsoever, and I am going to maintain my composure, and my effort in fairness, regardless of his truculence and his petulance or his arrogance, and I expect to continue listening to what the evidence is. But when such flimsy statements as this are made, and then he cannot back it up, I think it is something that we should consider as to whether or not we should throw this whole statement of his out, and then proceed by way of direct question and direct answer from Mr. Lattimore, because we have seen this whole statement is full of such jumbled statements as that, that are not backed up; and when you specifically inquire as to the foundation for his statement—

Senator FERGUSON. May I just say in relation to that, that is the reason this hearing is taking so long. If we were to admit these generalizations, such as the one about the China lobby and the fact that the State Department is a victim of the China lobby, and many other statements that have been shown to be hearsay, and not founded upon fact, then we would be admitting the truth of all of these statements and these conclusions. That is the difficulty that we are facing here, with a long cross-examination to try to ascertain what the facts are, and what this man actually knows. It is unfair to a record.

Senator SMITH. I think what he says is a reflection upon the State Department and upon the people who are honestly trying to operate the State Department in the best manner, and for him to characterize these four or five people as the people who have made victims of State Department employees. But that is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator FERGUSON. I had one other question that I wanted to ask the witness. He refers to Senator Knowland as the "Senator from Formosa," and have you ever seen an editorial entitled, "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I remember, no.

Senator FERGUSON. You think that you might have?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't think that I have.

Senator FERGUSON. You realize that when you say that a Senator is from a foreign land, that it is a serious charge against the Senator?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should think that that would vary with the circumstances, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. If you felt that he was, then it would not be a serious charge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should feel that it varies according to whether the name or the term is applied humorously or hostilely, et cetera.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think to accuse a man of being a Senator from a foreign country is humorous or could be humorous?

The CHAIRMAN. When it is made under oath?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; in a serious investigation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I did not call him that under oath. I referred to the fact——

The CHAIRMAN. You did call him that under oath, because you are under oath all of the time here, Mr. Lattimore, and so anything you have said is under oath, and your counsel will so advise you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I referred to him in quotations, not as my characterization.

Senator FERGUSON. And I said on this record, I gave you a question, that that was the Communist line. Now, I will ask you again: Did you ever see it in an editorial, "Senator from Formosa"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can remember.

Senator FERGUSON. To back up what I said about it being the Communist line, I want to show you that editorial and ask you whether you ever saw it? Don't read the slip on it; I turned it down.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I haven't read the slip, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. I know you didn't, because I asked you not to, but read the editorial, and I will ask you if you ever saw it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should like to ask that when I am shown written material——

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer that "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I be allowed to see the whole thing.

Senator FERGUSON. I want you to read the editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. That calls for a categorical answer, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This I never saw.

Senator FERGUSON. Now look at the slip.

Mr. LATTIMORE. "San Francisco, Calif.—Peoples World."

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know that that is a Communist sheet?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that was stated at the Tydings hearings a couple of years ago, and I don't know the paper myself.

Senator FERGUSON. You learned, then, in the Tydings committee that that was a Communist sheet?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I heard that it was stated that it was a Communist sheet.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, they end the editorial by saying, referring to the Senator from California, "the Senator from Formosa"; and in another place they use it as "Senator from Formosa"; and the title is "Senator from Formosa." And they say: "Knowland has been the Senator from Formosa rather than from California anyway."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have already said that I do not read the Communist press.

Senator FERGUSON. I will introduce that into the record to prove that it is the Communist line of referring to a distinguished Senator from this body as the Senator from a foreign land, Formosa.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The editorial referred to was marked "Exhibit 467," and is read in full below by Senator Ferguson:)

SENATOR FROM FORMOSA

Democratic leaders at their recent State executive committee meeting vied for the dubious honor of controlling a pro-Truman delegation to their party's national convention.

But they did not pay the slightest attention to selecting a candidate to run for United States Senate and to preparing a major campaign to defeat Senator William F. Knowland, the GOP incumbent.

It is an open secret that the Democratic leadership has given no real opposition Governor Warren for years. It is also a fact that most of the party's bosses did not try too hard to beat Senator Richard Nixon in 1950.

Now they seem to be preparing only a token campaign against Knowland. And there could be no clearer measure of the bankruptcy of the Democratic Party leadership in California than its complacency in permitting a State with a great progressive tradition to be represented by two of the worst and most reactionary men in the Senate.

Knowland has been the Senator from Formosa rather than from California anyway. His primary concern seems to have been representing Chiang Kai-shek in the Senate. He has been a major advocate of an all-out United States war against China, and has been prepared to expend millions of American lives to restore the corrupt Chiang regime to power.

Knowland has flagrantly misrepresented the people of California. He has been for every reactionary and repressive measure such as the Taft-Hartley and McCarran Acts. And he has been against price control and rent control and even the most modest social-security measures.

And he can be defeated. He can be swept out of office in a wave of revulsion against his war policies and his flagrant advocacy of vested interests in the Senate.

But one thing is sure. That job can't be left to the Democratic Party and to the committee it has picked to survey candidates. It is a job for labor, for the Negro people, for the masses of people who want Knowland defeated. We believe that CIO, AFL, and independent unions should take the lead in joining forces behind a strong progressive candidate who will not be a dummy for Knowland, who will really go out to win, who will really represent the people, and will really realize the potential of mass opposition to the Senator from Formosa.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I answer?

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask a question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I ask that the record show at this point that I repeat that I do not read the Communist press?

Mr. SOURWINE. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Lattimore, earlier, over a space of some 30 or 35 minutes, there was discussion of what was referred to at some times as a recommendation with regard to the United States getting out of Formosa.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to be sure the record is clear on that point. Is the point you were attempting to make that you merely, during that period in 1949, referred to what you found or felt to be the opinion in Washington, and that you were not yourself recommending to the State Department that the United States get out of Formosa?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not completely, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you clarify that, please? Did you recommend to the State Department that the United States get out of Formosa?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At the time that this article was written, in July of 1949, I was reflecting State Department opinion. By the end of 1949 I had accepted that opinion as the established policy.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the question, please?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. That calls for a categorical answer, and I want the answer "yes" or "no," and then you may explain afterward.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I say "yes," with amplification?

The CHAIRMAN. You may explain your "yes" after you say it, or "no" after you say it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. At the end of 1949, in a memorandum that I wrote preparatory to a conference that was called by the Department of State in, I believe, November of 1949, as I recall, there was a paragraph saying that we should liquidate our position in Formosa as rapidly as possible, or words to that effect.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the only occasion on which you recommended to the State Department that we get out of Formosa?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the only one I recall, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you regard Formosa as an undesirable form of government, a monarchist form of government, which was not worthy of our support?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever say so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was not a monarchist form of government, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever say so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That it was a monarchist—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever say so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am just asking for clarification of the question.

Did I ever say that South Korea was a monarchist form of government?

Mr. SOURWINE. I am talking about Korea, Senators.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I could have ever said that Korea was a monarchist form of government.

Mr. SOURWINE. And just to make the record clear, it is Korea we are talking about when I asked you if you recommended that the State Department get out of it; was that your understanding?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you say that you did so recommend in something that you wrote in November of 1949?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I wrote it in November of 1949, that was the date.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you have here today on several occasions used language which sounded as though you intended to convey the impression that you had not made such a recommendation to the State Department. Did you at the time intend to convey that recommendation to the committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At that time I intended to convey that impression only with regard to that particular newspaper article.

Mr. SOURWINE. You weren't expanding the answer beyond the specific question that was asked you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was not intending to; no.

Mr. SOURWINE. And if you conveyed a broader impression, that was not your intention?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you sir, attend a conference at the State Department on far eastern policy in October of 1949?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your date, Mr. Sourwine. I thought it was November, but it may have been October.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you take part in that conference orally?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, in the course of that conference, say :

* * * I think we ought to give a little more attention to the problem of Korea. Korea appears to be of such minor importance that it tends to get overlooked by Korea may turn out to be a country that has more effect upon the situation than its apparent weight would indicate.

I don't know how it can be done but I should feel very much easier about the prospects of success of American policy in the Far East as a whole if we can proceed or arrange our new relationship with Japan, whatever it turns out to be, by disengaging ourselves as far as possible from southern Korea.

It has been widely stated, and I don't know if it is true, but it may be open to criticism—that Korea is not a decisive strategic position. Certainly on the political side Korea is likely to be an increasing embarrassment. Southern Korea unfortunately is an extremely unsavory police state. The chief power is concentrated in the hands of the people who were the collaborators of Japan and therefore Korea represents something which does not exist in Manchuria and North China; namely, if the Chinese are willing to trade with Japan it is because they no longer fear that trade with Japan means Japanese strategic control.

Southern Korea, under the present regime, could not resume closer economic relations with Japan without a complete reinfiltration of the old Japanese control and associations.

Korea is a danger to us in other respects. I think that throughout Asia the potential democracies—people who would like to be democratic if they could are more numerous and important than the actual democrats. The kind of regime that exists in southern Korea is a terrible discouragement to would-be democrats throughout Asia who would like to become democrats by association with the United States. Korea stands as a terrible warning of what can happen.

Did you say that, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I said that; and may I ask if that is the full text of what I said on the subject of Korea?

(A printed document was handed to the witness.)

Mr. SOURWINE. If there is any additional portion that you would like to have inserted in the record, preceding that or following that, I will ask that the chairman insert it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am merely asking, because I can't recall offhand whether I reverted to the subject of Korea later in the discussion.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is in our record in full, sir, and if you will notice, I was reading from page 1677 of volume 5 of our hearings, which is the official State Department transcript of these conferences. The whole thing is in the record, and the record will show, as you will find if you examine it, that you adverted to the subject of Korea.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right, and I just wanted to make sure whether that was the only occasion on which I adverted to it. My wife has here, I think, a separate transcript of everything that I said at the conference, and it would be easier to check in that; and may I ask permission to check that?

Mr. SOURWINE. If there is anything that the witness cares to offer later on in connection with that, the Chair can rule on it at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so. We will go on now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as this particular reference goes, Mr. Sourwine, that is certainly what I said, and I stand by it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, I just would like to clarify one minor point in the record. At the bottom of page 20, you made a reference to Mr. John Stewart Service, Mr. O. Edmund Clubb, and Mr. John Carter Vincent, and you compared them with Mr. George Kennan; and I want to ask you if you really mean that any of those three men could adequately fill the same relative position with respect to the Far East that Mr. Kennan fills with respect to Russia?

MR. LATTIMORE. May I recall the original wording, "would have been capable of holding"? I will amplify that to say "capable of developing into that kind of man." With that amplification; yes, I believe that.

MR. SOURWINE. You refuse to accept it the way I stated it, Mr. Lattimore?

MR. LATTIMORE. Would you repeat the way you stated it?

MR. SOURWINE. I will try.

THE CHAIRMAN. The reporter will read it.

MR. SOURWINE. I wonder if there was something in the way that I stated it that you rejected.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

MR. LATTIMORE. I will accept that. I would prefer to state things in my own words.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I inquire there, Mr. Chairman?

After the Loyalty Review Board of the President has found reasonable doubt as to Mr. Service, and you read the opinion, do you still say that that is a correct statement?

MR. LATTIMORE. I still say that that is a correct statement, Senator, and I return to my characterization yesterday of the wording of that "reasonable doubt" ruling as an undesirable one for the handling of Government personnel.

Senator FERGUSON. For that reason, you place no credence in the Board's finding, is that correct, because you do not believe in the principle upon which it is based?

MR. LATTIMORE. May I say "No," and then qualify it?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

MR. LATTIMORE. No, I don't. I think that it is extremely detrimental to the morale of Government personnel when a man is subjected to repeated jeopardy, and after many specific clearances is finally got rid of under a new and vague wording.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you ever accepted the conviction of Alger Hiss as being a proper conviction?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes, I have. I also accept his attempt to get a fresh trial as a proper procedure under American law.

Senator FERGUSON. And have you ever expressed any objection to the Smith Act, the one under which the 11 Communists were convicted?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am sorry—first, no, I have not expressed any objection to it. I should add that I have never read it.

MR. SOURWINE. Might I inquire, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LATTIMORE, going to page 23 of your statement, you will recall that you had discussed three interpretations of what you said were the "records of the State Department victims of the China lobby," and then you talked of the central problem of the subcommittee; and then you said:

Let us take a look, an honest look, at this preposterous theory of a secret spider web with me at the center of it.

Now, before I ask this question, I want to lay a foundation by asking you, do you know what I mean when I refer to the "referent" for a pronoun?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am sorry; no.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you use the pronoun "he," and then I say, "What is the referent for that pronoun," I mean who were you referring to when you said "he."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, may we use it in that sense in connection with the question I am about to ask?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Right in the next sentence you wrote, and had mimeographed:

First and foremost, my acquaintance with those State Department officials can best be described as sporadic.

Who did you mean by "those"? What is the referent for "those"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I corrected this text.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understand that, but you had "those" originally, and that is what you had mimeographed; and I want to know what you mean by "those"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant originally my acquaintance with State Department officials.

Mr. SOURWINE. What State Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. With State Department officials.

Mr. SOURWINE. You said "those," and now I want the referent for "those."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I meant, when I wrote it, to refer to my acquaintances with State Department officials.

Mr. SOURWINE. What State Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Then I read "those"—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that calls for the names of the officials, that is the question: What State Department officials?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant State Department officials in general with whom I was acquainted.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is obviously untrue, Mr. Lattimore, because the context of your own statement shows that you differentiate between these men and other State Department people. Now, I want to find the referent in your own statement with regard to "those." Do you go back or were you referring to men who were in the so-called secret spider web, or do you go further back to the paragraph above it and find "men who have had much to do with determining our far eastern policy," or do you go still further back to find the referent for "those"? Obviously it must appear before the use of the pronoun.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My intention was to refer to State Department in general, as people in general; on page 22, for example, "the State Department victims of the China lobby."

Then after I had written it, I saw that the word "those" would easily be interpreted as meaning a reference only to three men, and I therefore, in order to carry out my intention, struck the word "those."

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you mean it, sir, when you originally wrote it? Did you intend it as a reference to a particular group of men?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I intended it as a reference to the whole far eastern group.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by the "far-eastern group"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean those in the Department of State primarily trained as far-eastern experts, especially China experts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling this committee that you did not have a particular group of men in mind when you said "those"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the particular group that I had in mind.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean all of the State Department people who were trained in the far-eastern affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the general group I meant.

Mr. SOURWINE. But in the next sentence, sir, you wrote: "I met all of them first in China", didn't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is why I changed it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have changed it, but isn't that what you originally wrote?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because I realized that some of the China group that I had met, China group of the State Department that I had met, I had not met first in China, and therefore I changed the wording to make it inclusive.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, didn't you, when you first wrote this, have in mind a particular group of State Department officials, and wasn't that a group of State Department officials all of whom you had first met in China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, let us go down a little farther—

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I amplify that?

The CHAIRMAN. I think that you have gone into that before the question was propounded to you, and I think that that is far enough. I hope, Mr. Lattimore, that you might obey the decorum of this committee, and when you are cut off by the chairman of the committee, that is the end of your statement, and your statement is on file in this committee, and you are under oath.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, pursuing Mr. Sourwine's question just a bit, I would like to call attention to the fact that in the same paragraph there is further evidence by language which seems to me to substantiate the contention made by Mr. Sourwine, and I call your attention to the statement:

Foreigners living in the small foreign communities of China saw each other frequently—

Now, that is not the whole State Department. It is those in China.

* * * and my wife and I were on friendly terms with them there. But it is also important that you recognize the limitations of our acquaintanceship with them and other Foreign Service personnel.

Evidently he is referring to some particular group in China, and then he adds, "and other Foreign Service personnel." Then—

"When they were transferred"—that is "they," and not the whole Foreign Service—"were transferred to other posts we lost touch with each other * * *."

Now, who does he mean?

"* * * when we again found ourselves in the same city"—which apparently he did—"we were glad to see each other, but we seldom corresponded with them, or they with us."

I submit the comment that it certainly bears out the contention of Mr. Sourwine. Those were not changed in the paragraph, and I read them just as they are in there now.

Mr. SOURWINE. When we get down to that question, may I inquire whether you made those changes on the advice of counsel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in the next paragraph, sir, you say:

"As for my acquaintance with these men * * *"

Were you referring to certain men?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was referring to the general group of those working on China particularly.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't mean the same men that you referred to in the paragraph above when you wrote "those"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant in the paragraph above, when I wrote "those," the same that I meant in the paragraph below: The general group of people working in China, some of whom I met first in China, and some of whom I met first elsewhere, although they were China service people.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say that the referent for those various pronouns is not the phrase in the second paragraph above, that is, the first paragraph from the top of page 23, "the men who have had much to do with determining our far-eastern policy"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It would certainly include them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, let us go back to the paragraph at the bottom of page 22: "* * * a web of men who were attempting to serve a Communist cause * * *" Is that a referent for the "those" and "these" and the "them"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It would include them, and others.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Let the witness continue the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. He may continue the reading.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Aside from these social contacts, my Government experience has been limited and my contacts with anything that could be called policy making (or attempts to influence policy) extremely rare. The record was fully brought out in the hearings before the Tydings subcommittee, and is as follows:

1. In 1941 and 1942 I was personal political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. This was on the nomination of President Roosevelt; but I was in the personal service of Chiang Kai-shek; not of the Chinese Government; not of Mr. Roosevelt; not of the American Government.

I was, in effect, charged with liaison functions between Chiang Kai-shek and the White House. My first appointment, in July 1941, was for 6 months. I was then reappointed, to serve indefinitely. When I resigned at the end of 1942 to enter a war job in this country, Chiang graciously asked me to consider myself on "reverse lend-lease," and to return to his service at any time.

In February 1942, I returned to this country for several months during which Chiang asked me to familiarize myself with the handling in Washington of American aid to China. During this time my liaison with the White House, on Roosevelt's instructions, was through Mr. Lauchlin Currie, an assistant to the President. I lived in Baltimore but came over to Washington several days a week and Mr. Currie offered me the use of an office adjacent to his.

The big problem at this time was to get supplies to China for use in the war against Japan, and on Chiang's instructions I was in communication both with Mr. Currie, who was handling this matter for

the President, and with officials of the various Chinese missions in Washington.

It was apparently these circumstances that formed the basis for the charge—as if there was some sinister significance in it—that I had “a desk in the State Department,” from which the inference has been made that I influenced the State Department. Currie’s office, and other White House executive offices, were in the building which also housed the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget. I confess I did not think of this when the charge was originally made. The fact of the matter is that the State Department were quite resentful of Roosevelt’s use of his executive assistants, like Currie, to provide personal channels through which Chiang communicated with Roosevelt, and this resentment extended to me. Consequently, I doubt if I would have been very welcome in the State Department during this period.

2. In 1943 I was Deputy Director of the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information in charge of Pacific operations. As the title implies, I was responsible for operations, not policy. In 1944 I came to Washington, still with the same title, and during that year I went out to Australia, to set up OWI operations under General MacArthur. You will recall that General Thorpe, MacArthur’s chief of Counterintelligence, testified before the Tydings committee (transcript, p. 1215) that he thoroughly investigated me in connection with this mission, and found nothing subversive in my record. In fact, he was kind enough to say, “Were I called on to commit my personal safety and that of my command on information supplied by Dr. Lattimore, I would do so with confidence that he would always act as a loyal American citizen.” I submit as an exhibit the statement made to the Tydings committee by General Thorpe in 1950.

May I submit that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. This offer will be withheld until the Chair can go over it.

MR. LATTIMORE. In the same year, 1944, as a representative of OWI, I accompanied Vice President Wallace on his mission in Siberia and China. In the fall of that year, I returned to my university work, coming to Washington only 1 or 2 days a week, as a consultant to OWI.

I have been accused by Budenz of exerting a Communist influence on the Vice President of the United States when I accompanied him on his mission to Siberia and China. This barefaced accusation has been so effectively disproved by the testimony of Mr. Wallace and of Mr. Alsop that it is unnecessary for me to repeat their evidence here. Mr. Wallace in his recent letter to the President also confirmed the fact that I did not act—or, indeed, attempt to act—as his political adviser on the mission in question.

3. In the winter of 1945–46 I spent between 3 and 4 months in Japan with the Pauley mission, which was making a survey of American reparations policy in Japan. Using my connection with this mission as a springboard, a whole new series of accusations have been parroted here concerning ideas I am supposed to have advocated concerning Japan.

Mr. Dooman, Mr. McGovern, and the always obliging Budenz have stated, and your questions to other witnesses have inferred, that I recommended a policy of deindustrializing Japan—a policy which they in chorus labeled as Communist. Mr. Dooman, Mr. McGovern, Mr.

Colegrove, and your counsel, Mr. Morris, have also, in chorus, distorted some ideas which I expressed before the end of the war concerning the Japanese Emperor.

It is a most interesting coincidence, if one could call it that, that whereas McCarthy's charges of my subversive influence on Government policy, based on Alfred Kohlberg and dutifully echoed by Louis Budenz, were concerned almost solely with our China policy, this new note was suddenly sounded by no less than four of your witnesses—that my policy recommendations on Japan were also sinister. Even the phrases used by the four men were similar. Mr. Dooman claimed that the Pauley report, which I had written, "provided for turning Japan into a pasture." Mr. McGovern testified that it was my policy to have "a bloody peace in Japan"; "to completely reduce Japan to vagary and impotence"; "to reduce Japan back to an agricultural country and destroy all Japanese industry." To have Budenz join this chorus is most surprising of all because in 1950 he testified about me for a whole day and never even mentioned my ideas about Japan. But before this committee he obligingly came through and stated that I had aided the "Communist conspiracy" for a "hard peace in Japan."

All of these statements are false. Now I do not want to appear to subscribe to the charge that anybody who advocated such a policy is a Communist. But the fact is that neither the Pauley mission nor I personally ever advocated the deindustrialization of Japan. When I was in Japan with the Pauley mission at the end of 1945 I did play a major part in drafting a reparations report, in close conference with Mr. Pauley and based on the assessments of the technical members of the mission, working with data supplied by General MacArthur's headquarters. This report was anything but a punitive document and could not possibly be described as aiming at a "bloody peace." It supports none of these ridiculous yarns. Its principal recommendations were to use the surplus war industry of Japan as reparations to aid the industrialization of countries in Asia that had been plundered by Japan; to prevent Japan from controlling the economic life of Asia; and to leave Japan enough industry to provide for trade and the purchase of necessary imports.

Even before the end of the war, when hatred of Japan was at its height, I wrote in *Solution in Asia*, 1945, page 184:

We must avoid confusing industrial demilitarization with disindustrialization. In a Japan deprived of all industry, people would starve by the million * * * we do not hate them to the point of starving several millions of them. Japan must be left with some industry.

Neither *Solution in Asia* nor the Pauley report is a classified document. They clearly show that whoever steered Mr. Dooman, Mr. Colegrove, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Budenz to brand these recommendations as Communist was far, far off the beam and completely lacking in scruple.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore has referred to this *Solution in Asia*, and I recall testimony in this record—and I do not know whether the witness has seen it—of an FBI agent here before this committee, and I wonder whether we could have that so that it would appear here? Do you have that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; I have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, you may proceed, Mr. Lattimore.

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment. I would like to refer to this testimony.

Mr. MORRIS. We have it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to have it go in the record at this point. Have the clerk read it, and identify the witness.

Mr. MANDEL. This is the testimony of Harvey M. Matusow, in executive session, before this committee on February 13, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was he or what was he?

Mr. MANDEL. He gives his career as follows in the testimony:

I joined the Communist Party in October of 1947. A year preceding that I joined the AYD, American Youth for Democracy, Communist Party youth.

Mr. MORRIS. He joined the Communist Party on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; isn't that right, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. MANDEL. I am reading in sequence, and I haven't come to that yet:

In 1948 I worked in full-time employment of the Jefferson School, in the Jefferson School book shop.

Further:

In March of 1949, I became a full-time employee of the Communist Party of New York City, worked at the county headquarters—

Mr. FORTAS. Is he reading the transcript?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. FORTAS. He seems to be skipping about.

Mr. MORRIS. Was not Mr. Matusow at that time an employee of the FBI?

Mr. MANDEL. On page 6 of this testimony it says:

In the summer of 1950, I went to New Mexico, to Taos, N. Mex., and at that time I had contacted the FBI, and was furnishing information to them and still in the party, and furnishing information to them in relation to party activities near Los Alamos, at Taos, N. Mex.

Senator FERGUSON. At one time he was in the employ of the FBI, as an agent?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. What does he say about the Solution in Asia, as far as the Communists are concerned?

Mr. MANDEL. It says:

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Matusow, we are primarily interested in the Institute of Pacific Relations and matters pertaining to the Far East in connection with the Communist Party.

In the course of your activities, did you ever handle any literature of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. In 1948, when I worked at the Jefferson School book shop, and during the periods of 1949 when I worked at the book shop on Sunday nights to supply literature to the various lecturers they had on their lecture program I handled certain material put out by the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MANDEL. Was this pamphlet one of those pieces of literature that you handled?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct. Our Job in the Pacific, by Henry A. Wallace.

Mr. MANDEL. Who published that pamphlet?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Institute of Pacific Relations, American Council.

Mr. MANDEL. How did you handle that pamphlet?

Then there is further discussion dealing with the pamphlet.

Senator FERGUSON. Can you get down to the other one?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. Did the book shop ever promote any of the publications of Owen Lattimore?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; it did.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. The books *Solution in Asia*, by Owen Lattimore, published by Little Brown & Co.—

Mr. MANDEL. What year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1945—it was one of the books used in the book shop and suggested reading for a background on the party line, the Communist Party line, in Asia.

Mr. SOURWINE: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Chair may wish to order this entire record placed in the record at this point.

Senator FERGUSON. I move it be placed in the record, but I wanted to have Mr. Lattimore know what was being said in this record about his book.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your motion that this entire record be included?

Senator FERGUSON. This witness' testimony be included in this record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be the order.

(The testimony referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 469," and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 469

INTERNAL SECURITY

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL
SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., Wednesday, February 13, 1952.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—CONFIDENTIAL

This subcommittee met at 11:15 a. m., pursuant to notice, in room 457, Senate Office Building, Senator V. Watkins presiding.

Present: Senator Watkins.

Also present: Benjamin Mandel, Director of Research.

Senator WATKINS. The subcommittee will come to order. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW, 1308 GRAND AVENUE, DAYTON 6, OHIO
(RESUMED)

Mr. MANDEL. Will you give your name and address?

Mr. MATUSOW. Harvey M. Matusow, 1308 Grand Avenue, Dayton 6, Ohio.

Mr. MANDEL. You have been previously sworn?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you give very briefly your career in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I joined the Communist Party in October of 1947. A year preceding that I joined the AYD, American Youth for Democracy, Communist Party youth organization.

In 1948, I worked in full time employment of the Jefferson School in the Jefferson Book Shop.

Mr. MANDEL. That is the Jefferson School of Social Science?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, at 575 6th Avenue, in New York City.

In September of 1948 I became a full time employee of People's Sings, Inc., a cultural organization of the Communist Party at the time.

Mr. MANDEL. Where were they located?

Mr. MATUSOW. 126 West 21st Street.

Mr. MANDEL. Why do you say it was a cultural organization of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Every organizer and full time employee of that organization were members of the Communist Party—

Mr. MANDEL. To your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my knowledge. I attended meetings with them as Communists.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you proceed with your other experiences in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. While at People's Songs, I worked on a national scale with the Progressive Party in their 1948 election campaign.

During this time I was also an organizer in the Communist youth movement in New York County.

In March of 1949 I became a full time employee of the Communist Party of New York City, worked at the county headquarters.

Mr. MANDEL. Where were the county headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. 35 East 12th Street.

Mr. MANDEL. Who was your superior?

Mr. MATUSOW. George Blake Charney.

Mr. MANDEL. Does that complete your experience in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, it does not. In May of 1949, under Communist instructions, I went to Puerto Rico, spent three weeks in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MANDEL. Did you go to Puerto Rico under the auspices of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. MANDEL. You were paid by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. MANDEL. And you did not go under some other committee or other auspices?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, the Communist Party of New York County and New York State, both.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you describe briefly your trip to Porto Rico, what you did there, and who accompanied you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Ted Bassett, who was then New York County Educational Director for the Communist Party, accompanied me to Porto Rico.

When we got to Puerto Rico, we met in closed party meetings with Caesar Andreau, who was then General Secretary of the Porto Rican Communist Party; Juan Santo Rivers, who was Chairman of the Porto Rican Communist Party. We also met with Juan Sias Corales, Trade Union Secretary for the Communist Party of Porto Rico and General Secretary of the Communist union there, either the CGT or UGT. A check will bear out which one it is.

His wife, Consuelo Sias Corales was Educational Director of the Communist Party at Puerto Rico; also Jane Speed Andreau, the wife of Caesar Andreau. She had been a Communist Party organizer in Alabama and had attended Communist leadership schools in New York.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you go on with your activities?

Mr. MATUSOW. We were instructed to set up a Communist Party newspaper in Porto Rico or furnish the funds for the setting up of this newspaper.

Mr. MANDEL. Did you take funds with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; but we brought information down as to where the funds could be gotten or how they could be gotten.

Mr. MANDEL. Did you know the details of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. Well, basically the funds would be gotten when the paper was ready for publication and the funds were needed, a Communist organizer would go from New York to Porto Rico with a bank draft or the cash necessary.

Mr. MANDEL. That was the arrangement you told the Porto Rican Communist leaders?

Mr. MATUSOW. Correct. Now, we also had the question of getting a Porto Rican delegate to the World Youth Festival to be held in Budapest, Hungary, in 1949.

Eugene Cubues, the Communist youth leader of Porto Rico, was selected.

I was instructed to tell him that he was to apply for a passport to go to France, Italy, and England. I was instructed to tell him to apply for the passport to go to eastern European countries as a tourist. But before I left, I received all of the necessary information, photographs and life history, to obtain a visa for him to go to Hungary.

I turned that information over to the Communist Party office in New York.

Mr. MANDEL. Whom did you turn it over to?

Mr. MATUSOW. To actually the American Youth for a Free World, at 144 Bleecker Street.

Mr. MANDEL. To what individual did you turn it over?

Mr. MATUSOW. To Lou Diskin, who at that time was Communist Party organizer for New York State, the youth movement in New York State, and with instructions for Cubes to pick up his visa for Hungary in Paris, when he got there.

In the summer of 1949 I was a full time employee of Camp Unity. I managed the Communist Party book shop at that camp, Camp Unity, Wingdale, New York.

In the fall of 1949, that is, from September to December, I was a full time employee of the Workers Book Shop at 48 East 13th Street in New York. I then carried out party assignments and was working in the Communist Labor Youth League as, at that time, State Literature Director of the Labor Youth League.

In the summer of 1950 I went to New Mexico, to Taos, New Mexico, and at that time I had contacted the F. B. I. and was furnishing information to them, and still in the party, furnishing information to them in relation to party activities near Los Alamos, at Taos, New Mexico.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Matusow, we are primarily interested in the Institute of Pacific Relations and matters pertaining to the Far East in connection with the Communist Party.

In the course of your activities, did you ever handle any literature of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. In 1948, when I worked at the Jefferson School book shop, and during the periods of 1949 when I worked at the book shop on Sunday nights to supply literature to the various lecturers they had on their lecture programs, I handled certain material put out by the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MANDEL. Was this pamphlet one of those pieces of literature that you handled?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, Our Job in the Pacific by Henry A. Wallace.

Mr. MANDEL. Who published that pamphlet?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Institute of Pacific Relations, American Council.

Mr. MANDEL. How did you handle that pamphlet?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was displayed at the book shop, and when people who were attending the Jefferson School, or party members whom I knew to be such, inquired about material, background material, on Asia, and mainly relating to the Communist revolution in Asia taking place in China, the Communists versus the Nationalists, I was instructed to suggest certain readings. This Our Job in the Pacific was one of those suggested readings.

Mr. MANDEL. Who suggested it to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. The manager of the book shop, Sid Ballinger. Before that, it was Ruth Nesi, the wife of Jim Nesi, who works for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you state as far as you remember what your instructions were in connection with this pamphlet?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, this pamphlet was one of the many books used—I will say that, that this was, as I say, part of the background material that you would give a Communist or somebody interested in the subject of the Communist Party viewpoint on the Pacific or the China question, the Asiatic question.

Mr. MANDEL. Did the book shop ever promote any of the publications of Owen Lattimore?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, it did.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. The book Solution in Asia, by Owen Lattimore, published by Little Brown & Co.—

Mr. MANDEL. What year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1945—it was one of the books used in the book shop and suggested reading for a background on the party line, the Communist Party line, in Asia.

Mr. MANDEL. What do you mean by suggested reading?

Mr. MATUSOW. You see, that was the Jefferson School book shop, and there were many courses conducted.

During this period, as I said, the war in China, the Communist revolution in China, was taking place, and many people professed a great interest in that and the party, the Communist Party line, as disseminated, had not caught up with the tide of events, we might say. The party had been caught for a while flat-footed in the terms of the actual literature put out by the Communist Party, international publishers.

Things were moving too fast for them. The State Education Committee got together and decided which books would be good background material, and which supported the Communist Party line.

They came out with a decision that Solution in Asia was one of those books which could give a Communist Party member a correct line, a Communist line, on the Asiatic situation in China and China specifically.

Mr. MANDEL. Did the book shop also promote the works of Israel Epstein?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. One book in specific was The Unfinished Revolution in China. Besides promoting the books of Israel Epstein, he was a lecturer at the Jefferson School on the question of China.

Mr. MANDEL. Did it promote the works of Lawrence K. Rossinger?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the name. May I go back on one point of Israel Epstein? When I worked at the Jefferson School, I was informed by David Goldway, who was then the Executive Secretary or Director of the Jefferson School, or held a leading position at the school, that nobody works at the Jefferson School and there are no lecturers on our programs who are not Communist Party members.

Mr. Goldway is also a member of the New York State Educational Committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. MANDEL. How do you know that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I attended the meetings, staff meetings, of the Jefferson School. As I say, I was a full-time employee, and when I was on the New York State Educational Committee of the Labor Youth League, I was on the Educational Committee of the Labor Youth League, and we worked closely with the Communist Party Education Committee in New York State, and I was told that Mr. Dave Goldway was a member of that Committee and had seen him at Communist Party headquarters when he was there to attend meetings of this New York Educational Committee.

Mr. MANDEL. What if anything do you know about the work of Frederick V. Field?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was told there again, before my trip to Porto Rico, I should say, that I should prepare myself or I should get a good background of the Porto Rican question.

Mr. MANDEL. Who told you?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Communist Party organizer in New York City, George Blake Charney.

Before I went to Porto Rico they wanted to make sure I was well founded in the party line of Porto Rico. I asked where I might get the material needed for the study of the background on the part of the Porto Rico question, and I was informed that the Frederick Vanderbilt Field library on West 26th Street, the Frederick Vanderbilt Field library was the place to go to get the party line and the background material needed for Porto Rico.

Mr. MANDEL. Did you actually go to that library?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I did.

Mr. MANDEL. How long were you there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I spent three or four afternoons and a few mornings there doing research on Porto Rico.

Mr. MANDEL. Did Frederick V. Field teach at the Jefferson School?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my knowledge he lectured there, he did lecture there. I mean, I know that, but I can't say what specific lecture it was.

Mr. MANDEL. In what way did the name of Evans F. Carlson come to your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was a member of the AYD, American Youth for Democracy, I picked up the official publication of the American Youth for Democracy, which at that time was the Communist Party Youth Organization in the United States, and on the back cover of this publication called Youth, a letter from Evans F. Carlson, a retired Brigadier General of the Marine Corps, was published, and it stated that he was proud and honored that his name had been chosen to name one of the AYD Clubs.

It seemed that one of the AYD Clubs had written him asking him for permission to use his name.

Mr. MANDEL. Is there any way you can get us a copy of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what issue that would be.

Mr. MANDEL. What year would that be?

Mr. MATUSOW. It would be one of the 1946 or 1947 issues.

I was also informed by people in the party literature set-up when the book The Big Yankee came out, which was the biography of Evans F. Carlson, before I sold that book, I mean in my capacity as a literature agent for the Communist Party, that it was highly recommended reading on the question of the Communists in Asia, and that General Carlson was a very close friend of Mao Tse-

tung, the party chairman and the head of the Communist Chinese Government. I was also told that General Carlson had been to China and he had trained the remnants of the Eighth Rout Army, which was the Communist Army. That was before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MANDEL. In what way did the name of Corliss Lamont come to your attention?

Mr. MATUSOW. Corliss Lamont had a number of articles published in a magazine called Science and Society.

Mr. MANDEL. What is the magazine?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was a Marxist quarterly, I believe. It was put out by members of the Communist Party. It delved mostly into philosophical questions.

Mr. MANDEL. Was it considered a Communist publication by the Jefferson book shop?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct. We also handle a book, and the title slips my mind right now, by Mr. Lamont, published by the Philosophical Library in 1949 or 1950, dealing with Marxist philosophy.

Mr. MANDEL. In other words, the work of Corliss Lamont was promoted, the books of Corliss Lamont were promoted, by the Jefferson book shop?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, and also the Workers book shop.

Mr. MANDEL. In what way has the name of Chu Tong come to your attention?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was editor of the China Daily News.

Mr. MANDEL. What was the official estimate of the China Daily News?

Mr. MATUSOW. When Mr. Chu Tong lectured at the Jefferson School of Social Science on the question of China, I was informed before his lecture that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MANDEL. Who informed you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Dave Goldway, of the Jefferson School. I might add that the reason for this answer and the reason for my question was that I was to handle literature that was to be sold during his lecture.

Before anybody lectured, I inquired about how far with the party line "can I go in selling the literature?" I mean, "would there be any objections on the part of the lecturer?" I was informed that he was a party member and that I could go all out in distributing party literature at his lecture.

I was also told by the same person, and other people connected with the Daily Worker and the Communist Party State Office when I was employed there, that the China Daily News was the Chinese language version of the Daily Worker in that it disseminated the line so closely and did not deviate.

Mr. MANDEL. Did you remember who told you this?

Mr. MATUSOW. There again I go back to Mr. Dave Goldway. I go to Ben Bordofsky.

Mr. MANDEL. Who is he?

Mr. MATUSOW. He is head of Wholesale Book Corporation, the Communist Party literature distributing house in New York and nationally, and on occasions when I had occasion to visit the offices of the Daily Worker and speak to certain people there, such as Allen Max, and offhand I can't think of some of the other names, and also Mr. James Nesi, a teacher at the Jefferson School and a lecturer for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, he also told me that he took the China Daily News as a Communist party organ.

Mr. MANDEL. Would you remember what year Chu Tong lectured at the Jefferson School, approximately?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1949.

Mr. MANDEL. Have you anything more to say about Chu Tong or the China Daily News?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I believe that completes that.

Well, yes; also one other person, if I might, a member of my club, the Tompkins Square Youth Club of the Communist Party, was a man named Lee York, or it could have been pronounced York Lee. I am not sure which was his first or last name.

He was born in China. At the time he was about 24 years old. He had joined the Chinese Communist Party at the age of eleven in China. During the second World War he joined the American Army and claims to have become an American citizen on the basis of that.

He also referred to the China Daily News as a Communist Party organ, distributed among the Chinese people in New York City.

Mr. MANDEL. In conversation with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANDEL. What, if anything, do you know about Agnes Smedley?

Mr. MATUSOW. We distributed and sold books written by Agnes Smedley at the Jefferson School book shop and the Workers shop.

Mr. MANDEL. What, if anything, do you know about Edgar Snow?

Mr. MATUSOW. His book, Red Star Over China, the party considered one of the most important books on the China question.

Mr. MANDEL. What, if anything, did you know about an organization known as A Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was informed by the Jefferson School, during the summer of 1948, through Dave Goldway, that a lecturer, namely, James Nesi, would appear at the summer camp for a period of one week to discuss China, and he would represent the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

I know Mr. Nesi personally and knew him to be a member of the Communist Party.

During that week when Mr. Nesi lectured, I was informed that the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy was a Pro-Communist group run by Communist party members. Their office was at 799 Broadway, in New York City.

At a later date in 1949 I had visited their office on more than one occasion—and don't remember the names right now, but knew the people that staffed the office to be members of the Communist Party.

Two of them in particular, who were secretaries or employees of that organization, had attended Communist Party youth meetings which I attended.

Mr. MANDEL. Was 799 Broadway the headquarters of other Communist organizations?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. One in particular where I worked, the Labor Youth League and the Labor Research Association was also at the offices of 799 Broadway.

Mr. MANDEL. What if anything do you know about the Magazine Guild and its parent organization, the United Office and Professional Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was a member of that organization and while—

Mr. MANDEL. Just let me interrupt you, if you please. Of which organization?

Mr. MATUSOW. The United Office and Professional Workers Union.

Mr. MANDEL. You were not a member of the Book and Magazine Guild? That which was affiliated with the United Office and Professional Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. I worked very closely with the organizers of that Book and Magazine Guild.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you tell us what you know of either the Book and Magazine Guild or the United Office and Professional Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. My contacts with the United Office and Professional Workers Union, of which the Book and Magazine Guild was part of, as a Communist Party member and a member in good standing of the United Office and Professional Workers Union, was informed by the organizers of the United Office and Professional Workers Union, such as Winifred Norman, Norma Aronson, Jack Greenspan, Aaron Kramer, Ethel Beach, and also by Communist Party organizers such as Norman Ross, that the United Office and Professional Workers Union was staffed, and full-time employees had to be, by members of the Communist Party. That included the Book and Magazine Guild.

Mr. MANDEL. Does the name of James S. Allen mean anything to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. James S. Allen was considered one of the party theoreticians on the questions of minority groups.

I believe in 1937 he wrote a book called The Negro Question in the United States, which is being reprinted now by the Communist Party.

He has written a number of pamphlets—I don't recall the titles of those pamphlets—and articles in magazines such as Political Affairs, and which was distributed by the Communist Party.

Mr. MANDEL. Were his pamphlets promoted by the Jefferson book shop?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, and they were published by the Communist Party, International Publishers or New Century Publishers.

Mr. MANDEL. Was New Century Publishers an official Communist publishing organization?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. MANDEL. What does the name of Abraham Chapman mean to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. The name is just familiar. I don't know him.

Mr. MANDEL. William Mandel?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Mandel had lectured at Camp Unity in the summer of 1949 under the auspices of the Council for American-Soviet Friendship. And there again, at Camp Unity, I was informed by the State Literature Director of the Community Party, Ben Bordofsky, that all lecturers at camp this summer "will

be Communist Party members, and your literature distribution in relation to those lecturers will be accordingly."

Mr. MANDEL. Mildred Price?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know the name.

Mr. MANDEL. Thank you very much, Mr. Matusow, for your testimony today. (Whereupon, at 11:53 a. m., Wednesday, February 13, 1952, the hearing was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

Mr. FORTAS. May we see it?

Mr. MORRIS. It is the testimony of Mr. Matusow.

Mr. FORTAS. Could I read it at luncheon; this record?

Senator FERGUSON. That is all right.

Did you ever know that your book was being used by the Communists as a Communist line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I didn't. I believe that record says that they used it for background reading.

Senator FERGUSON. Covering the Communist line, does it not say that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It says they used it as background reading.

Senator FERGUSON. You heard what was read.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I heard it, they said they were using it for background reading.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that the Communists were using your Solution in Asia as background reading?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I did not.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not it was in line with the Communist line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should say not.

Senator FERGUSON. Had you ever heard anyone, outside of this witness, saying that it was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that parts of a Communist review of Solution in Asia were introduced into the record, but not the whole review.

Senator FERGUSON. This record makes this statement, and your counsel can check it at noon:

Things are moving too fast for them. The State Education Committee got together and decided which books would be good background material, and which supported the Communist Party line.

Now, did you ever know that your book was used by the Communist State Education Committee as supporting the party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I did not.

Senator FERGUSON. And then at another place they say:

They came out with a decision—

meaning the Communist Party—

that Solution in Asia was one of those books which could give a Communist Party member a correct line, a Communist line, on the Asiatic situation in China and China specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. Your question is: Did he know that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not know that. Might I amplify that?

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to have you amplify that you did not know it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would understand that anybody who was studying the Far East at that time might read various books for background information, and anybody could use a book like that to twist to their own purposes, whatever those purposes were.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, Mr. Lattimore, do you not think then that people may be justified in criticizing your book as following the Communist line when testimony before this committee from an employee, an FBI agent, has characterized it as having been adopted as carrying out the party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, Senator. And may I say a few words in addition to that?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I do think that such an interpretation would be entirely unbalanced unless it were also entered into the record that many people of other points of view also used and commented favorably on Solution in Asia.

Senator FERGUSON. But you would not criticize people now for following what this witness has said under oath; would you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would criticize anybody who took a single opinion on a book that was in the open market and was used, quoted, commented on by all kinds of people of the most diverse opinions.

Senator FERGUSON. Can you account for the reason that the Communists may have taken this book as background for the problems in Asia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I can't.

The CHAIRMAN. I think at this time, Mr. Chairman, we have reached a point where we can recess for lunch.

Senator SMITH. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

On page 2 of this summary it is said, where he quoted:

Things were moving too fast for them. The State education committee got together and decided which books would be good background material, and which supported the Communist Party line.

Now, I inquire as to whether or not there is anything in that record to indicate that this term, "the State education committee," refers to an official organization of the State, wherever it was, in New York, or is that the committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. MORRIS. The antecedent paragraph shows that, I think, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I just wanted to be sure what it is referring to.

Mr. MORRIS. It says: "* * * in the terms of the actual literature of the Communist Party," and "Things were moving too fast for them."

Senator SMITH. Is that referring to the State education committee of the Communist Party, or the State of New York, or what?

Mr. MORRIS. Of the Communist party.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have reached a point where we can recess now for the noon recess, and we will reconvene at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p. m. the hearing was recessed until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, so that there can be no confusion in the record as to the witness Harvey M. Matusow, I want to read in relation to his identification with the FBI from the record:

In the summer of 1950, I went to New Mexico, to Taos, N. Mex., and at that time I had contacted the FBI and was furnishing information to them, and still in the party, furnishing information to them in relation to the party activities near Los Alamos, Taos, N. Mex.

Mr. FORTAS. May the record show that that is the only passage in the transcript that refers to this connection with the FBI?

Senator FERGUSON. That is right.

Mr. FORTAS. And may the record also show that I agree that certain parts of the transcript will be deleted?

Senator FERGUSON. That has no reference to this case.

Mr. FORTAS. That is correct.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed to read, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I make a request, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. You may make a request.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My wife is sitting here with me with certain supporting material that I prepared for this statement. May she from time to time hand that material to me as I need it?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that that should be done for the purpose of implementing your answers. You should make your answers, as far as you can, and then if you ask for information from anyone that is connected with it, it will be granted.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask a short series of questions at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, has Mrs. Lattimore, to your knowledge, been giving advice and assistance to any of the witnesses before this subcommittee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether to call it advice and assistance. She came over here to help Mr. Holland somewhat, before he appeared before this committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has she been helping any other witnesses in any way, as far as you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has she attended a number of our hearings, to your knowledge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. She has attended a number of hearings; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew that she had been taking notes of those hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what she did with those notes?

Mr. LATTIMORE. She brought them home and showed them to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. To your knowledge, has Mrs. Lattimore had any contact with witnesses before this subcommittee, other than Mr. Holland?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We have both of us seen Mr. Carter.

The CHAIRMAN. He is just asking about Mrs. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would rather have you ask her yourself, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking what you know.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, my mind is extremely confused because of the very complicated work that I have been through preparing this statement and consulting with other people myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you answer the question yes or no?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I can't answer it yes or no.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, the record shows that this witness feels that he is not competent to go along, as I understand this

answer here. He said he is so confused with the work he has been through preparing this that he might not be responsible for his answers.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care to take that.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I rephrase the question?

Do you know, Mr. Lattimore, whether Mrs. Lattimore has consulted with any witnesses before this committee before they have testified here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I state, Mr. Sourwine, why my memory is confused?

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. That is not the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I cannot answer that clearly, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is do you know. You can answer it whether you know or not, and then explain.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has she consulted with any of the witnesses who have appeared here, after they testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I amplify my previous answer, Mr. Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. You may explain it, not amplify it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will explain it by saying that these hearings have now been going on for some 8 months. During the course of that 8 months, both my wife and I have been very busy making notes, looking up references, all kinds of things, and for that reason it is not at all clear in my mind what persons my wife may have seen or consulted with before their hearings or after their hearings in the course of this long period.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any instances in which Mrs. Lattimore has consulted with witnesses who appeared?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall at the moment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you advised or assisted any witnesses before this committee, you yourself?

The CHAIRMAN. That is, before they testified, do you mean?

Mr. SOURWINE. Either before or after, in connection with their testimony here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have talked with Mr. Holland and Mr. Carter. That is all I can recall at the moment, because there may be others, if you would name some others. I would be glad to answer whether I recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you consulted and advised with any witnesses before this committee after they had begun their testimony and before they had concluded it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever come over to Washington to have conferences with witnesses before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you and Mrs. Lattimore ever have conferences with witnesses before this committee on the day they testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the day they testified? My wife was over here and saw Mr. Holland, I think, on the morning that he testified here.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that your complete and full answer to this question I just asked you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is as full as I can make it at the moment.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say that you and Mrs. Lattimore did not on any occasion come over to Washington and have a conference with any of the witnesses before this committee on the day they testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I couldn't say we didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think you did?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure. If I were allowed to consult with my wife, I could probably get a clearer recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that on that point the witness be allowed to consult with his wife and then asked to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. She doesn't remember any such occasions. She thinks it could only have been Mr. Carter and she doesn't remember consulting with him here.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may proceed.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk with Mr. Clubb before or after he testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I talked with Mr. Clubb before he testified here, but I didn't know that he was to testify here.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you confer with him after he testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I talked with him subsequent to his testifying here, but I don't recall whether we discussed his testimony here or not.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you think about it, whether or not you did discuss with him his testimony before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I again consult my wife?

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator FERGUSON. Was she with you when you were talking to him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think she would have been there; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if it does not interrupt the Senator— Mr. Lattimore, you seem to have the impression that if you had consulted and advised with any witness before this committee, it was Mr. Holland. Apparently after talking with Mrs. Lattimore, as you stated she thought if it was anyone it was Mr. Carter. Could it have been Mr. Holland and Mr. Carter together?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It might have been, but I don't think both of them together.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us anything about the occasion on which you might have consulted with Mr. Carter about his testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't recall precise dates. I can't recall the precise stage which the hearings had reached. I do remember talking with both of them, though.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, if you had, with Mrs. Lattimore, made a specific appointment and met with Mr. Carter to discuss his testimony before this committee, would you not remember it, or if you had done so with Mr. Holland would you not remember it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have seen and talked with so many people in the last 8 months, on the general subject of—

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer that. Would you not have remembered it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, did you ever have dinner with Mr. Carter and Mrs. Lattimore at the conclusion of a session of this com-

mittee at which Mr. Carter had testified, for the purpose of discussing with him the testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My wife says she saw him at the time of his hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is: Did you have dinner with him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking about you, now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether you had dinner on the night of September 20, 1951, which was the date on which Mr. Carter testified before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I couldn't tell you, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not have dinner at the Aldo Cafe, in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Aldo Cafe? I may have, I don't remember it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where that cafe is?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I couldn't tell you.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you ever eaten there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't tell you.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think it is possible that you could have eaten in the Aldo Cafe and not remember it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is quite possible.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know if there is anything unusual about the cafe?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that it is a cafe that has a tremendous grape arbor so that wherever you sit at the tables the grapes are hanging about a foot and a half above your head?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I remember such an arbor; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember eating in that cafe?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I remember eating there; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the occasion on which you were eating there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; Mr. Carter was there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us who else was there?

The CHAIRMAN. You have grapes and Carter mixed up now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I can't remember anyone else there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say there was no one else there besides you and Mr. Carter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't say so; no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Mrs. Lattimore was there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, do you not know she was there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; she was there.

Mr. SOURWINE. From your own recollection, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not from my own recollection; I am sorry.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think it is possible that Mr. Lawrence Rosinger was there with you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Might be. No; neither of us remember his being there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that your recollection? You said it might be, and you turned to Mrs. Lattimore, and she said "No" and you said "No." What is your recollection, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, my memory is not built of the structure of grape vines.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You can answer. What is your recollection, please?

Mr. LATTIMORE. None; blank.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you would say that we would be unable from you to obtain the name of the fourth person, if there was a fourth person who was with you that night?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Going back to Mr. Clubb, do you remember your conversation with Mr. Clubb?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before he appeared here?

Senator FERGUSON. Either before or after.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I remember we dropped in without any previous planning or anything to call at the Clubbs' one day when we were over here, and we dropped in because I had called him at the Department and was told he was on leave, or something of that sort.

Senator FERGUSON. You saw in the paper, did you not, that he had been suspended?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If you will let me go on with my story, Senator; after receiving this reply from the Department of State, I called his house and he said, "Yes, we are at home. Come on over."

So we went over there, and he told us that he had been suspended. We then saw it in the paper.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, after he testified, did you have a conversation with him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think almost certainly; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk to Mr. Vincent?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Before or after he testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Neither before nor after.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Service?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have seen Mr. Service occasionally in the past few months in connection with his appearance here before or after, I couldn't specify.

Senator FERGUSON. And Mr. Davies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not Mr. Davies.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, if I understood you correctly, you stated earlier that you had not come over to Washington for any conference with any witnesses before this committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have recalled one to your mind, have we not, that is, the occasion on which you had dinner with Mr. Carter and Mrs. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to ask you if you can recall any other occasions on which you had conferences with witnesses before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I can't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say there were no other occasions on which you had conferences with witnesses before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I can't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say there were not many such conferences?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I can't.

Mr. SOURWINE. No more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may proceed, Mr. Lattimore, to read your statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The distortions by your witnesses of what I wrote in 1945 about the Japanese Emperor are even more amazing. Mr. Dooman charged that I had been opposed to using the Japanese Emperor as an instrument of American policy after the war, as if Americans who opposed keeping pet emperors were somehow un-American, and Senator Eastland argued that Communists wanted to overthrow the emperor because "communism and monarchy are incompatible" and "Lattimore understood this."

Mr. Colegrove, rising to the occasion, expressed the idea much more vividly, saying that I had urged that the Japanese Emperor "and his whole family should be exterminated."

But Mr. McGovern excelled even Mr. Colegrove in the enormity of his accusations. Under prodding and leading questions from Senator Eastland, McGovern elaborated his distortions of my opinions about the Japanese Emperor to the point of saying that I "wanted him murdered," and wanted his family, including "his wife and children," treated as "among the worst of the war criminals," and "turned over to the Chinese who would know how to deal with him."

This ludicrous "mishmash" is a deliberate garbling of the opinion that I clearly expressed in *Solution in Asia*, in 1945, that after the war (not as "the best way to overthrow Japan"), the Emperor and his family should be interned in China, under the supervision of the United Nations. This suggestion was obviously predicated on the assumption that there would be a strong, stable government in China, under Chiang Kai-shek, and that China would be one of the Big Five of the United Nations. It was also predicated on the assumption that if the Emperor was not made a martyr, but simply removed from circulation, the way would be cleared for a future republic in Japan which I thought would favor the growth of a democratic system (*Solution in Asia*, pp. 187-188).

It was a humane suggestion, made at a time when many people, inflamed by Japanese atrocities and high American casualties, were demanding mass exterminations, just as a few fanatics are demanding now that we get rid of our Russian worries, or our Chinese worries, by dropping atom bombs indiscriminately and wiping out women and children as well as troops. I have never believed in or advocated this kind of bloodthirstiness.

Others (and I accuse none of them of being Communists) wanted to be more drastic. For instance, Senator Brien McMahon was quoted in the *New York Times* of August 11, 1945, as saying, "If the Japs are allowed to keep their fantastic god-emperor system, we may get an armistice and not an end to the war." Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault was quoted in the *New York Times* of August 30, 1945, as declaring that our greatest potential danger was in leaving the Japanese Emperor in control, and saying "There will either be a popular revolution headed by the commercial class or the Mikado will rebuild the old structure and begin new conquests at a future date."

On September 18, 1945,, Senator Russell, of Georgia, supported by Senators Fulbright, McClellan, and Taylor, introduced a joint reso-

lution to have Emperor Hirohito tried as a war criminal (S. J. Res. 94, Congressional Record, vol. 91, p. 8680).

I have here, also, quotations from others who wanted to get rid of the Emperor—including Hanson Baldwin, Mayor LaGuardia, Otto Tolischus, Brig. Gen. Carlos Romulo, Admiral William F. Halsey, Senators Wallace H. White, Tom Stewart, William Langer, and Sun Fo of the Chinese Nationalist Government—which I would like to introduce into the record.

Senator SMITH. What purpose is that, Mr. Chairman? Here are some unsworn statements by somebody who is not even at the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received at the moment, subject to a decision by the committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I speak to your remark, Senator?

Senator SMITH. I am just making an observation. Neither one of those men are here to be subject to cross-examination. You have put in ex parte statements from them.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I make an observation pertinent to your observation?

Senator SMITH. That is up to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I cannot see anything to raise an issue about. The Chair will pass upon the insertion into the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Against this background it sounds rather fantastic to hear Mr. Colegrove make what was, for a political scientist, an extremely rash statement. He said that "exterminating" the Japanese Emperor "has always been the Soviet line." I must confess my own ignorance. I should like to see Professor Colegrove produce the evidence on this interesting point.

On the subject of Japan, I don't want to be misunderstood. If the price of gaining your approval is that I forget the stab in the back at Pearl Harbor, that I forget the barbarous depredations of Japan in China and other countries, and that I subscribe to emperor worship, then the price is one that you will not get from me. I cannot forget recent history, and I cannot forgive treachery, whether it is made in America or in Japan. I do hope, however, that Japan will turn her back on her recent history, that she will become a decent member of the family of nations, and that the Emperor will become a ruler on the model of the English constitutional monarchy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, in the light of your present knowledge, do you think the United States was wrong in not eliminating the Japanese Emperor?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. May I explain that by adding that what I recommended on the subject of the Japanese Emperor was written before the end of the war when it was expected that there would be a bloody last stand made on the Island of Japan itself before we secured a surrender, and that therefore the political aspects, following the conquest of Japan, would turn out to be quite different from what it actually was.

Actually, the Japanese surrendered before we had landed at all. The Emperor took part in the surrender, and on the whole, I should say, that General MacArthur's handling of the Emperor was conducted with great diplomatic skill and statesmanship.

Senator WATKINS. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. You say "I recommended." To whom did you make a recommendation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To anybody who might buy my book.

Senator WATKINS. Did that include the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It included anybody who might buy my book.

Senator WATKINS. Is that the only recommendation made?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the subject of the Japanese Emperor, I believe that is absolutely the only recommendation I made.

Senator WATKINS. I noticed you said in the form that "I recommended" and that was the reason I was curious to know.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I was merely referring to what I had written in Solution in Asia.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to ask one question on that. You mentioned again the Solution in Asia. I will ask you whether or not you knew that your book, Solution in Asia, was advertised for sale by the International Book Store, 1400 Market Street, San Francisco 2, Calif.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't know it.

Senator FERGUSON. And did you know that the International Book Store, San Francisco, was listed by the Un-American Activities Committee report 1947, page 100, "The Communist Party book center in the Bay area for the distribution of its literature"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't, Senator, and in fact I believe I had never heard of the International Book Store until this moment.

Senator FERGUSON. We talked about the Daily Peoples World this morning, did we not, and you had heard that that was a Communist newspaper?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I first heard of that at the time of the Tydings hearings, a few years ago.

Senator FERGUSON. On January 8, 1945, in the Peoples Daily World, this ad appeared under "San Francisco." I am putting that in in relation to the witness' testimony, the witness who testified about your book being used.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is the first time I have seen it.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that at an executive session I took some time ago there was some testimony on that same point. It seemed to me there was an FBI agent who made a statement on that.

The CHAIRMAN. That was covered this morning.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, is the Senator offering this for the record?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, I am. But I want to call attention to the fact that it is listing William Z. Foster's book in the same ad.

Do you know William Z. Foster.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know who wrote Sabotage?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't know that book.

Senator FERGUSON. The Plot Against Peace. Do you know whether that was by Albert Kahn?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I have heard of that book, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. So your book was advertised with Mr. Foster, Mr. Albert Kahn, and the Solution in Asia. Do you think that might

confirm the man who testified this morning that it was being used as background of the Communist Party for their party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Senator, I have already stated that I don't see why the Communists—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that might confirm? That is the question. Do you care to answer that "Yes" or "No," and then elaborate, if you wish?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't answer that question yes or no, Senator. I don't know how the Communist Party operates in these matters.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you ever talked to any Communists in relation to that book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my knowledge.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever arrange for any price reduction for that book, to Communists or Communist book stores?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not your publisher did?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether he did or not.

Senator FERGUSON. Did he ever consult you about reduction in price?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I was ever consulted on that.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, will you think about it. You say you didn't think so. Will you think a moment and see whether or not you do recall that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if this is offered for the record, it appears to be a photostat. I believe Mr. Mandel prepared this photostat or caused it to be prepared. May we ask Mr. Mandel, who has been sworn for the duration of these hearings, about this?

Mr. Mandel, is that a photostat which you caused to be prepared?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is it a photostat of?

Mr. MANDEL. It is a photostat of the paper called the Daily People's World.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is a photostat of a portion of a page of that paper, is it not?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir. June 8, 1945, page 5.

Mr. SOURWINE. Being the display ad of the International Book Store?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Just one more question about Mr. Foster.

Do you know who William Z. Foster was, that is, what his position was in the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe he was at one time one of the leading Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. At one time. Do you not think he is now?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is he?

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I thought he was replaced by Browder or somebody.

Senator FERGUSON. When did that happen? When did you hear that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Years ago.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know he was indicted as one of the leading Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't answer you on that. I know that people considered the leading Communists were indicted, but I couldn't tell you anything about it.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not know whether William Z. Foster was indicted?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know Albert Kahn's position?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever hear of him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have heard of him in connection with that book that you have just referred to.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know whether or not he wrote pro-Communist literature?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Other than that, I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this to be admitted, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The document referred to was marked as "Exhibit No. 471" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 471

[Daily People's World, June 8, 1945, p. 5]

SAN FRANCISCO

NEW BOOKS AT INTERNATIONAL

ORGANIZED LABOR FACES THE NEW WORLD (by Wm. Z. Foster), 5 cents: Discusses the growing strength of organized labor, and the possibilities for advancement created by the formation of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

THE PLOT AGAINST THE PEACE (by the authors of "Sabotage"): Deals with Nazi Germany's secret plans for a Third World War by splitting the United Nations.

SOLUTION IN ASIA (by Owen Lattimore): Mr. Lattimore deals with the political, economic, and military factors affecting developments in the Far East.

INTERNATIONAL BOOK STORE

1400 Market Street, San Francisco 2, Calif.

Free mailing to all parts of the United States

DAILY PEOPLE'S WORLD was cited as the "West Coast mouthpiece of the Communist Party * * * published by the Pacific Publishing Foundation, Inc., in San Francisco. * * * The San Francisco office is located at 590 Folsom Street and the Los Angeles office is at 206 South Spring Street." (California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, 1948, p. 342.) GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS, May 14, 1951, House Committee on Un-American Activities, page 131.

INTERNATIONAL BOOKSTORE, SAN FRANCISCO

1. "The Communist Party book center in the bay area for the distribution of its literature." (California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1947, p. 100.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the Chair desire the witness to go ahead with the reading of his statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with the reading of your statement, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the record would be more balanced—

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind about the balance of it. You may proceed with the reading of your statement. We can take care of the balance. Please go ahead with your reading. We will take care of the balance of the record. That is our obligation. Please go ahead with the reading of your manuscript or else desist from it.

MR. LATTIMORE. 4. In 1949, I was invited by the State Department with about 30 other people to take part in a discussion of far-eastern policy; and as part of the preparations for that discussion I contributed—also on invitation—a memorandum of my views. To the best of my recollection this is the only time, in more than 25 years, that the State Department has ever asked me for my views.

For the purpose of discrediting the far-eastern policy of the present administration, and presumably to keep himself in the newspapers as a perpetual presidential candidate, Mr. Harold Stassen has attempted to make me the scapegoat of this conference.

Mr. Stassen accused me of leading, at this conference, a "prevailing Lattimore group" which advocated a Communist line. He then described a "10-point program" which he claimed I had advocated. Mr. Stassen obviously did not expect the record of the conference would be made public.

MR. SOURWINE. May I ask leave to interrupt the witness at that point, to clarify his statement in that regard?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. Do you, Mr. Lattimore, intend by that sentence—

The CHAIRMAN. What sentence is that?

MR. SOURWINE. "He then described a '10-point program' which he claimed I had advocated."

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to get more of the sentence in there.

MR. SOURWINE. That is the full sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. It refers back to who?

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Stassen.

Do you intend by that sentence, Mr. Lattimore, to make the statement that Mr. Stassen claimed that you alone, as an individual, advocated a 10-point program?

MR. LATTIMORE. That sentence, Mr. Chairman, should be taken in conjunction with the previous sentence in which there is the expression quoted from Mr. Stassen "prevailing Lattimore group."

MR. SOURWINE. Will you answer the question directly, please? Did you intend by that sentence to make the charge that Mr. Stassen had stated that you, as an individual, had advocated a 10-point program?

MR. LATTIMORE. He described me as one of the individuals who had advocated a 10-point program.

MR. SOURWINE. I am asking about your intent, sir. Did you intend by the sentence that I read to charge that Mr. Stassen had stated that you, as an individual, personally, had advocated this 10-point program?

MR. LATTIMORE. My intention was to quote from Mr. Stassen himself, that he said I was one of a group which advocated a 10-point program.

MR. SOURWINE. You did not quote from him that way, did you, Mr. Lattimore?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did. He accused me of leading at this conference a prevailing Lattimore group. Later in my statement I come to the question of Mr. Stassen and me personally.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact you know, do you not, that Mr. Stassen said the group advocated these 10 points; that he explained what he meant by the group, and that he did not at any time say that you personally had avocated all the 10 points. Is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Stassen repeatedly made statements which would convey to the ordinary member of the public reading the newspapers that, as a member of the group, I must have made such statements personally.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you then charging, Mr. Lattimore, that Mr. Stassen did state that you had advocated this 10-point program?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am stating that Mr. Stassen conveyed that impression.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now may I get back to the original question, sir. I wish we could have a yes or no on it. Did you, by the use of this sentence "He then described a '10-point program' which he claimed I had advocated" mean to say that Mr. Stassen was charging you as a person with advocating this particular 10-point program?

Mr. LATTIMORE. With advocating; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is your intention?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And will you now—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Which he claimed I had advocated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you now tell the committee from what part in the record you are quoting when you say that Mr. Stassen declared that you were advocating that program, as an individual?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He stated "that the members of this group had not differed from each other."

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Proceed with your reading.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, please, may I continue?

Do you not know, Mr. Lattimore, that after having identified the group that he was speaking of, after having said there were two leaders in this, one perhaps senior, Mr. Owen Lattimore, and Mr. Lawrence Rosinger, they were the leaders in the discussion of the prevailing group, Mr. Stassen was then asked if he would in a concrete way set forth some of recommendations that this group had made during the conference and he stated "The group that was led in the discussion by these two gentlemen recommended 10 points for American policy in China and in Asia."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I submit, Mr. Sourwine, that to the ordinary reader that would convey the impression that I had made some of the statements.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are discussing this, then, only in the light of what you consider to be a statement by Mr. Stassen that you as a member of this group have advocated the 10-point program that you speak of?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed with the reading, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Accordingly, he let his imagination run riot and attributed to me all the opinions expressed at this conference with which he disagreed, and some that he just imagined.

As soon as I learned of Mr. Stassen's statements I appealed to the State Department to release the full record of the conference. I publicly asked Mr. Stassen to join me in this request, which he did not do.

As soon as I could obtain a transcript of my remarks I released it to the press, and later the full transcript of the entire conference was released.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

Do you, Mr. Lattimore, take credit for the release of that conference record by the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, you referred yesterday somewhat disparagingly to my ego, but I think in this case I can claim a major part of the credit for getting that transcript released.

Mr. SOURWINE. I do not think there is any question about it.

As a matter of fact, do you know that this committee had asked that that transcript be made available to this committee long before you asked that it might be made public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that it was denied to this committee until after you asked that it be made public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't know that; no. I may have heard it at one time, but I didn't know it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I take no issue with the statement that you were largely responsible for the release of that transcript.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may proceed with your reading, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. You have that in your files, and I ask you to check it against what I say here. This transcript clearly showed that I had not advocated any of the 10 points which Mr. Stassen had so irresponsibly labeled as a Lattimore program. His 10 points were as follows:

1. Deferment of the problem in Asia; priority for Europe. What I said was that the problems of Asia and Europe should be handled jointly.

2. No United States aid-to-Asia program until "after long study." I did not suggest "long study." I said that we could attract Asian countries away from Russia by showing that friendly association with the United States was a better and faster way of obtaining economic prosperity.

3. That the Russian Communists were not as aggressive as Hitler. On that point Mr. Stassen attributed to me a garbled version of something that was said by Mr. George Kennan, of the State Department.

4. Early recognition of Red China. I did not advocate this. I said that to recognize Red China in haste might create in Asia the impression that we had been panicked; but that to defer recognition too long, if the Chinese Communists proved that they were there to stay, might give the impression that we had been baffled. Incidentally, I do not believe that we should recognize Red China at this time.

5. The United States should encourage such countries as Britain and India to recognize Red China, and should then follow with its own recognition.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, when you say that you do not recommend that we should recognize China at this time, do you know of anybody that would recommend that we recognize Red China when we are fighting a war with her?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. While we are fighting that war?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Has that anything to do with your recommendation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I put that in as a safeguard against being quoted out of context.

Senator FERGUSON. Quoted by who?

Mr. LATTIMORE. By this committee or the press or anybody.

Senator FERGUSON. You think that this committee would quote you out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This committee has quoted me out of context.

Senator FERGUSON. On what occasions?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can give you one occasion when Mr. John Carter Vincent had read to him, I believe, or had shown to him, a passage from *Solution in Asia* dealing with what I represented as the attitude of the Asian peoples on the frontier of China, and left out the words "in their eyes" in such a way as to misrepresent me as believing what I said other people thought.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you find that in the transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; it is in the transcript.

Senator FERGUSON. Could you let us see it?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, the question was, Did you find that in the transcript? It is perfectly obvious from the way you turned around to Mrs. Lattimore that you did not. Is that not true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was turning around to see if we had a copy of that part of the transcript with us.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you find it in the transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I checked the transcript.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you call the attention of the committee to the fact that there was something in the way of an omission?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you think it could have been an omission, or do you want to now cite it as bad faith upon the part of the committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That particular quotation has been used against me so often, and I have protested against it so often, that when I encounter it now I can hardly avoid the assumption that it is deliberate misquotation.

Senator FERGUSON. You mean that it has been quoted before with this omission?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, it has.

Senator FERGUSON. Who quoted it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I ask if we have a record of it?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; we would like to have it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator McCarthy quoted it, and I can produce that quotation.

Senator FERGUSON. I wish you would, for the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. And Miss Freda Utley quoted it, and I can produce that quotation.

Mr. SOURWINE. How about producing the quotation that you charged the committee made out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As soon as I can get hold of the copy of the transcript, Mr. Sourwine, I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed with your reading for the time being.

Mr. LATTIMORE. 5. The United States should encourage such countries as Britain and India to recognize Red China, and should then follow with its own recognition. There is nothing like this in the transcript.

6. That it should be United States policy to turn Formosa over to the Chinese Communists. I did not mention Formosa.

7. That it should be our policy to permit the Chinese Communists to take Hong Kong. Although Mr. Stassen said this was one of the "hot arguments" of the conference, the only mention of Hong Kong in the entire conference was by Mr. Butterworth of the State Department, who had merely said, "The British have not sought any particular assistance through us for the defense of Hong Kong." Mr. Stassen himself also referred to Hong Kong, but there was no "argument."

8. That Premier Nehru had shown reactionary and arbitrary tendencies. I did not speak on the subject of India, nor mention Nehru, for whom I have always had the highest regard and whom I consider the outstanding representative of freedom in Asia.

9. That the United States should not approve the Nationalist blockade of the Chinese Communist coast, and should send economic aid to Communist areas. I did not say this.

10. That no aid should be sent to the non-Communist guerillas, nor to the Chiang Kai-shek forces. I said nothing of this sort.

In his second hearing, after the full record had been released, Mr. Stassen backtracked. He did not, of course, admit error. That would have been out of character for a Presidential candidate. He attempted to cover up by quoting some member of what he had labeled the "Lattimore group" (who, he said, had "not differed" from each other) in support of each of his 10 points. He quoted me in connection with only 1 of the 10, and that in a way to distort my meaning.

Confronted with the absurd discrepancies between the kind of conference that he had pretended to describe and the kind of conference that was revealed when the full transcript was finally published, Stassen tried to escape by doing acts on the flying trapeze, as if he were a road-show McCarthy swinging through the air with the greatest of ease from "205 names" to "57" names and all the rest of it. Instead of continuing to claim that I was the leader of the group because I advanced all or any of their 10 points, the only reason he could now give for calling me and Mr. Lawrence Rosinger its "leaders" was that we had done most of the talking; although even this was not the case.

Whatever agreement there was between Mr. Rosinger and me was purely accidental. I know Mr. Rosinger only very slightly and had had no discussion with him on any of these matters either before or during the conference. Our contributions to the discussion happened to be on different subjects, except on the matter of the recognition of Red China and, since we differed markedly on this, there was not even anything which could be termed agreement between us.

On the subject of the recognition of China, Mr. Rosinger advocated recognition as "early as possible," within "perhaps 3, 6, maybe 9 months," whereas I pointed out that there could be serious disadvantages either in a hasty recognition of the Red regime, or in delaying recognition too long.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness whether he thinks that the quoted statements there, his own and Mr. Rosinger's, are actually different or whether his own statement is only more palatable?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think my statement is entirely different.

Mr. SOURWINE.—Mr. Rosinger, within "perhaps 3, 6, maybe 9 months." You were urging that recognition be not delayed too long. What is the difference?

Mr. LATTIMORE. One of the differences is that I have here simply boiled down what I actually had to say on the subject, and one of the things that I had to say on the subject was that any question of recognition of China should be considered only in conjunction with a number of other moves on policy in Asia. I don't believe that point was taken up by Mr. Rosinger at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. The discussion of the whole question of what you said can well be saved for a later date. But I was endeavoring to find out whether, on the basis of what you had seen fit to quote here, you felt that there was a contradiction between what Mr. Rosinger had urged, and what you were urging.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I think there is a distinctive difference.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think they are contradictory?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think contradictory, in that context, Mr. Sourwine, is a rather trick word.

Senator FERGUSON. Do I understand the witness is accusing the counsel of trying to trick him?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and it has been going on right along. Answer that question. You can answer it yes or no. Do you think it is contradictory?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That my position was contradictory of Rosinger's?

The CHAIRMAN. The statement of the witness will be stricken from the record as regards the question being tricky.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, I am sorry, Mr. Senator. I still think it was a tricky question.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be stricken from the record also. Now if you will answer the question we will get along.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that the question is not susceptible to answer in terms of the word "contradictory."

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. Go on. Go on with your reading.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a fact that in October 1949, many responsible, well-informed and patriotic men believed that it would be sound policy to recognize the new government in China. To hold that belief was not in the slightest unpatriotic or subversive. When the British Government recognized the Red government of China, there was no appreciable Tory opposition, and the present conservative government confirms that policy today. I hold it against no man that he took that position at that time. I freely admit that I was not crystal-clear in my own mind then as to the best course of action. If I myself, at that conference, had advocated the recognition of China, I should not be in the least ashamed of it. But on the point of relevant fact, the record shows that I did not. It would be more accurate to accuse Mr. Rosinger of conniving with Mr. William R. Herod, president of the General Electric Co., Mr. William S. Robertson of the American & Foreign Power Co., and J. Morden Murphy, vice president of the

Bankers Trust Co. All of these men advocated recognition at that time, as the transcript shows. I present for your record quotations from these and other men who advocated recognition of Red China.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, at that point, the entire transcript of the proceedings of that State Department conference is in the record of this committee, as printed in volume 5.

I should like at this time to tender to Mr. Lattimore and his counsel, and Mrs. Lattimore, the committee copy of the record of Vincent's testimony.

I am still interested in having Mr. Lattimore identify the particular quotation which he says was printed improperly.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be presented to the witness. Mrs. Lattimore is not a witness before this committee, and neither is his counsel. It will be presented to the witness.

Mr. SOURWINE. I beg the Chair's pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. If the witness wants to refer to his counsel or anyone else, that is his business.

Mr. FORTAS. Do you want us to have Mr. Lattimore look at this now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time, while we are on that particular record, I want to offer into the record, back at the time we put in this ad from the International Book Store, the remarks of the report of 1948, page 342, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, on May 14, 1951, House Committee on Un-American Activities, page 131.

The CHAIRMAN. That will go in in connection with the other offer?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; with the ad.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

I think you are going to take up considerable time here, in having the witness look up through the labyrinth of testimony.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I have some assistance, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I think probably it would be well to defer the matter until a later date.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is all right with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say that I understand a request was made for a continuation of the hearing by Mr. Fortas.

Mr. FORTAS. I said, Mr. Chairman, that I had engagements Saturday and Sunday out of town, that it would be possible for me to fly back and get here Monday morning, but it would be very difficult, indeed. But I could get back Wednesday morning.

The CHAIRMAN. We are deferring other committees. I have put over the Appropriations Committee today in order to be here. I am going to put over the Judiciary Committee on Monday in order to go on. We just must go through with it to a conclusion. I am sorry to say that we just cannot accommodate you in that respect.

Mr. FORTAS. I should say, Mr. Chairman, that I made the other arrangements on the basis of Mr. Morris' kind statement to me that the committee would have to finish by Friday night. Is that not true?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I did not. Mr. Fortas. I said that we had a hearing scheduled for Monday, and I gave as the reason why we could not begin on Wednesday as you suggested the fact that we would have to

finish this week this hearing because of the other engagement on Monday.

Mr. FORTAS. That is what I tried to say, briefly though.

Mr. MORRIS. That made no mention of Friday.

Mr. FORTAS. You said this week.

Mr. MORRIS. I did.

Mr. FORTAS. As I understand it, the chairman is now suggesting that we go on Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. We will go on with this hearing because the Senator from Michigan here, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and also other Senators, are detained. We just have to conclude this so as to go on to other work.

Today I had to adjourn the Appropriations Committee so as to come back here. I am sorry to say that our condition is such that we just cannot always accommodate the way we would like to accommodate.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that we hold the hearing on Saturday also?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir, we will be here on Saturday also.

Mr. FORTAS. It is absolutely impossible for me to go and be here on Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. You can have some other member of your firm here.

Mr. FORTAS. There is no one else who is considering this case, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry not to be able to accommodate you, but the work is so, here, that we just have to put in every hour, as you may see since you have been up here, as you know without being told of it.

Mr. FORTAS. I know, Senator, but I did make this engagement on the basis of what I understood Mr. Morris to say, and I cannot cancel it.

Mr. MORRIS. There was no mention that we would not have anything on Saturday.

Mr. FORTAS. I understood you to say Friday night. If I misunderstood you, I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish I could accommodate you, Mr. Fortas. I am sincere in that; but it just cannot be done; that is all there is to it. You have other members of your firm.

Mr. FORTAS. I do have other members of my firm, but there is nobody who is familiar with this matter. However, you will have to give me a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. I will have to deny your request, that is all. I am sorry to do it.

I do not think we should delay the committee to look up something through that record at this time. I would like to go on.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the statements on the subject of the recognition of Red China, at this conference that we were discussing, I have some supplementary statements in favor of that at the same time which I desire—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know what question you are addressing this to.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am addressing this to the point in my statement where I say "I present for your record quotations from these and other men who advocated recognition of Red China."

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. You may proceed and present that, and the Chair will pass on it. We will go over it.

I may say to you that I am going to pass on these things as to whether or not they are material or in line with the hearing. I am going to pass on them just as soon as I can.

(For the material referred to see exhibit 477 which appears on p. 3703 of appendix I, pt. 10.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. A member of this committee did his best to help Mr. Stassen. As "evidence," Mr. Stassen cited the fact that I made the not very brilliant or original remark that there was a "new situation" in Asia. "That meant the recognition of Communist China, doesn't it?" asked Senator Smith, eagerly coming to his aid. "That is right," said Stassen.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why Professor Lattimore has put in the words "eagerly coming to his aid."

What is the basis for any such statement as that, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the impresson I got from reading the transcript.

Senator SMITH. Is there anything in the transcript that reads that? That is another part of your imagination. I guess you got that from your epidermis that you referred to yesterday, the feeling.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Why are you justified in saying that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that Mr. Stassen had made a not at all convincing statement and that he received immediate support.

Senator SMITH. I asked the question. According to what you said, that meant the recognition of Communist China, does it not? That is a question, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a question and it is a leading question.

Senator SMITH. Maybe it is leading, but why do you say I was eagerly coming to his aid?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because my impression was that it was a leading question, and for the purpose of leading him to—

Senator SMITH. Do you have any reason on earth why I should want to come to Mr. Stassen's aid?

Mr. LATTIMORE. None; except the impression I have here.

Senator SMITH. That is just your imagination at work; is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My interpretation of a written text, Senator.

Senator SMITH. There is nothing in that text that says anything.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, Mr. Lattimore, it is also trying to infer that the Senator did it in bad faith. Is not that what you wanted to convey to the public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Then why did you use it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is no implication of bad faith.

Senator FERGUSON. Then why did you use it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The indication is that this was a statement that might be strengthened to imply the recognition of Communist China and Senator Smith had helped Mr. Stassen to make that, to carry that inference further.

Senator FERGUSON. You accuse Stassen of bad faith, do you not, in that record?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't accuse Stassen of anything more than just trying to get on in the world.

Senator FERGUSON. And not of bad faith?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of bad faith, no, just trying to get on in the world.

Senator SMITH. You think then that any time a committee member asks a question to clear up the statement of a witness, that that is eagerly helping, for the witness that you referred to, eagerly coming to his aid. That is what you said, did you not? And you said it without any foundation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is simply my impression on reading the transcript. If I misinterpreted you, I would be glad to change it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are making that a part of your oath here, before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What, this statement here?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Senator SMITH. We might ask him to prove that now. I think that would make a good point.

The CHAIRMAN. We might have to go into your mental processes in order to find out if you were eager.

Senator SMITH. That just goes to show, Mr. Chairman, the total irresponsibility of this witness' statements, without foundation.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, you say you did not accuse Mr. Stassen of bad faith.

The CHAIRMAN. He said so. He testified to it here today.

Senator FERGUSON. I want to go back on page 32, where you accuse him, that—

Stassen tried to escape by doing acts on the flying trapeze, as if he were a road-show McCarthy swinging through the air with the greatest of ease from "205 names" to "57" names—

and all the rest of it. You mean that that sentence does not infer bad faith.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that sentence infers great agility.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you pretend as a scholar and as a teacher in a college that your answer is an answer to the question that I asked?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You will proceed with your reading. Everybody is in bad faith, excepting Mr. Lattimore.

Senator SMITH. That seems to be the case.

Mr. LATTIMORE. How much more silly can the part-time president of a great university get?

Senator FERGUSON. Now, who are you talking about?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Stassen.

Senator FERGUSON. I have been talking about a Johns Hopkins professor, and I wondered whether or not you had come into that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. How much more silly can the part-time president of a great university get?

Senators, if you are really interested in the future of our country—and I am sure that you are—you will look into your minds and hearts and try to find the answer to the real and shocking question, "Why does a man of Stassen's stature engage in irresponsible and false accusations of pro-Communist views? Is this committee lending itself to the encouragement of such destructive activities by the politically ambitious, the fellow-travelers of witch-burning, the insecure, and the vain and ambitious?"

Mr. SOURWINE. You say that is not charging Mr. Stassen with bad faith?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He is charging him with perjury. Whether that is bad faith or not, I do not know.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, do you claim that is charging him with good faith?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I claim that is charging him as is clearly stated here, with irresponsibility.

Senator FERGUSON. And that is not bad faith when he does it under oath?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, you are a lawyer. You would have to define that. I can't.

Senator FERGUSON. Then why did you use it—it is your word?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I used the term "irresponsible."

Senator FERGUSON. And you say that is accusing him of bad faith?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it is not accusing him of bad faith.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go ahead.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, do you think that a witness, or any other person, can use words of invective and then escape their legal effect by claiming that they have no knowledge of their legal effect?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine—

The CHAIRMAN. Just answer that "Yes" or "No," and we will see where we will get.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My answer is that I am incapable of answering that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lattimore, are you a teacher in Johns Hopkins?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what institution are you a graduate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not a graduate of any institution.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a graduate of any high school even?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I finished my studies at a school in England—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you graduate from high school? Can you not answer that question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I just want to make a point here that I went to school in England where they do not graduate.

The CHAIRMAN. Please answer the question. Did you ever graduate from high school? You can answer that "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your answer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't graduate from a high school. I went to school in England; I left school at the age of 19 and there was no such thing as graduation ceremonies or diploma or anything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever graduate from a grammar school?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Chairman, along that line, while we are on that subject—

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I asked that question is the apparent desire of this witness to avoid the consequences of his own statements by saying that he does not understand the statement, after it has been brought to his attention.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the witness a question along that line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, on your statement there I have no desire whatever to escape any responsibility for what I have said.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care what your desire is.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will stand by every word that I have written in this statement. What I am declining to do is to accept legalistic paraphrasers and rephrasings of what I have said in terms which I do not understand.

Senator SMITH. Maybe I can understand it. Let me ask you about this: On the bottom of that paragraph, you refer to "the fellow travelers of witch burning." Who are you talking about there? Can you tell us who you are referring to there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should say that Mr. Stassen at that moment was fellow traveling along with Senator McCarthy, and I should say that Senator McCarthy is a graduate witch burner.

Senator JENNER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator SMITH. Those are the only ones that you refer to there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Those are the only ones that I have at the moment.

Senator FERGUSON. I suppose you are not imputing bad faith in that answer that you made about Senator McCarthy and Mr. Stassen?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think there is a difference there.

Senator FERGUSON. You think that is bad faith?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think there is a difference between Senator McCarthy and Stassen. I think Mr. McCarthy is capable of bad faith. I think Mr. Stassen is just too slippery. That is, the question of bad faith and good faith probably doesn't alarm him.

Senator JENNER. You say you are an academic specialist on the Far East?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator JENNER. We should like to know when you are speaking as an academic expert and when you are expressing the opinions of a private citizen.

I will ask you this question: Are you an expert on politics, economics, geography, or military science?

The CHAIRMAN. On either of those, is that what you mean, Senator?

Senator JENNER. That is right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not primarily on any of those.

Senator JENNER. Then what academic degrees do you have?

Mr. LATTIMORE. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. He has none.

Senator JENNER. He says he is an academic expert, but he has no degrees.

Senator SMITH. I believe he does have some honorary degrees.

Senator JENNER. You said you were an academic expert on the Far East. I asked you what academic degrees you hold and you said "None."

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator JENNER. That is all I want, Mr. Chairman. He has answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Go on with the reading.

Mr. LATTIMORE. 5. In addition to the foregoing Government connections, I once lectured, on invitation and without pay, to a group of State Department personnel, on Japan. I was one of a number of outside persons who gave similar lectures.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee needs a little more information on that subject.

Did you lecture on more than one occasion, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Only that one occasion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Just one occasion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the only occasion I can recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember when that was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I look and see if I have the documentation on that?

Mr. SOURWINE. While we are waiting for that answer, is it your statement that you did not give a series of talks or lectures for personnel of the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my recollection, I never did anything of that kind; no.

Mr. SOURWINE. This particular lecture that you speak of, the date of which you are trying to get us, can you tell us how that was arranged?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will bring in the exact date reference tomorrow, Mr. Sourwine. It was arranged by a letter to me from someone in the State Department. I remember being asked about that at the time of the Tydings committee hearings, and didn't remember, and I believe I looked it up later and found that it was Mr.—I think his name is Francis J. Russell.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Mr. John Carter Vincent had anything to do with that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what position he held at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't recall—no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss with him the subject of your lecture either before or after you made it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. If that date could be furnished for the record, I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman, on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Go ahead with your reading, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Just to keep the record full at this moment, I believe the date was probably early in 1946.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. 6. In 1945, on my own initiative, I wrote to President Truman, expressing my views on China policy.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to ask the witness if he kept a copy of that letter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I kept a copy of that letter.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have it with you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you furnish it for the committee record?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that that letter, as furnished and identified by Mr. Lattimore, be placed in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us look at it first.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is a copy, Mr. Lattimore, of the letter that you speak of?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a copy.

Senator FERGUSON. Is it a carbon copy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it is a typed copy.

Senator SMITH. Do you have the carbon copy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I have a carbon copy.

Senator SMITH. An original carbon copy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The original carbon copy; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is only one copy of this. For the information of this committee, it is only a single page, does the Chair believe it should be read?

The CHAIRMAN. One moment, please; we have not looked at it.

Senator Smith, will you take over the chair, please? I have another assignment.

Senator FERGUSON. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the letter to the President be made a part of the record, and if there is any question about it it may be compared with the carbon copy.

Senator SMITH (presiding). Without objection, that will be done.

(Letter referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 473" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 473

JUNE 10, 1945.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,

President of the United States.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, on the recommendation of President Roosevelt, appointed me his political adviser in 1941, the policy of the United States was to support a united China. There appears now to be a major change in our policy, which may invite the danger of a political and even a territorial division of China and the further danger of conflict and rivalry between America and Russia.

Until quite recently, great care was taken to avoid any inference that America, in aiding China as a nation, was committing itself to all-out support of one party in China's domestic affairs. There now appears to be a fundamental change. Public statements by men regarded as spokesmen for American policy encourage many Chinese to believe that America now identifies the Chinese Government with one party and only one party, commits itself to the maintenance of that party, and may in the future support that party in suppressing its rivals.

Such a belief among Chinese may make Russians feel that America has led the way in committing itself to one party in China, and that Russia would be justified in following that lead and committing itself to the other major party. As a consequence, we may be heading straight into a situation in which political partisanship and rivalry for control of strategic geographical zones will be the actual starting point for any discussion of far-eastern issues between America and Russia.

In the eyes of many people such a development would mean that America itself, long the supporter of China's political and territorial integrity, had initiated a new policy identified with the political and territorial partition of China.

These considerations point to the possibility of grave crisis and make me feel it my duty as a citizen to lay before you, Mr. President, the opinion that the crisis cannot be averted by approaching the problem through the politics of either China or Russia. The first step toward a solution must be to correct the alarmingly rapid drift of current American policy.

With the utmost earnestness, I venture to urge you to have America's policy toward China impartially reviewed by advisers who are not associated with either the formulation or the implementation of that policy as recently practiced.

Respectfully yours,

[S] OWEN LATTIMORE.

OL.

Senator SMITH. Are we ready to proceed? Do you have some further questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. Not immediately, sir.

Senator SMITH. I would like to ask Mr. Lattimore one question.

On the strength of that letter which you wrote to the President, you had a conference with the President?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. And he gave you 3 minutes?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Just about.

Senator SMITH. All right; go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't have a stop watch with me.

Senator SMITH. But you said in your document here it was 3 minutes, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; that is my recollection. But it was a relative order of magnitude that I made.

The President, in response, asked me to come to see him, and I did. Our conference lasted about 3 minutes. Neither my letter nor my visit had the slightest effect on American policy. This is the only time, in more than 25 years, that I ever took the initiative in writing to a President of the United States.

Senator FERGUSON. When he replied, did he only ask you to come and see him? He did not give you any opinion, did he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have a copy of his reply here, which I will be glad to submit, if you want it.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to see it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think the reply says: "Glad to see you some time."

Senator FERGUSON. I want to know whether it was an answer to your letter or what. You say now there has been nothing done by our Government after the date of the letter of June 1945, indicating that the President followed anything you had to say in that letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Indicating that my visit had the slightest effect on American policy.

Senator FERGUSON. You say there is nothing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not in my opinion.

Senator FERGUSON. I will have some questions later on it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the only occasion when you visited a President of the United States, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the only occasion on which I have ever visited Mr. Truman.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked if that was the only occasion on which you visited a President of the United States.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, I thought you said the President. A President; no. I also saw President Roosevelt several times, in connection with my work with Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will reserve questions for a later time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you leave with the President any of your writings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My book, you mean?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. Or any writing, outside of the letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I left with him two memoranda.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you copies of the memoranda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have copies of those memoranda. Incidentally, there is some supplementary correspondence about arranging a conference. Would you like to see that, too?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; I would like to see it all.

Mr. Lattimore, when you gave us the first letter, why did you not give us the memoranda that you left?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You asked for the letter. I have the whole lot here, ready to hand over. I don't think it is an indication of reluctance.

Mr. FORTAS. May we take a recess while these letters are read? We have been going for about an hour and 20 minutes.

Senator SMITH. Wait until he asks about these memoranda.

Senator FERGUSON. I move, Mr. Chairman, that we make all of these records a part of the record.

Senator SMITH. Does that include the memoranda you were talking about?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. Is the document attached here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; it is attached.

Senator FERGUSON. All right.

Senator SMITH. That will be done subject to the decision of the chairman, if there is any reason why the communication the President makes to a third party should not go into the record. I am not too familiar with that rule or policy.

(For the correspondence referred to see exhibit No. 530A, B, C, D, E, pp. 3386 to 3388.)

Senator SMITH. We will recess for 5 minutes.

(At this point a short recess was taken, after which the hearing was resumed.)

Senator SMITH. We will proceed with the hearing. Are there any further questions before we proceed with reading the statement?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by our custodian of records to be sure that the witness and counsel understand that the transcripts of the Vincent testimony which we handed over to them are the committee file copies, and should not be taken with them.

Senator SMITH. Yes.

All right, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, at this point I have found the relevant passages in the transcript about the quotation from Solution in Asia that was shown to Mr. Vincent—No, it was apparently not shown to him, but read to him. May I indicate it?

Mr. SOURWINE. What page is that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 3246.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Of the transcript.

Mr. SOURWINE. And from page of Solution in Asia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It refers to as quoted on page 139.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you have a copy of that Solution in Asia?

Mr. SOURWINE. There is one here.

What is the quotation which you say was read out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

The fact that the Soviet Union always stands for democracy is not to be overlooked. It stands for democracy because it stands for all the other things. Here in America we are in the habit of taking a narrow view of foreign claimants to

the status of democracy. If China or Russia or some other alien people do not measure up to the standards of some particular American modification of Anglo-Saxon democracy, we say that it is not democratic. We are going to find ourselves boxing with shadows instead of maneuvering in politics, if we stick to this habit. The fact is that for most of the people in the world today, what constitutes democracy in theory is more or less irrelevant. What moves people to act, to try to line up with one party or country and not with another, is the difference between what is more democratic and less democratic in practice.

Mr. SOURWINE. What context was that taken out of?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was taken out of the context, the previous paragraph, which begins "To all of these peoples—" that is, peoples of the frontier of Russia—

the Russians and the Soviet Union have a great power of attraction. In their eyes, rather doubtfully in the eyes of the older generation, the Soviet Union stands for strategic security, economic prosperity, technological progress, miraculous medicine, free education, equality of opportunity, and democracy, a powerful combination—

then that goes on—

The fact that the Soviet Union also stands for democracy—
which is clearly linked to the previous statement—

in their eyes—

is not to be overlooked.

Senator FERGUSON. But does it not indicate clearly that there was something about it; it was not taken out of context to mislead, was it?

Let me see your book.

In the transcript, do the words "also stands" indicate that there was something else in your book before about it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it indicates the previous paragraph, you see, the two.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; but there was not any attempt to leave the impression there were not any paragraphs before this?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. The whole statement is introduced, the whole passage is introduced, by the statement that "in their eyes" it looks like this, not in my eyes, but in their eyes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore; that paragraph you have just read has several sentences. The second sentence says:

Here in America we are in the habit of taking a narrow view of foreign claimants to the status of democracy.

Did you mean that as you wrote it, to cover only what we here in America are in the habit of from the standpoint of the eyes of the peoples of Russia and the Soviet Union, or from the standpoint of the peoples of Asia that you were referring to in the paragraph above?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a little bit complicated, your question, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. We will reduce it to a simpler form.

Is all of this paragraph which you read, which you say was taken out of context, is all of that paragraph to be read as an expression of what these "peoples" referred to in the paragraph above?

Mr. LATTIMORE. All of it is to be taken in context with the introductory statement that, politically, the Soviet Union, as of 1945 had a great power of attraction to people on its frontiers.

I then describe the reasons for that power of attraction, as I thought it appeared to the eyes of the people affected.

The statement as presented in the transcript looks as if I had merely given a eulogistic description of Soviet Russia, as my own description, without reference to the opinions of the people whom I had previously mentioned. I think that is a serious distortion of context.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, there are a number of separate sentences in that paragraph, are there not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. How about this sentence:

We are going to find ourselves boxing with shadows instead of maneuvering in politics if we stick to this habit.

Who is the "we" that you were referring to there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. "We" is primarily the United States, but I think it might be stretched to include also the democracies of Western Europe with interests in Asia.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you say:

The fact is that for most of the people in the world today, what constitutes democracy in theory is more or less irrelevant.

When you said "fact" there, were you referring only to a fact in the eyes of all of these people that you mentioned in the paragraph above?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was referring to a fact in my own opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. But in three sentences above that, where you said, "The fact that the Soviet Union"—you were not referring to a fact in your own opinion; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was referring to a fact in the eyes of the people to whom I referred.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think counsel for the committee understood that, and deliberately quoted this out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I presumed that they had graduated from more grammar schools, high schools, colleges, and so forth, than I had. If I was able to write it, they ought to be able to read it.

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

Senator FERGUSON. How could the previous paragraph that you claim was left out after this sentence:

Here in America we are in the habit of taking a narrow view of foreign claimants to the status of democracy.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think the two paragraphs are very closely tied together, Senator Ferguson.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, who is the "we" here? Here in America?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. That was not saying there that the people of Russia—

Mr. LATTIMORE. No—here in America, we Americans are in the habit of taking a very narrow view of foreign claimants to the status of democracy.

In other words, we do not regard the Russians as democratic, but, for the reasons given above, there is the possibility that other people, who don't know the United States, might take the Russians as democratic.

That is a political fact which we have to take in consideration, if we want to set up a counter program that makes those people more attracted to us and our policy than to the Russians and their policy.

In fact, somewhere else I state that the United States has more power of attraction over Asia than any other country, if we will use it rightly.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know what Mr. Vincent said about your paragraph, whom you have quoted here as being able to be an Ambassador, and placed him on a par with some of the other members of the State Department in the higher brackets?

He said: "I would say that that was a misconception of communism." Would you say he was correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I see that?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, and it was not on a leading question, either.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Vincent, after having this truncated quotation read to him, is asked: "Now that you have heard it"—that is, without the part which I, the author, regard as essential—"does it have any connotation in your mind as being pro-Communist or anti-Communist?"

Mr. Vincent replied: "I would say that that was a misconception of communism." Mr. Vincent is replying in 1952 to a passage written in 1945, published in 1945. In other words, at a time when the entire situation had greatly altered.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you now say that it is a misconception of communism?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I would not say that. I would say that at the present time this kind of power of attraction of the Russians over neighboring people in Asia, has probably diminished in a great many cases. I do not know of any cases in which it may have increased.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, can you see anything in that paragraph that may have led the Communist Party to adopt your book as a background on the Communist line in having told in the same ad with Foster and Kahn's book. Taking your paragraph, can you see any reason that they may do that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Ferguson, I have no knowledge of the processes of the Communist mind, or why they choose my book, or anybody else's book as general reading.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, you have complained, as I understand, about something being read out of context. Now, the paragraph that you referred to as being read out of context, is a paragraph consisting of seven sentences, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right. At least I will accept your count. I have not made the count myself.

Senator SMITH. You start off one of them in saying: "Here in America, we are in the habit of taking a narrow view of foreign claimants to the status of democracy."

There is nothing in that sentence connected with any preceding paragraph or sentence, is there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That particular sentence, I think, is merely a statement of fact.

Senator SMITH. Well, yes. Now the next sentence is also in the same category, is it not? It does not refer back to anybody's eyes, or the eyes of any particular people?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; here the inference is very clear that I am referring to the fact that Americans, rightly, in my opinion, do not recognize Russia as a democracy.

Then I go on to say—

but we are boxing shadows if we don't realize that what the Russians have to offer in the most illiterate and backward parts of Asia may appear to people there to be democratic. If we are going to meet that attraction, we have to set up something that will beat the Russians' attraction.

Senator SMITH. That is not what you said in the book, is it? You are adding that now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is part of the entire thread running through the book, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Then the complaint that you have to make against the committee is for not putting the whole book in, printing the whole book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The complaint I have is that this particular paragraph is so clearly related to my statement of "other peoples' opinions" that it is a quotation out of context to put it in in a manner that would lead the hearer, when he merely has it read to him, to believe that it was a statement of my opinion.

Senator SMITH. It appears to me that it would be a statement of your opinion. But that is a matter for construction. I suppose we need not waste our time on that.

All right, you may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very little has been said about me before this subcommittee that wasn't already in the record of the hearings before the Tydings subcommittee. Most of it is just a regurgitation of the same vague nonsense. To refresh your memories, let me read to you the conclusions of the majority of that subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, would you indicate, please, where, in the hearings before this subcommittee, has been regurgitated 1,400 pages, or any portion of it, of the Tydings' hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say the Budenz testimony, and a lot of the rest.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you saying that Mr. Budenz testified before this committee the same way that he testified before the Tydings' committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am saying that he regurgitated the same nonsense, with some additional embellishments.

Mr. SOURWINE. Since we would prefer to use more precise and descriptive words than your adjectives, will you answer my question, please?

Is it your statement that Mr. Budenz testified before this committee substantially the same as he testified before the Tydings' committee?

Senator SMITH. Can you not answer that question, whether he did or whether he did not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He did and he did not, Senator. He repeated his Tydings' testimony, or most of it, and he added some more. I come to that later in my statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it your statement, sir, that Mr. Budenz in the testimony before this committee, contradicted anything that he had said before the Tydings' committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Contradicted?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir. Did he, before this committee contradict himself in what he had said before the Tydings' committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall offhand that he did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he before the Tydings committee say anything which contradicted anything he later said before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before the Tydings' committee he was cross-examined and he contradicted things he had previously said.

Mr. SOURWINE. I wish you would answer the question, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before the Tydings' committee he could hardly contradict something he hadn't said yet before this committee. When he came to this committee, he obviously had to watch his step in dealing with his previous Tydings' testimony.

Senator SMITH. I thought your complaint the other day, Mr. Lattimore, was that he said more than he said before the Tydings' committee, and things differently.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I deal with that later in my statement.

Senator SMITH. You did make that statement, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did.

Senator SMITH. All right, proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure that it comes later in my statement; I think it comes previously, where I deal with his testimony about Japan. I am not sure whether it is earlier or previously.

This is quoting from the Tydings' committee report, pages 72 and 73:

Owen Lattimore is a writer and a scholar who has been charged with a record of procommunism going back many years. There is no legal evidence before us whatever to support this charge, and the weight of all other information indicates that it is not true * * * We find absolutely no evidence to indicate that his writings and other expressions have been anything but the honest opinions and convictions of Owen Lattimore. Similar opinions and convictions vis-à-vis the Far East are entertained by many Americans, about whom no conceivable suggestion of Communist proclivities could be entertained. We do not find that Mr. Lattimore's writings follow the Communist or any other line, save as his very consistent position on the Far East may be called the Lattimore line.

In the hearings before this subcommittee there has, however, been some addition to, and some subtraction from, the cast of character. The most important subtraction is Freda Utley, who has not—at least not yet—been accorded the publicity facilities of these hearings. Miss Utley is an ex-Communist, with a record of pro-Nazi utterances.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you give us the data on the pro-Nazi utterances?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have that data in the transcript of the Tydings' committee hearings. Just let me see if I have it here.

Senator FERGUSON. What are you quoting from?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am quoting from a review in Catholic World by Leonard J. Schweitzer, of Freda Utley's *The High Cost of Vengeance*.

Senator SMITH. We will not accept any review, also, that you have a quotation from.

Senator FERGUSON. We want to know what you are quoting from.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have already testified under oath that Miss Utley is an ex-Communist with a record of pro-Nazi utterances.

We want to know what the utterances are.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see if I have any direct quotes here.

Senator FERGUSON. Surely you did not take that from an editorial of some opinion of hers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Here is a direct quote.

Mr. SOURWINE. By whom?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A direct quote of Freda Utley, from her book, *The High Cost of Vengeance*.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have the book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't have the book with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether that quotation is taken out of context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think it is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that what you are basing your charge on, that she has a record of pro-Nazi utterances?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am basing it on this and a number of other quotations.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever read the book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I have.

Senator SMITH. Do you have the book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Have we a copy with us?

I have a copy at home in Baltimore. I don't have it with me.

Senator FERGUSON. I suggest we wait until we get the book.

Senator SMITH. Go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before the Tydings' committee she demonstrated her personal animus against me. This committee hired her as a member of its staff, and she undoubtedly aided in recruiting witnesses and in rehearsing their stories.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Chairman would pardon me, I would like to ask Mr. Lattimore to name one witness who was recruited by Miss Utley.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I cannot name any witness. I have not been inside the proceedings of this committee. That is why I wrote "undoubtedly."

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by "undoubtedly"? "Undoubtedly" means "without doubt."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Without doubt, in my mind.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not say that.

Senator SMITH. You are making a statement of fact.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is clear, from the context, I think.

Senator SMITH. You still understand, Mr. Lattimore, that you are under oath, and you are making a statement of fact here, and now you have no information to back it up?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Excuse me, Senator Smith, I think I am making an expression of strong opinion.

Senator SMITH. That is not what we want here. We want facts, as we have mentioned many times.

Do you know whether or not this committee had had any witness recruited by Miss Utley?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is my opinion—

Senator SMITH. I am not asking your opinion. I am asking for a fact.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not know, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I did not think you did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Miss Utley rehearsed the story of any witness before this committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I assume from the way in which some of those stories were presented—

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know for a fact.

Senator SMITH. Then you are making statements here under oath, that are not the truth, so far as you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am making statements of strong opinions.

Senator SMITH. We do not want any more opinions. We want statements of fact. You are sworn. If you do not know a thing to be a fact, we do not want you to be sitting here quoting somebody else's opinion. You are just wasting the time of everybody.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, a great many statements of opinion against me have been freely entered into the record. Am I not to be allowed to state my own opinions?

Senator SMITH. No; you state facts. That is what we want. If you do not have a foundation of fact, then do not state it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not know why she has so discreetly disappeared, or whether her removal is permanent. My guess is that the committee, or its staff, must have concluded after this intimate dealing with her that she was too obviously erratic and unreliable, and too clearly an agent of the China lobby.

Senator SMITH. You are "guessing" now, are you not? You admit you are guessing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am stating it.

Senator SMITH. And you have not a particle of information in the way of facts, to back that up?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am making my guess. I stated it as a guess.

I hope that some day the story will be told, which will give the details of this extraordinary show of circumspection. It reminds me of the farcical incident of the missing witness, Huber, recruited by Joe McCarthy, to appear before the Tydings committee.

He was subpoenaed at the request of the Wisconsin Senator—"the Wisconsin whimperer," who has recently shown Mr. Luce that he can dish it out, but he can't take it—but Huber lost his nerve at the last moment. I've often wondered what happened to Huber and why he has not been compelled to explain how he was recruited and by whom, and what eventually happened.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness if he thinks Mr. Huber has, or has had, anything to do with this committee or its proceedings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no reason to believe so, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then why do you drag him into your testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am stating the case of the witness who disappeared, after McCarthy recruited him, and I am comparing it with the fact that Miss Utley has not appeared after the committee recruited her.

Senator SMITH. You think that has some place in this hearing, that paragraph you just read, do you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir; I have had—

Senator SMITH. As a statement of fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As a statement of opinion.

Senator SMITH. I say "as a statement of fact" do you contend that is a fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What is a fact?

Senator SMITH. What you have stated in that paragraph. You know what I am talking about, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Excuse me, sir. The discussion has gone on over several subjects, and I am not quite sure what fact you are referring to.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you about that paragraph you just read. Did you introduce that as a statement of fact? Do you understand that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The statement of fact that Huber was recruited by McCarthy, that he later lost his nerve and disappeared, and so on? Yes, I state that as a matter of fact.

Senator SMITH. I am talking about what is in the paragraph, that whole paragraph, is that a statement of fact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my belief, it is, Senator.

Senator SMITH. All right; go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Among the additions to the Tydings list I have already dealt in some detail with Mr. Dooman and Mr. Stassen, and have referred to the novel ideas of Mr. Colegrove and Mr. McGovern, concerning my alleged recommendations about Japan.

I should now like to turn to the testimony of Barmine and Fittfogel.

General Barmine, of course, is an ex-Communist. So is Wittfogel. Your chairman, Senator McCarran, has indicated that this makes them especially credible witnesses.

Senator SMITH. On what do you base that, your charge against Chairman McCarran? Is that some more opinion of yours?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is not a charge against Senator McCarran, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Is that backed up with facts, or is that mere opinion of yours?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a reference to Senator McCarran's introductory remarks, at the beginning of the hearings of this subcommittee.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is your interpretation of those remarks, is it not, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I read the remarks?

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it your interpretation of those remarks or a direct quote?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is not printed here as a direct quote. I would have to look through it to see whether the words "specially credible witnesses" do appear there directly.

Senator SMITH. Or whether Senator McCarran indicated. You say there "Your chairman, Senator McCarran, has indicated that this makes them"—that is, the fact that they are ex-Communists—"especially credible witnesses."

Mr. LATTIMORE. The chairman stated:

In such an investigation as this, where a possible conspiracy is being examined, very often the only evidence obtainable derives from persons who once participated in the conspiracy.

I think my words here are a warrantable characterization of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the Senator went on:

Only eyes that witnessed the deeds, and ears that heard the words of intrigue, can attest thereto. Thus, ex-Communists, and agents of the Government who posed as Communists, often are the only sources of evidence of what transpired behind doors, closed to the non-Communist world.

Do you think there is anything in that that has anything to do with the credibility of an ex-Communist as a witness?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that it is a fair inference of mine to state that Senator McCarran has indicated that these make them especially credible witnesses.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you not see any difference between availability and credibility?

Your shrug does not get into the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is more lawyer language, Mr. Sourwine. I wrote what I thought.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think "availability" and "credibility" are legal terms, which require a legal definition? You used that word "credibility"—it is your word, as you said the other day. What do you mean by it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was referring to credibility and not availability, and I think that my opinion there is supported by what has just been read from Senator McCarran's introductory statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you mean by the word "credibility"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I meant that the committee would believe them.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you think that Senator McCarran is saying here that ex-Communists are especially entitled to be believed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was the impression that I got.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you still get that impression, now that we have been over the language again?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I still do.

Senator SMITH. So you still say that Senator McCarran has indicated that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In my opinion, he has indicated.

Senator SMITH. I am asking you for a statement of fact, Mr. Lattimore. You seem to dodge behind your opinions. You seem to forget that you are under oath to testify to the truth here.

Now, do you still say that Senator McCarran has indicated that this makes them specially credible witnesses?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What I am clearly stating there is my opinion, that Senator McCarran has so stated.

Senator SMITH. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should have assumed the contrary: that a man who has spent his life in the Communist school of lies, deceit, and intrigue, should always be suspect. But Senator McCarran would apparently regard that view as proof of Communist tendencies.

Barmine was a Red army general.

Senator SMITH. He admitted, did he not, that he was Red?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, he did. That is my authority for making this statement.

His testimony was that another Red general told him that I was a Soviet agent in China. This was not entirely new, since Senator McCarthy had quoted Barmine in his attack on me in March 1950, and then dropped him.

After reading the transcript of Barmine's flimsy testimony before your committee, I wonder if this use of fantasy and hallucination to establish guilt is not more worthy of the Kremlin than of the United States Senate.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, have you at any point in the preparation of this statement deliberately sought to be contemptuous of this committee, and/or the Senate of the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I have deliberately sought to express a feeling of indignation and outrage against the treatment I have received.

Senator SMITH. What treatment do you refer to from this committee, so far as this committee is concerned, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I refer to the admission of the kind of evidence that has been heaped against me without a word of cross-examination, to test the reliability or credibility of the witnesses.

Senator SMITH. Is that all you have to say on that? All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Barmine was a conspicuously reluctant witness before you, and in spite of leading questions by Mr. Morris and members of this committee, and their repeated efforts to aid him in remembering conversations and events between him and other Reds, supposed to have taken place 15 or 18 years ago, his answers remained vague, apologetic, and full of qualifications.

Barmine said that the other Red general, named Berzin, in a discussion of the possibility of opening Soviet intelligence branches along the China coast, mentioned me and Joseph Barnes as "our men," whatever that means, in connection with the possible use of IPR personnel in China.

Here Barmine made two slips. He referred to this discussion as taking place at the end of 1933—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I might interrupt there, because of that date, would the witness indicate at what point in the transcript of the testimony Mr. Barmine said that this discussion took place at the end of 1933? It is the understanding of the committee staff that Mr. Barmine said it took place in 1935.

Senator SMITH. Will you point that out?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is taken up in the rest of the paragraph.

Senator SMITH. Can you point that out?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is referring to the fact that a correction was made later and therefore doubtless it doesn't appear in the final transcript of the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean a correction in the testimony of Mr. Barmine, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you intending to state or imply that this committee has doctored the transcript of Mr. Barmine's testimony in publication?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether the committee or its staff doctored the testimony, or whether Barmine made a request to alter his testimony, or what happened.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you making the charge that it was altered?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am making the charge that, if I may go on with the rest of the paragraph—I think it explains it clearly.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think you should answer that right now, sir. Are you making the charge that the testimony was altered after having been given, that the transcript was changed for whatever reason after the testimony had been taken down?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am making the charge that newspapermen who called me after the story—that newspapermen called me after the story appeared and Barmine's story was mysteriously up-dated in later editions of the evening papers.

Senator SMITH. What newspapermen called you? Let us get that fact now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The man who called me was, as I remember, the United Press man, United Press desk man, in Baltimore.

Senator SMITH. What was his name?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember his name.

Senator SMITH. Who else called you, a newspaperman?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He was the only one—no, there may have been a Baltimore Sun man who called me, too.

Senator SMITH. You do not know who that was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you here when Mr. Barmine was testifying, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I wasn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. You make the definite statement here, and a statement you are offering this committee under oath, that he, meaning Barmine, referred to this discussion as taking place at the end of 1933. Do you know that to be so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am making reference to the fact that two different newspaper stories appeared.

Senator SMITH. You do not know it of your own knowledge? Just answer my question, do you know it of your knowledge or not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I don't know it of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you read the record of Mr. Barmine's testimony at that point?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what that record shows?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As the record now stands, it doesn't show 1933.

Mr. SOURWINE. What does it show?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not—I would have to read it again to refresh my memory, but my impression is that it doesn't show very clearly what year.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean, sir, that you are stating here, on the basis of what one or two newspapermen, according to you, told you, that the testimony of this witness was different from what the record which you have read shows it to have been?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not what newspapermen told me, I am basing it on newspaper clips.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying here on the basis of newspaper clips—if you please, Mr. Lattimore—are you testifying here on the basis of newspaper clips that the testimony of Mr. Barmine was actually different from what the record before this committee shows it to have been?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am testifying that after the story appeared, I was called for comment because 1933 was mentioned and I said "Why, my goodness, in 1933 I had nothing to do with the Institute of Pacific Relations." And the later stories carried the date 1935 or 1936.

Mr. SOURWINE. And are you presuming to conclude from that that the record of this committee was changed, rather than accepting the possibility that a newspaperman might have been mistaken?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't say that, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you say, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I say that when I pointed out to newspapermen who called me after the story appeared—

Mr. SOURWINE. Pointed out what?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That in 1933 I had no connection with the Institute of Pacific Relations, and that I was in the United States and not in China from 1933 to the autumn of 1934, after this, after I had been called on this point, Barmine's story was mysteriously up-dated in later editions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the evening papers, is that not what you said?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Either the evening papers or the morning papers, I can't recollect now.

Senator SMITH. How about the rest of the sentence, to refer to 1935 or 1936? You do not know now whether it was 1935 or 1936, do you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The record reads, page 194 of the printed record, that Mr. Barmine said that he was appointed to the presidency of some trust that he was working for at the end of 1933.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the witness' interpretation of what the record says is of any particular value here.

If he has a portion of that record which he believes establishes his contention that Mr. Barmine said 1933, I think he should offer that portion of the record and let it go in now.

Mr. FORTAS. Mr. Chairman, will you give a witness a minute to look at the record, since there is a question about the record?

Senator SMITH. I thought we had it there.

Mr. FORTAS. He hasn't had a chance to look at it since he has been asked the question.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore do you have in your possession, I mean for your own use, a copy of that transcript?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I do.

Senator SMITH. Then I am going to suggest that if you can find any justification or statement about the 1933 and will send it out any time within the next 10 days, we will look it over and see it. That is to save time.

All right, Mr. Sourwine, have you some other questions?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, I have one more question.

Mr. Lattimore, you stated and stressed the fact that you had no connection with the IPR until 1934. As a matter of fact, did you not attend the IPR conference in 1933?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I attended it as a delegate. I was not an employee, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think the attendance at that conference was not a connection with IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your amendment, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever an employee of IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was an employee of IPR from the beginning of 1934.

Mr. SOURWINE. Until when?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Until 1941.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are speaking now of your connection with the magazine Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. As editor of that magazine, you were an employee of IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was an employee of the Pacific Council of the IPR, not the American IPR.

Senator SMITH. You may proceed.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Barmine also said our names had been suggested because they needed men who had "military training" (p. 1933). I have had no military experience whatever, and I doubt if Barnes had, either. When Senator Eastland asked him, "Just exactly what did he say about Mr. Lattimore?" Mr. Barmine answered evasively, "You see, I want to emphasize that this project which was finally never realized by me was only a very small part of the preparation. This was 15 or 16 years ago—to tell you exactly what words, I would not like to say anything I don't remember very firmly." Again, how vague can testimony be and still be permitted to be used to blacken a man's name?

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you read that sentence again, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The last one?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Again, how vague can testimony be and still be permitted to be used to blacken a man's name?

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Since everything about Barmine's General Berzin sounds rather fishy I tried to look him up on Barmine's book *One Who Survived*. Sprinkled all through this book, in both the original French version and the American version, which seems to have been stepped up considerably for local consumption, are a great many names of important Russians with whom Barmine claimed to have rubbed shoulders. One name that is entirely missing in both versions is that of General Berzin. Yet in his testimony Barmine makes a great deal of Berzin as a real big shot under whom he worked for 15 years. Why does he mention him here for the first time? Incidentally, neither version of Barmine's book, of course, mentions Joseph Barnes or Owen Lattimore or the IPR.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask one brief question?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, do you know if there was a General Berzin?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Barmine also stated that a General Krivitsky in Paris in 1938 corroborated Berzin's statement about Barnes and me. General Krivitsky also wrote a book and testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1938. In neither place did he mention my name. Nor did he mention Joseph Barnes or the IPR. What is more significant, he did not mention either the Red generals, Berzin or Barmine.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I inquire once more, Mr. Chairman?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, did you use research methods to endeavor to ascertain whether there was a General Berzin?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, there are no research methods at my disposal to determine that fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you make your best efforts to determine whether there was a General Berzin?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Having no means, I made no efforts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In short, Barmine's testimony can best be described in the words of Barmine. When Senator Ferguson asked him whether the FBI had the "evidence" that he had just given about Barnes and Lattimore, he said, "Well, if you call it evidence—" (p. 211).

It reminds me of a little story in Barmine's book, which I submit herewith as an exhibit, describing how a Soviet military intelligence agent, when he takes a powder and runs out of the Soviet police state, hires out as an expert on Soviet skulduggery and, when he runs out of real information, has to invent a lot of new stuff in order to stay in the racket. It reads to me like a very good description of Barmine himself as well as of his native American counterpart, Budenz.

Mr. SOURWINE. What book are you referring to, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Here, Barmine's book, *One Who Survived*.

I would like to hand up at this moment a copy of the relevant part of the text of Barmine's book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you read that book?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I have.

Senator SMITH. That will be submitted subject to the Chairman passing on it when he goes over it.

(The material referred to was marked exhibit 475 and appears in the appendix on p. 3704.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. I turn now to the other ex-Communist, Karl August Wittfogel. In his testimony Wittfogel tried to creat two impressions—that in the early years of our acquaintance we were friendly with each other on the basis of mutual Communist sympathies, and that after he finally stopped being a Communist, in 1939, he broke off relations with me. Both of these pictures, drawn by Wittfogel's inventive hindsight, are maliciously false.

I first knew Dr. Wittfogel in Peking in 1935 and 1936. He has attempted to show that at this time I knew he was a Communist and must therefore have been one myself. He does not claim that he ever told me he had been or was still a Communist. I did not consider him one. He had been rescued from Hitler's Germany by a committee of British scholars, an active member of which was the distinguished authority on economic history, R. H. Tawney, a stanch anti-Communist.

The flimsy statements by which Wittfogel attempted to show that I knew he was a Communist are complete nonsense. The chief one is a story that in my presence Dr. Woodbridge Bingham had asked him if he had ever been a Communist and he said "No." He then tried to suggest that I flashed him a smile implying that I knew that what he really meant was that he was a Communist. The truth is that I have not the faintest recollection of this whole conversation, but if I smiled at all, it was certainly a non-Communist smile. Now I would be willing to believe that Communists have an arsenal of secret signals, but I would never suppose that it included anything as good-natured as a smile. In fact, I though that these grim conspirators regarded a smile as a bourgeois gesture—practically as an enemy of the state. If I am wrong, and if a smile is a secret Red signal, I confess that I used to smile a good deal. In the pre-McCarthy days I used to think that life was lots of fun.

Senator SMITH. May I ask you a question there? Were you present when Wittfogel testified in this room?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Did you have any representative present?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me ask my wife whether she was there.

She was there.

Senator SMITH. You knew when he was going to testify, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it was announced in the paper.

Wittfogel also made the ridiculous assertion that the fact that I used the terms "feudal" and "feudal survival" in describing Asiatic societies showed that I was a Communist. His claim that these terms are nothing but litmus papers for telling Communists from non-Communists is ridiculous. It sounds like an echo from the religious disputes and persecutions of the Middle Ages, when professing Christians put each other to death in quarrels over the difference between "transubstantiation" and "consubstantiation."

On this rather absurd subject Wittfogel specifically charges that in a book published last year, *Pivot of Asia*, I dropped my academic disguise and let the heretical truth leak out: I referred to "semi-feudal" relations in the Chinese Central Asian province of Sinkiang. It is quite true that I used the phrase, and it was an accurate description. I am sorry that I did not know that the Communists had a patent on the term, and that to use it was as dangerous as it is to smile.

If the use of terms like "feudal survival" is a test of communism the following quotation may be of interest. It is from the *American Anthropologist*, July-September 1951, page 403, and is from a review of a book about Japan:

But here (in Japan) as in Germany, industrialization was so late and so rapid that many feudal elements survived.

The author who thus uses the hideous and forbidden expression "feudal elements" is Esther S. Goldfrank (Mrs. Karl-August Wittfogel). I hasten to say I know nothing of her political views, and in any event I wouldn't accuse Wittfogel of anything on account of his association with his wife.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then, Mr. Lattimore, would you tell the committee, please, why you dragged Mrs. Wittfogel in?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because I think it is a pertinent illustration of the absurd nonsense of Wittfogel's talk about semi-feudalism and feudal survival, and so on.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you read the review by Mrs. Wittfogel which you quote here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have not read the full review, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. You quote one sentence out of context, is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I quote one sentence which here I think is a complete statement of the problem, and therefore can be considered in context.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, and if so will you assert, whether Mrs. Wittfogel is making that statement as her own or as a summarization of what was said in the book that she reviewed?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't answer that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not know, do you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Have you any data on that?

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is, Do you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, not knowing, you have yet presented the letter for this committee as though it were her own opinion, is that not correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have presented it as a quotation from a review by Mrs. Wittfogel.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think that is an adequate answer to the question, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you have so presented it without having seen the whole review?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is one clear, unequivocal aspect of Wittfogel's testimony that demonstrates that he was lying either about me or about his own severance of Communist affiliation. Wittfogel stated definitely twice that he finally broke all Communist connections in the summer of 1939. I have in my possession many long letters which show clearly that he remained on friendly terms with me for 8 years thereafter—that is, until 1947. If he told the truth about his separation from communism in 1939 he must have continued to think of me as non-Communist, at least until 1947, when we had our last exchange of correspondence.

Many very friendly letters which he wrote to me in 1940 and 1941 contain such phrases as "the warmest greetings to all of you," "I am so happy to see you soon here," "yours in friendship," "your new book—looks fine and it reads fine," "Love to all of you, when do we meet?"—none of which sound as if I were a Communist he had finally broken with in 1939.

In an undated letter in 1941, Wittfogel wrote to me as follows:

During this week end I have reread your Inner Asian Frontiers and McGovern. The reading of the two books made it clear again to me how absolutely superior your analysis and presentation is not only to his—he is a dwarf—but to practically everybody who has ventured into an analysis of Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft of the oasis. Your analysis really seem definite and classic. I shall follow it for whatever I may be able to write about the Asiatic Oases. I hope to be not too stupid a disciple.

During the war, from 1941 through 1944, I had very little time for correspondence with anyone, but, in a letter to me dated March 4, 1945, praising my book Solution in Asia, he wrote—and this is the same book I will call to your attention that Senator Ferguson has suggested has some sort of Communist coloration—he wrote:

I have delayed writing my weekly Sunday letters for hours because I could not tear myself away from your Asiatic Solution. By watching my action, not my words, you can judge how great the power of attraction of your new book is. You are really an expert to end all experts. I have not read anything for a long time, that made me think so much about the various aspects of the postwar world. This is a fascinating story, one, which, I hope, will be read much and intensely, because you certainly show that the political leaders have to act quickly, wisely, and boldly, or else—But I am sure, you are right, as solid a peace has to be made as possible in this most artfully balanced of all worlds. The breath-taking picture of a world dancing ballet on a swinging tight rope emerged clearly from your masterly pen.

This is the letter that Wittfogel tried to bypass in his testimony, saying that he had barely looked at the book and wrote me a nice note just to be polite. I submit all of these letters in full for your record.

Senator SMITH. We will receive those, subject to the Chairman's permission.

(For the letters referred to see exhibits 597 A, B, C, D, pp. 3611 through 3614.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. From this time until 1947 Wittfogel remained friendly, and even when we had some differences of opinion he did not suggest that he thought me pro-Communist in any way.

During 1947 we had a disagreement over his invitation to me, at the end of 1946, to write an introduction to his History of Chinese Society: LIAO. I asked him to be allowed to read the book before writing the introduction, and I am afraid that I indicated that I would not write an introduction without being given a chance to form my own opinion about the work I was supposed to sponsor in this way. This entirely reasonable request didn't seem to suit Wittfogel and after several letters I heard no more from him.

My guess about the matter is that Wittfogel staged this little maneuver because, with the mounting China Lobby attacks on the IPR for harboring Communists, with constant reiteration of the familiar Kohlberg attacks on me, he was becoming alarmed about his own concealed Communist connections, and decided that he had better join the pack rather than run the risk of being destroyed by it. Senator McCarran's indication, at the opening of these hearings, that if ex-Communists informed on other people all would be forgiven, provided this tortured man Wittfogel with a perfect avenue to the new social security.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few questions?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. One question I would like to ask is this: Do you believe that Communists or former Communists are performing a service for the United States when they come forward and testify?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I believe that the kind of information about the inside workings of the Communist Party that can be obtained by ex-Communists, by FBI agents passing as Communists in the Communist Party, and so on, is absolutely essential to our security. I believe that there are probably ex-Communists who are of great value.

But I believe that it is a great temptation to the ex-Communist to market his wares at more than their true value, and to go on purporting to give testimony when he has exhausted his real testimony.

Therefore, I believe that it is extremely necessary, especially in public hearings, where people, not only people's reputation but their livelihood is affected, that there should be the severest testing of the credibility of any ex-Communist used, and the validity of his testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, I think in justice to you one matter should be shown. You are bilingual; are you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, bilingual usually means equally versed in two languages.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then let me say are you multilingual, do you have several languages at your command?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have several of them that I speak, none of them as well as I speak English, of course.

Mr. SOURWINE. What are they, sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I speak Chinese very well. I speak Mongol pretty well. I speak French enough to get along. I speak German enough to stammer along, and to understand other people's conversation, and I have a reading knowledge of Russian, a considerable remnant of a reading knowledge of Latin, and a few tattered remnants of a reading knowledge of Greek. I could also at one time read Swedish, but I am out of practice now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have access to a Soviet encyclopedia or a "Who's Who"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is a copy of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia in the library at Johns Hopkins.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you check it or have it checked to find out whether General Berzin was mentioned therein?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a paper. I would like to ask Mr. Mandel what it is.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a translation submitted by the Library of Congress in reference to Ian Antonovich Berzin, and it is a translation from volume 5, pages 626-627 of the Soviet Encyclopedia, 1927.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer this for the record.

Senator SMITH. You may read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Very well.

Senator SMITH. This is in English?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Read it, then.

Mr. SOURWINE. The names I may mispronounce as they are Russian names. It reads as follows:

EXHIBIT 474

TRANSLATION

[Translation from vol. V, col. 626-627 of the Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia, Moscow, 1927]

Berzin, Ian Antonovich ("Pavel Vasil'evitch," "Zemelis," "Vinter") born in 1881, Communist party-worker. He hails from a peasant family in the Livonian Province. As a village teacher he conducted revolutionary activities among the peasants. He joined the Social Democratic Party of Latvia in 1902. In 1904 he was arrested and banished to the Olonets Province from which he escaped in 1905. During the 1905 revolution Berzin was active as a propagandist and agitator in the Baltic region. He was arrested by a punitive detachment of General Orlov in December 1905. Upon his release from prison in 1907 Berzin worked in Petersburg as secretary of the Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party. At the same time he was elected as a delegate to the London Congress. He emigrated in 1908, lived in Switzerland, France, Belgium, England, and in the United States, working in various party organizations, became editor and collaborator of the Latvian organs of Bolshevik orientation (such as the central organ of the Social Democrats of Latvia "Tsinia" and others). In 1915 he took part in the Zimmerwald Conference and in the founding of the "Zimmerwald Left." In 1916 and 1917 he was editor of the Latvian Social Democratic newspaper "Stradnaks" in Boston and of the Russian left wing—internationalist newspaper "Novyi Mir" (The New World) in New York. In 1917 he was elected at the Sixth Congress as a member of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party (of Bolsheviks) and of the Central Committee of the Social Democrats of Latvia. At the Second Congress of the Soviets he was elected member of the All-Union Central Executive Committee. In 1918 he was appointed Plenipotentiary Representative to Switzerland, and in 1919 People's Commissar of Instruction for Latvia. From 1919 to 1920 he was secretary of the Comintern. In 1920 he headed the delegation for peace negotiations

with Finland and afterwards he became Plenipotentiary Representative to Finland. From 1921 to 1925 he was attached to the Embassy in England. Since August 1925 he has been the Plenipotentiary Representative of the U. S. S. R. in Austria. Berzin's literary works, chiefly in the Latvian language, encompass a great variety of fields ranging from politics to problems of cultural and art criticism.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Does it mention he is a pal of Barmine's?

Mr. SOURWINE. This is from the Soviet dictionary of 1927, sir, as previously stated. It is offered in the record, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of showing that there was such a person as Berzin.

Senator SMITH. All right; go ahead.

(The material referred to was marked exhibit 474 and was read in full by counsel.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have now disposed of the charges against me personally. But I am also concerned with something of far greater importance—the fate of the far-eastern policy of our country.

The threat of sabotage to our far-eastern policy transcends the interest of the individual citizen. For more than a quarter of a century I have been openly printing, publishing, and stating in public lectures exactly what I think about a wide range of problems. My field has been the Far East in general, more specifically China, and still more specifically the border lands between China and Russia. The record shows that I have never consistently agreed with any ideology, school of thought, group, trend, or individual. I have at times changed my own opinions, but only on the basis of changed conditions, more mature consideration, or additional data; never because of being hypnotized, intimidated, or bought.

I do not find it surprising, or anything to be ashamed of, that I have at times made mistakes. But, whatever the mistakes I have made, I have never tried to deliver the policy of my country into the hands of a foreign power, as the Communists have tried to deliver it to the Soviet Union, and the China lobby is trying to deliver it into the hands of Chiang Kai-shek.

On the record of the situation in China and changes in American policy toward China, the issue, Senators, is not one of domestic politics, or McCarthy's reelection, or of who will benefit, politically or otherwise, from denunciation of me, Mr. Vincent, or others. The great issue is what about China? Are we on the right track? Or has United States policy been affected by disloyal or subversive persons?

When discussing China, it is of crucial importance to put events into their proper perspective in history. I ask you, Senators, if you are interested in facts, kindly to allow them to be presented in the context of their time. If you do not, the result will not be clarification but a continuation of the distortion and confusion that have characterized your inquiry to date.

There have been malicious and pointless attempts to prove that I and other misrepresented the Chinese Communists as "different" from the Russians, or as mere "agrarian radicals." It was proved before the Tydings committee that I never did. Neither, I believe, did the career far-eastern experts of the State Department. But I offer you, for the record, an exhibit showing that Gen. Pat Hurley; Freda Utley, of the China Lobby; and Hallett Abend, of the New York Times, did say that the Chinese Communists were not real Communists. Now, here again, it would be utter nonsense to suggest that this is a sign of

communism or procommunism. The judgment that Patrick Hurley, for example, expressed about the Chinese Communists was a perfectly possible conclusion for a man to arrive at honestly at that time. He may have been wrong—but he was not attempting to distort the facts or subvert his country.

May I hand in here these quotations that I have just referred to, Senator?

Senator SMITH. They will be received, subject to the decision of the chairman for insertion in the record.

(For the material referred to, see exhibit 476 in appendix I of pt. 10, p. 3705.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. One of the principal targets of the China Lobby's criticism in the controversy about the history of our Chinese policy has been the proposal for a coalition between the Nationalists and the Communists—or more properly for a working arrangement between the two, in order to avoid a civil war in which, as informed observers knew and as events proved, the Chiang government would be bound to lose. Even General Marshall's motives have been assailed by the China Lobby because he advocated this, in spite of the fact that it is a matter of record that this policy was first sponsored by Secretary of State Byrnes, who has never been attacked for it and should not be.

It is nonsense to say, as had been dogmatically asserted before this committee, that coalition or cooperation with Communists always ends with the Communists taking over.

The Free French cooperated with the Communists, and the Communists did not take over France. Today about a third of the French Deputies are Communists.

The postwar Government of Burma began as a coalition with Communists, but the Communists were later expelled and armed action taken against them.

The Indonesian Nationalist movement began as a united front with Communists, but the Indonesian Government has since taken armed action to suppress them.

The British cooperated during the war with Indian Communists, but the Communists did not take over India.

In saying this I do not want to be misunderstood as advocating collaboration with Communists. This is always dangerous—as dangerous as a partnership with a bear. It should be tolerated only where there is no alternative. My point is only that coalition is not necessarily surrender, and that coalition may reasonably be advocated in particular circumstances by persons whose sole objective is the ultimate defeat of communism.

In China too the idea of coalition and compromise was not a foolish idea dreamed up in Washington. There was a solid basis for the view that a coalition was the only alternative to the certain triumph of communism. And there was a solid basis for the hope that it might give the non-Communist groups time to reorganize, and eventually to oust the Communists.

If I may make an interpolation here, Mr. Chairman, I would like to change "eventually to oust the Communists" so as to read "and eventually to dominate the situation."

The reason I suggest the change is that at that time, that is, right at the end of the war, the precedence of the ousting of the Commu-

nists for the French and Italian Governments had not yet been established, and it might seem as if I were claiming a little too much precedence by talking in the thing in the context of 1945.

Senator JENNER. May I ask a question?

You say that the Chiang government was bound to lose if the civil war was started. Did the Nationalists have more troops than the Communists, or fewer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not quite sure of what you said.

Senator JENNER. Did the Nationalists have more troops?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; but before that you said—

Senator JENNER. You said the Chiang government was bound to lose if the civil war was started.

Mr. LATTIMORE. If the civil war was started. No.

Senator JENNER. Well, at this particular time in history, did the Nationalists have more troops than the Communists, or fewer troops?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe they had a good many more.

Senator JENNER. Were the Communist troops trained for other than guerrilla war?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I am not sure of to answer that question.

Senator JENNER. Was Under Secretary Acheson correct on June 19, 1946, when he testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that Chiang had four times as many troops as the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably he was right. I don't have the figures to check it.

Senator JENNER. Was he correct when he said that the Communists needed American minimum training, and I quote from him, and minimum quantities of equipment, needed American military training and minimum quantities of equipment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know about that, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Are you sure you mean the Communists and not the Nationalists?

Senator JENNER. He said that. That is the record of June 1946. What I want to bring out is how could the Communists have won without Russia's help if the Nationalists had four times the number of troops that the Communists did? How could they have possibly won without the Communist help?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A recent British authority on the subject said that they had two invaluable allies, the Chinese Communists, that one was Chiang Kai-shek and the other was the Republican Party of the United States.

Senator JENNER. Thank you very much.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can give you the exact reference. The book is called *Asia and the West*.

Senator SMITH. Who wrote that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is by a man named Maurice Zinkin, a former member of the Indian Civil Service, who now represents a large corporation in India.

Senator JENNER. Then it was the Republican Party that withheld the aid to Chiang's Nationalist Government; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think the author I have quoted was making a satirical reference to the fact that, as the civil war drew to a close with the Nationalists being steadily defeated, the fact that the Nationalists were receiving American arms resulted in transferring to the Communists in China the idea of nationalism so that the nation-

alist idea was captured away from the Nationalists by the Communists.

Senator JENNER. And then it was the Republican Party that sent General Marshall to China with his mission?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, we have to talk here in terms of context.

Senator JENNER. You gave me an answer; you said two things, the invaluable aid of Chiang and the Republican Party. I want to find out if the Republican Party sent General Marshall over to force Chiang Kai-shek to form a united government to take the Communists into his Republic and into his army.

Senator SMITH. If it is available, he should be able to give it.

Senator JENNER. It is available. He made the answer of the two invaluable things.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Republican Party did not send General Marshall to China. He was sent by the administration.

But if I may amend the way you put the question, Senator, I would suggest that General Marshall was not sent to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept the Communists.

Senator JENNER. What was the result of General Marshall's mission?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The result of General Marshall's mission was that he failed to negotiate a compromise in China.

Senator JENNER. After being there how long?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see, about 1 year, I think.

Senator JENNER. He talked a little bit longer than they are talking in Korea. They are talking 8 months in Korea, and he talked a little longer than that, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I accept your statement.

Senator JENNER. What was the report that he brought back to this country?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The report that he brought back was that his attempts at negotiation had been defeated primarily by the intransigents on both sides.

Senator JENNER. During this period of time, the Republican Party, had they failed to vote appropriations to help Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't answer you on the record.

Senator JENNER. Was the money that was appropriated by us used, was the intent of Congress used to help Chiang Kai-shek in his fight against the Communists? Was it used?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that General Chiang was not short of munitions.

Senator JENNER. And at the time General Marshall arrived in China, the Nationalists had four times the number of troops as the Communists had?

Mr. LATTIMORE. And were already being warned by General Wedemeyer not to overextend themselves.

Senator JENNER. And yet your answer to these facts is that the Republican Party and General Chiang Kai-shek caused the downfall of the Nationalist Government in China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I quoted a satirical comment by the British author.

Senator SMITH. May I ask a question there, Mr. Lattimore?

Were you in China while General Marshall was there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I wasn't. Wait a minute, now. I want to be absolutely accurate on this.

In the week of Christmas, 1945, to New Year's 1946 I was briefly in Shanghai and Peiping on a visit connected with the work of the reparations mission in Japan.

I am not sure whether General Marshall was in China at the moment or out of China for a visit. But I didn't see him.

Senator SMITH. What I was pointing to was, was the trip that you made with Mr. Henry Wallace and some other persons, through Russia, I believe, and Mongolia, did you go down to China on that trip?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. What year was that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 1944.

Senator SMITH. And how long were you gone on that trip?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Approximately 2 months, I think.

Senator SMITH. Up to that time had the Chinese Nationalists, about that time, been holding their own, so to speak, if we may know, in their fight with the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Up to that moment there was officially no fighting between the Nationalists and the Communists.

Senator SMITH. What I meant was had the Nationalists up to that time held their ground? They hadn't been run over like they were later?

Mr. LATTIMORE. They lost a lot of ground to the Japanese. I don't think they lost any ground to the Communists.

Senator SMITH. That is what I mean. Some time after that trip they did begin losing a lot of ground to the Communists, did they not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that they lost it to the Japanese, not to the Communists as long as the war lasted.

Senator SMITH. When did they begin losing ground to the Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think after the civil war began.

Senator SMITH. Do you remember what time, what year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that is rather hard to date because there was a certain amount of scrappy fighting between the Nationalist troops and the Communist troops which General Marshall tried to halt with his famous truce teams, and so on; but the real fighting began in 1946.

Senator SMITH. That is all, unless you want to say something else about the Republican Party.

Senator JENNER. I am glad to find out who sold them out.

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, is this a good time to break today?

Senator SMITH. No; we will go on until we finish this. We only have seven more pages. We want to finish.

Have you any questions now?

Mr. SOURWINE. No, sir; not now.

Senator SMITH. All right, you may go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will proceed.

There had in fact, been a coalition in China from 1937 to about 1944. It had worked. It had not been dominated or captured by the Communists, and it had saved China from Japan. The Byrnes-Marshall policy was not a new experiment. It was an attempt to restore and prolong the previous combination that had been dominated by Chiang Kai-shek.

Look at the historical record.

Before Pearl Harbor, the overwhelming issue in China was the issue of Japanese aggression. In 1937, the Chinese formed what they called a united front, including the Communists and Chiang's Nationalists, against further Japanese encroachment. It is of cardinal significance—and it conditions every subsequent event—that this united front enabled China to continue the fight against Japan—with which we were also at war after December 1941; and that it was so clearly controlled by Chiang Kai-shek and his party that foreign aid, both ours and Russia's, was received directly only by Chiang Kai-shek, not by the Communists.

By 1944, or perhaps as early as 1943, while we were still in bitter war with Japan, this coalition had fallen apart so much that American representatives, diplomatic, military, and economic were seriously worried. We were making every effort to strengthen Chiang Kai-shek, militarily and economically, but our help was being wasted through inefficiency and corruption. Some experienced observers were already beginning to believe that Chiang Kai-shek's part of free China was in danger of being completely conquered by the Japanese. Some of these observers, including American military officers, even felt that the American Government ought to assert its right to send supplies to the Communist areas of resistance. Their argument was that we must be prepared to keep up resistance to the Japanese somewhere in China, even if it was Communist resistance, just as we were doing everything we could to keep Communist Russia in the war against Germany.

If I had seen at that time some of the reports that were published later in the white paper, I might have taken a position in this controversy; but I did not see them and so simply maintained my previous position in general support of Chinese resistance, and later supported the policy that General Marshall was trying to carry out.

But I believe that this period has been well summed up by Mr. Joseph Alsop. In a column on July 25, 1951, he pointed out that the argument for direct American dealings with the Communist-led forces had been ably presented by Mr. John Davies, of the State Department, who was prophesying in 1943-44 that at the end of the war the Communists were going to come out on top; but that if America gave them moderate aid it would promote their confidence in America, and thus achieve a division between them and the Kremlin. Mr. Alsop had opposed Mr. Davies' position at the time, but in his column he concludes:

Davies made what must now be accounted an extremely brilliant deduction—that Titoism was possible, before Titoism had been heard of—and if Davies' recommendations had been followed, I now believe he would have been proven right.

Also, there is an important fact that has not been brought out before this committee. General Marshall's proposals were not an attempt to force Chiang, alone and without allies, into cooperation with the Communists. Much hope was placed in the minority parties composing the Democratic League, when General Marshall called—

a splendid group of men, but who as yet lack the political power to exercise a controlling influence. Successful action on their part under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would, I believe, lead to unity through good government (White Paper, p. 688).

If Chiang had known how to strengthen those allies and undertake with them a program of reforms it would have been possible to take the steam out of the Communist drive to political power. Chiang's failure to restrain the hostility and brutality of his rightwing supporters toward this group did much to destroy the support that moderate and liberal Chinese had been given him.

In that situation some of our best qualified observers had already predicted that if the Communist problem were put to the test of force in a civil war, the attempt would end in disaster. We all know that the attempt was made, that it did end in disaster, and that General Marshall, put the blame for the failure of his negotiations on the intransigents of both Chiang Kai-shek's side and the Communist side. We also know that it is the opinion of the American military experts who had most to do with Chiang's armies that Chiang overreached himself by invading Manchuria too deeply, against the advice of General Wedemeyer, and that, in the words of our own General Barr:

No battle has been lost since my arrival due to lack of ammunition or equipment. Their military debacles, in my opinion can all be attributed to the world's worse leadership and many other morale-destroying factors that led to a complete loss of the will to fight (hearings before Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, June 1951, p. 1856).

That, Senators, is the outline of what happened. Every possible effort has been made, by Chiang's representatives and by the China lobby to confuse the story, but the record speaks for itself. Let me repeat: there had been a united front, or loosely speaking, a coalition of Chiang's party and the Communists from 1937 to 1944. It had worked in the sense that Chiang had been able to dominate it, and that China had been able to defend itself against Japan, and thereby to help itself and us. Coalition proposals by General Marshall and others were made in the light of this history and of the clear, inescapable facts known to all of us who are not blinded by interest or idolatory, that Chiang's party was falling apart—and if put to the test would fall and the Communists would prevail.

And now what? How are we to handle the continuing consequences of the vast shift in the world balance of power represented by China under the control of a Communist government friendly to Moscow?

Some, including Chiang's refugee government and the China lobby, want to involve us in a war with Russia on the mainland of China, the sooner the better. I agree with General Bradley that this would be "wrong war, wrong time, wrong place."

Some want us to follow a policy of blockade, raids, and landings, aid to anti-Communist guerrillas, and the activities of what Congressman Walter Judd calls a United States "department of dirty tricks." I agree with the general consensus of the China experts in Great Britain that this would result merely in welding tighter the alliance between Peking Reds and Kremlin Reds, and an increase in the rate of Russian aid and in completing the conversion of China into a police state on the model of the Russian police state.

Some believe that we should write off China as a total loss. Again, I do not agree.

As the basis for a policy that might work, I suggest the following principles—

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the record might be clear, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness another question.

From here on to the end of the statement, you are giving your recommendations with regard to foreign policy that the United States should follow; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is quite right.

Senator SMITH. I do not think that has any place in this investigation.

Senator JENNER. It could be submitted for the record.

Senator SMITH. Yes. We will stop right there. The statement will be in the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I correct myself? I have been reading along and lost track of things.

Mr. Sourwine asked me if, from there to the end, it was my recommendation of foreign policy. There are seven points of foreign policy here, but the remainder, from the bottom of page 48 to 50 contains matter which I think is not direct recommendations of a foreign policy of this country.

Senator SMITH. That is dealing with the future anyway. I say that it can be put into the record.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to ask one question.

In relation to the letters and the memoranda to the President, and your talk, did you distinguish between being an adviser to the State Department and the President? Do you draw any distinction there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was simply a citizen who wanted to put some ideas before the President.

Senator FERGUSON. But when you were asked at times, as I understand it—and I want you to correct me if I am not correct—you claimed you were never an adviser to the State Department.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is quite right.

Senator FERGUSON. And did you distinguish then between that and being an adviser to the President?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would certainly distinguish, Senator, but I don't think I was being an adviser to the President.

Senator FERGUSON. When a man writes the letter and the two memoranda, or the one with the two parts of it, and the different letters, and saying how important it was that you see the President before he made commitments, in effect, do you say that is not in there? You are shaking your head.

Mr. FORTAS. I do not think that was what the letter said.

Senator FERGUSON. Let me have the letter.

Reading from the letter of June 20:

Since I am most anxious that the views which I represent should be laid before the President for his consideration before his forthcoming meeting with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin, I hope very much that you will find it possible to arrange an appointment for me as soon as possible after the President returns from San Francisco.

And then you give him the places that you can be reached. Do you still say that he did not want to act as an adviser to the President, counsel?

Mr. FORTAS. No; I say that is not the point.

Senator FERGUSON. What is the point? Why were you shaking your head when I was giving the question?

I do not mind being criticized from the witness, I expect it from the witness. But I do not expect that from the counsel.

Mr. FORTAS. Senator, in the first place I was not criticizing you. And in the second place, I believe, and the record will show—or at least I understood and the record will show whether it was or not—your reference was to the letter which Mr. Lattimore sent to the President.

Senator FERGUSON. The record will show that I was asking about his desire to give advice.

Mr. FORTAS. You can ask the question and I am sure he will answer it. But I thought you were referring to the witness' letter to the President.

Senator FERGUSON. You saw I had a paper in my hand, and you thought I was looking at it. It had nothing to do with the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is a question of the choice of words and the meaning of words to different people.

In my opinion, an adviser is a person who is retained or requested to act as an adviser. I don't think that the hundreds, in fact thousands, of people who ask to see the President of the United States in the course of a year in order to make suggestions of various kinds can accurately be classified as advisers.

Senator FERGUSON. So you are now saying that the reason you did not mention the President and these letters, and this memorandum, was that you figured that you were offering your advice, and he was not requesting it. Is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is correct.

Senator SMITH. Are you through?

Senator FERGUSON. Had you ever approved the plan that General Marshall was sent to China to put into effect?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I approved the sending of General Marshall, and I approved the statements—

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask you that. I asked you if you approved the plan.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I approved the statement that was issued at the time that he went to China, which was all that the public knew of the purposes of the mission. I approved of that.

Senator FERGUSON. When did you learn that he was sent on a mission to try and take the Communists into the government, as you advocated in your memorandum?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I learned that General Marshall was going to China when I saw it in the press. I did not advocate that General Marshall be sent to China to take the Communists into the government.

Senator FERGUSON. You did not advocate that General Marshall be sent, but you advocated that that be our policy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I warned the President, as I recall. May I see the text of what I wrote?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I warned the President.

Senator SMITH. Do you have any other copies of this? I imagine there might be some curious people that would like to see them.

Senator FERGUSON. I would say there would be.

Mr. LATTIMORE. We have only the copies that we are turning in.

Mr. SOURWINE. The letters are in the record, including the memorandum, I think.

Senator SMITH. There was some question that they be admitted subject to the propriety that the chairman would pass on them, having in mind there might be some correspondence with the President with which I might not be familiar.

Senator FERGUSON. I thought they were in or else I would not have examined on them.

Senator SMITH. I do not think there is any secrecy about them. But I did have some hesitancy myself in ruling on correspondence that might have passed between Professor Lattimore and the President of the United States, and I prefer to leave that for the chairman of the committee to pass on.

Mr. FORTAS. My I suggest, it is 5:15, and this witness has been on the stand all day. Perhaps you can clear that up tomorrow morning.

Senator SMITH. That can be done. But there is one thing, and I want to make it clear. Mr. Lattimore stopped reading or finished reading, I believe, at the top of page 47. Then there are a few pages, 47, 48, 49, and half of page 50, and I asked whether or not anybody wishes to have them read.

I want to ask whether Dr. Lattimore wants to go ahead and read it now, so that his whole story will be before us.

Senator FERGUSON. I do not want to object to him reading it.

Senator SMITH. I am asking Dr. Lattimore whether or not it is his wish that he proceed to read the pages. You see, they are dealing with some advice as to policy, not as to the past. What is your preference?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I prefer to read it, if I might.

As a basis for a policy that might work, I suggest the following—

Senator FERGUSON. Is this a suggestion to the committee or are these your views?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is my statement of opinion about foreign policy.

Senator FERGUSON. But not advice to the committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is not advice to the committee. It is words to be considered by anyone who is interested.

As the basis for a policy that might work, I suggest the following principles:

1. Since the North Korean Communist aggression, we have made clear some of the broad outlines of our policy in Asia as a whole. We have shown that we will nowhere tolerate the territorial expansion of communism by armed aggression, that we have the power to protect free peoples against this kind of aggression, and that if it is tried again, elsewhere, we shall resist again. We must hold fast to this policy, and we must build and maintain the strength to carry it out. If we do I believe we can count on continuing United Nations backing.

2. On the basis of these principles, we must consider the problem of China as a part of the whole complex of the problems of Asia. We cannot handle it successfully in isolation. We must be ready and quick to resist aggression anywhere in Asia; and at the same time, we must be even ahead of the Asians in insisting that freedom for them means freedom from all foreign domination—our own, Britain's and France's as well as that of the Soviet Union.

3. Our stand in Korea made it possible to begin negotiating from a position of strength. But in negotiating from positions of strength, it is necessary to show also that while we are determined to stop Communist aggression, we are eager to promote alternatives that are acceptable to the maximum number of people in Asia—and Europe. We must show that we are not blindly committed to preventing changes in the status quo—that we accept the principles of national self-determination, national independence, and the right of any people to determine its own form of government and its own economic system.

4. Those aspects of our policy that are symbolized by the words “point 4” and “Marshall plan” must be made as positive, as active, and as important as the aspects that are symbolized by the words “containment” and “positions of strength.” We must show our willingness to help in the progress of economic development, as well as political freedom, in all the countries that are willing to accept our policies of equality, mutual help, and mutual defense.

5. I do not prophesy—I do not think any man could honestly prophesy—what the eventual answer will be. But I do believe that China is different from Russia, has national interests different from those of Russia, and will follow those interests rather than Russian doctrine and dogma.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask one question at that point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. LATTIMORE, do you presently believe that the Chinese Communists are following the line of Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I do.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you see any signs that they are about to give it up?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I haven't had the time to follow the situation very closely, but I don't see any signs.

I do not pretend to know how far the China of the future may differ from the Russia of the present, or in what way. But I do believe that there is no Russian combination of strategic, political, and economic forces that can permanently mold the people of China against their will.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not understand that communism will not be directly, as far as the Chinese are concerned, indicated that it is coming from Moscow, but it is the trained man from Moscow, and under the domination of Moscow, that will make it appear to the Chinese that the thing is Chinese rather than Russian?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the contrary, Senator. My understanding is that the present Chinese Communist propaganda emphasizes the Russian connection. I may be wrong on that. It may have switched again, but that was the last I heard of it.

Senator FERGUSON. But the actual Russian does not come down except as an overseer, does he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, I am not informed on the details of that, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. You are giving an opinion. I would think before you would give an opinion that you would know something about the details.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am trying to give long-range opinions.

Senator FERGUSON. This is long-range advice?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is long range.

Senator FERGUSON. Fifty or one hundred years?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. How long? What do you call a long-range opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is not intended to be a report on the details of last week's situation in China.

Senator FERGUSON. How long a range?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, Senator. I should think it would depend partly on the outcome of the Korean negotiations.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you think that this advice will help this committee in deciding whether or not there was penetration in the IPR by Communists, and whether or not the IPR had an influence on the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it might help the committee to decide whether they think that I am a Communist or not.

Senator SMITH. You mean what you say as to the future?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What I say as to the future. If you think I am talking like a Communist, that is your judgment.

Senator FERGUSON. No, I think we ought to take it for the last reason.

Mr. LATTIMORE. 6. It is of critical importance that, as the independent forces and separate characteristics of China begin to make themselves felt, both China and the rest of Asia should be made to realize that their true future lies in independence—independence of America, as of Russia, but a real independence supported by America, and not a phony independence subordinate to Russia.

7. Independence of this kind is possible. It is possible without a world war. And it can lead eventually to a stabilization of relations with Russia as well as with Asia. It is the declared policy of our Government that our purpose in attaining positions of strength is to be able to negotiate such a stabilization. I support that concept of policy.

But to carry out such a policy successfully, we must convince Asia, and the world, and above all ourselves, that we are not abandoning democracy. In defending ourselves against totalitarian aggression abroad and infiltration within, we must not, despairing of our heritage of freedom, try to take refuge in the brutal kind of police state that we fought against when we destroyed Hitler and defeated Japan.

The responsibility, gentlemen, for deciding how the problems of China and Asia shall be handled rests squarely on this country, because of our preponderating influence on the policies of such countries as Britain, France, and Japan. I know that there are people who believe that we should forthwith go to war with the Soviet Union and thereby resolve the conflict over China and the world. Your chairman has said that such a war is inevitable. A logical case of sorts can be made for this view, based on the record of the intransigence and faithlessness of the Soviet Union in the international community. But this case disregards the basic values of the lives and the spiritual and moral well-being of ordinary people. These values are at stake, and they would be threatened even more by a great world war than they are by the present limited conflict.

War may come upon us. We may have no choice other than to endure and inflict its horrors. But the moral values that we are defend-

ing cannot be defended if we take upon ourselves the inhuman and brutal responsibility of preventive war. The demands of civilization and humanity are that we make every effort, unless and until we are forced into war, to protect ourselves and the values of civilization by means short of war.

The policy which I have described, as well as the policy to which our Government and the United Nations are committed at the moment, is the policy of containment of aggression and of building up the conditions and forces of freedom. It demands, over and above strength and firmness, a deep understanding of the hearts and aspirations of men. This policy is the hard way, the difficult course. It requires patience, firmness, and great skill. If we follow it, we shall be walking, fully armed, through minefields and among pitfalls. A violent move can bring disaster. Misinformation as to where we are treading, and the sensitiveness of the ground on which we tread, can cause a fatal miscalculation.

Senator SMITH. Just a minute, Dr. Lattimore. It has come to the attention of the Chair, from at least two sources, that at the end of this session a demonstration has been planned in this room.

The Chair wants to state that there will be no demonstration. The Chair has asked officers to come into this room, and the hall, and under no circumstances will we tolerate any demonstration for or against Dr. Lattimore. I hope that it will not be necessary for the officers to arrest anyone, as I have instructed them to do if there is any demonstration whatsoever.

Go ahead, Dr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Gentlemen, of this I am certain: So long as this program of maneuver is our policy, so long as we choose the difficult and great course of peace, we are completely dependent for success on the validity of our information, the skill with which we analyze the information, and the ability not only of our diplomats but of our non-Government, academic, and private research students and analysts. We cannot hope to play this dangerous game, and certainly not to win it, unless we have the facts as to what is going on. Our observers must be allowed to report the facts as they see them, without the fear that their motives will be misconstrued if they tell the truth. We must know the facts favorable to our enemy as well as those that we like. Of equal importance, we must have the views and opinions of all who have any special competence. Their views must be freely stated and stoutly maintained, so that those who have the ultimate decisions to make may have the fullest choice of various alternatives and so that the people may understand the issues at stake.

We cannot, of course, entrust our destiny in any way to those whose first allegiance is to a foreign loyalty, whether that be the Soviet Union, Communist China, Chiang's Formosa, or Franco's Spain. But we must be ever alert to encourage, and not to destroy, freedom for the vigorous expression of views, even of wrong views; and freedom for our private institutions, as well as our official personnel, to make their contributions to the formation of policy and the determination of our destiny. This is the essence of democracy, and it is democracy's strength. It must not be destroyed.

Senator SMITH. Dr. Lattimore, you have finished your prepared statement, I believe?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. And you have been allowed to finish it with the opportunity for such vigor as you wish to express, have you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. And with occasional interrogations, Mr. Chairman, as the chairman stated at the beginning.

Senator SMITH. I must say, at the end of this reading by you of a prepared statement, you have been allowed to finish this reading unmolested and with the emphasis you have just demonstrated.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. I just want to make that clear and have it in the record.

Senator FERGUSON. I wanted to ask if there is anything that he wanted to say now about this document, or to add to it or subtract from it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not at the moment, Senator, thank you.

Senator SMITH. Then we will recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, when the examination of Dr. Lattimore will continue.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Friday, February 29, 1952.)

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Pat McCarran (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran, Eastland, O'Connor, Smith, Ferguson, and Watkins.

Senators Young, McCarthy, and Mundt.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; and Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We regret the congested condition of the room, but it is impossible to do otherwise. We hope that we may have quiet.

You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, I was asked yesterday at the close of my statement if I had anything to add. I do have some supplementary material that I should like to be allowed time to assemble over the week end and present later.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, have you ever worked in concert with a person whom you knew to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever knowingly assisted the Communist Party of any country, or any person or persons known to you to be a Communist or pro-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The Institute of Pacific Relations; of course, the Russian members of the Russian Council could be assumed to be Communist.

Mr. MORRIS. But apart from them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Apart from them, no; I don't believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever taken instructions or abided by recommendations made by members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my knowledge; no.

Mr. MORRIS. The Communist Party or any other country?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever received any orders or instructions or suggestions, directly or indirectly, from any Communist or pro-Communist source?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I considered to be Communist or pro-Communist at the time?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the answer?

Mr. MORRIS. I will read it again. [Reading:]

Have you ever received any orders or instructions or suggestions, directly or indirectly, from any Communist or pro-Communist source?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Orders and instructions, no. Of course, when I went up to Yen-an, the Chinese Communist headquarters, in 1937, and later in Chungking under the instructions of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, I did talk with Communists.

Mr. MORRIS. But otherwise your answer is "No"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Otherwise my answer is "No."

The CHAIRMAN. Read that question again, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever received any orders or instructions or suggestions, directly or indirectly, from any Communist or pro-Communist source?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you fully understand the question, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I considered to be Communist or pro-Communist at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Except for Yen-an and Chungking.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Except for Yen-an and Chungking.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I don't consider that he has answered the question. When he puts the answer "considered" I do not think he has answered the question at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question again, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS (reading):

Have you ever received any orders, instructions or suggestion, directly or indirectly, from any Communist or pro-Communist source?

(Mr. Lattimore consulting counsel.)

Senator FERGUSON. The question is did he know them to be Communists or have information.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I considered to be Communist at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that that is the answer, and I do not think it calls for time, Mr. Lattimore. I think you should consider the question, if you please. I asked you if you understood it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I understood it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I will have it read again for you if you think you do not understand it or if you have any doubt about the understanding of it, because it is a vital question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I understood it, and I think my answer was clear, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think you have made an answer to the question, Mr. Lattimore. In order that you may clarify your situation, I ask the counsel to read the question again.

Mr. MORRIS (reading):

Have you ever received any orders or instructions or suggestions, directly or indirectly, from any Communist or pro-Communist source?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I considered to be Communist.

Mr. SOURWINE. Except in the case of Chungking and Yenan.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, and there it is only a question of having conversations with them, and I don't remember anything there that could be considered a suggestion, much less an instruction.

The CHAIRMAN. Or an order.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Or an order.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever consciously conformed your actions or your expressions of opinion with any Communist policy or Communist directive?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. When you were editor of the publication Pacific Affairs did you ever publish an article by a person whom you knew to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Apart from Russian contributions, no.

Mr. MORRIS. While you were editor of Pacific Affairs did you publish articles by persons whom you subsequently learned were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; learned or believed to be now.

Mr. MORRIS. Who were they, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, Mr. Field, and I suppose I should include any of those who have refused to testify before this committee.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that James S. Allen was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I didn't. To the best of my recollection, I knew nothing about him prior to his article coming in.

Mr. MORRIS. Prior to—

Mr. LATTIMORE. His article being submitted.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, did you know him to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I did.

Mr. MORRIS. That is, during the time you were editor of Pacific Affairs—

Mr. LATTIMORE. During the time.

Mr. MORRIS (continued). Right up to the middle of 1941, did you ever know that James S. Allen was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know that Joseph Barnes was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Again during the term of your editorship of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Then or ever.

Mr. MORRIS. That term is applied to all of these questions. The term "while you were an editor of Pacific Affairs" is applied to all of the questions I am now asking.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I see; yes.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Morris, I think probably he ought to be asked if he has ever been told by anyone that they were Communists during that time, in addition to the question you have asked.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you ever told that James S. Allen was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you ever told that Joseph Barnes was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Kathleen Barnes was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Mr. T. A. Bisson was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Chi-Chao-ting was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Chen Han-seng was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Frederick V. Field was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Michael Greenberg was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know or were you ever told that Y. Y. Hsu was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know or were you ever told that Olga Lang was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Harriet Moore was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Lawrence K. Rosinger was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Guenther Stein was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Edgar Snow was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you ever told that he was pro-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that he was pro-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't consider him pro-Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, "Did you know?" I think you can answer that "Yes" or "No." Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge, he was not pro-Communist.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that Andrew J. Steiger or were you ever told that Andrew J. Steiger was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Anna Louise Strong was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know or were you ever told that Mary Van Kleeck was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or have you ever been told that Nym Wales was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know or were you ever told that Ella Winter was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. SOURWINE. If I might interrupt, by the witness' answer to each of those questions "No; I don't believe I ever was," do you intend the "I don't believe I ever was" to refer to the portion of the question about having been told?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I include that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the "No" go both to the question of knowing and of having been told whether the person was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. In each instance?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Very good.

Senator FERGUSON. So, even though there are two questions, you are answering both of them "No"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am answering both of them, to both parts of the question, that I don't believe I ever was.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you qualifying that answer?

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute, now. Put the question again.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you answer both parts of the questions, all of the questions, "No"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I answered both parts of all the questions "No; I don't believe I ever was."

Senator FERGUSON. All right. Are you qualifying the "No" there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am qualifying that I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. SOURWINE. The statement "I don't believe I ever was" is not a completely responsive answer to the question, did you know So-and-So was a Communist. That is all I was getting at.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it certainly is intended to be responsive, Mr. Sourwine.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to answer "No"; do you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean to answer "No"; that I don't believe I ever was. After all, my memory is not perfect. I am being asked about people with some of whom I had extremely slight contact many years ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, if I ask you "Did you ever know that Y. Y. Hsu was a Communist?" and you say, "No", I don't believe I ever was," it is not completely responsive. Do you see what I mean?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I was asked if I know or was I ever told—

Mr. SOURWINE. That is right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That he was a Communist, and I don't believe I ever was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Ever was told.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Ever was told.

Mr. SOURWINE. Specifically on the question of did you know.

Mr. LATTIMORE. And I don't believe I ever knew.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. That is your answer to each of these series of questions?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is my answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all I wanted to know.

Senator FERGUSON. Are you qualifying the word "no?"

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am saying that I don't believe I ever knew or was told.

Senator FERGUSON. I do not think that is responsive to the question.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not responsive because he can say "No," and that would answer the question. It is a complete answer to the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, it would be a complete answer to the question if I had a total memory, but I just don't.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you ever told that Victor A. Yakontoff was frankly pro-Soviet?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. At any time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a man who used the pen name of Asiaticus?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I never knew him. I received articles from him which I published.

Mr. MORRIS. Did not all of the above 21 persons contribute leading articles to Pacific Affairs while you were editor of Pacific Affairs? Allen, Barnes, Kathleen Barnes, Bisson, Chi, Chen Han-seng, Field, Greenberg, Hsu, Lang, Moore, Rosinger, Stein, Snow, Steiger, Anna Louise Strong, Mary Van Kleeck, Nym Wales, Ella Winter, Victor Yakontoff, and Asiaticus?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would not be able to reply offhand that they all contributed at all or that they contributed leading articles.

The CHAIRMAN. You weren't asked about leading articles. You were asked did they contribute articles.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think I asked about leading articles.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(Mr. Lattimore conferring with counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Did they contribute leading articles while you were editor of the magazine?

Mr. MORRIS. Do you want to refresh your recollection?

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. MORRIS. That is all right if he wants to refresh his recollection.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have a list here of contributors to Pacific Affairs, Mr. Chairman. I would like to consult it.

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is all right.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Did you say that Michael Greenberg was on that list?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; Michael Greenberg.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My list here, which may not be correct, shows a contribution from him in September 1941, which would be after the period of my editorship.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. You didn't prepare for that edition.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much is the lag, Mr. Lattimore, in your magazine? That is, what is your schedule? What is the time period between preparation and going to press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This was a quarterly magazine, and therefore the timing of a quarterly magazine is rather leisurely. Some of the articles came from abroad. So some articles would be, so to speak, in the works for more than the period between two issues. The closing date before going to press when I was editing for China was rather long, naturally, because I had to send the final material from China. Then when I was editing it from Baltimore it was naturally very much shorter, but I don't remember just what the time limit was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think it was a month, 6 weeks, 2 months?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It may have been of the order of 6 weeks or so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Did you say that Y. Y. Hsu was on your list, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't have him on my list at all. That may be a mistake on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have the answer, did he or did he not? After you consult your list, I would like to have you answer the question completely.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In that case my list may not be absolutely correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Would your list show a translation done by him, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Possibly there may have been a translation by him that wouldn't show in my list.

Mr. MORRIS. You would have the original listed there, not the translation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is enough on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think you have an answer to the question. Do you have your question there?

Mr. MORRIS. With the exception of those two, Mr. Lattimore—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am going on through the list—

The CHAIRMAN. Consult your list and then answer the question. [Mr. Lattimore examining document.]

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think those are the only exceptions I would make, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Otherwise your answer is "Yes," Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That they contributed to Pacific Affairs during the period when I was editor of it.

Mr. MORRIS. There was a further qualification, that it was leading articles, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Leading articles would be a question of subjective judgment, and I am not sure whether I would qualify all those contributions as leading articles.

Mr. MORRIS. How about the distinction of an article rather than a review in Pacific Affairs?

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that, how about a distinction? I don't think your question is clear.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Pacific Affairs is made up of a series of articles and a series of book reviews. There is a distinction between the two. In fact, you have them listed separate, do you not, Mr. Lattimore?

The CHAIRMAN. Make your question complete.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you testify that they contributed articles as opposed to reviews?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I see. I think there is a further distinction to be made, that Pacific Affairs—

The CHAIRMAN. First of all, answer that question and then see if there is a further distinction to be made.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that they all contributed articles; yes, not reviews.

The CHAIRMAN. If you wish to make a further distribution, you may do so.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. I was simply going to state that Pacific Affairs included at the beginning of the magazine, articles. Then there was a section called "comment and opinion" or "comment and criticism," or something of that sort, which would be in a quarterly magazine more or less the equivalent of a letters to the editor section, and then came the book reviews.

Mr. MORRIS. If you use the term "leading articles," what would you describe as a leading article, in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would put it in the article section, but would not include the comment and criticism section.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, have you testified in executive session before this committee that you did not know Asiaticus to be a Communist and in your opinion he was a Socialist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I did; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Is the chairman satisfied with that answer? We will have Mr. Lattimore's answer read into the record. He said he believed he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am speaking from my recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. I understand you can't be expected to remember it word for word.

Senator FERGUSON. No. Show it to him and ask him if that is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have it here.

The CHAIRMAN. Show him the record and he may answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. You will find it on that page, Mr. Lattimore [Mr. Lattimore examining transcript].

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, my statement is that testimony was, "I don't know he was a Communist. I would have said, speaking as of the late 1930's, that I would have thought he was possibly a Socialist, but not a Communist."

Mr. MORRIS. All right. Mr. Lattimore, did you not testify in executive session before this committee that you did not know that Asiaticus was a Marxist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I see the transcript?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. That is on page 87.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I testified, "I didn't know whether he was a Marxist or not. I thought he was a left-winger."

May I add there that this was many years ago, and my memory may not have been perfectly accurate. Also I would like to add that I certainly did not consider myself then and don't consider myself even now an authority on who is a Marxist and who isn't.

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge was Asiaticus—

The CHAIRMAN. The reference to many years ago doesn't refer to the record you have in your hands, does it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was not in the record. I am adding that now, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but you said your memory many years ago. You did not refer to the record that you made that was handed to you today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't refer to it at the time. I said I wanted to add that.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Chairman means this record was not made many years ago.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I was just adding a clarification.

Mr. SOURWINE. This record was on July 13, 1951.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, might the record be clear as to what was in the record of the executive session and what he added? I am not clear what he added.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think the record should be clear on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Counsel may read the record.

Senator FERGUSON. So it will be clear.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Asiaticus was under discussion. Mr. Morris said:

And yet, Mr. Lattimore, you were able to recommend him as a qualified performer for the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. Lattimore said:

I didn't recommend him. He wrote in some material for me which I thought was a good article on the subject and I published it. One of his articles was on railway loans in China at the turn of the century, the late 1890's and the early 1900's. It concerned some of the British Railway loans of that period. I sent the article, as I always did in such cases, to the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, and they disagreed with some of his interpretations but not with his statements of facts.

Mr. MORRIS. You knew at the time he was at least a Marxist, didn't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't know whether he was a Marxist or not. I thought he was a left-winger.

Mr. MORRIS. What do you mean by that term, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is a vague term which it is extremely difficult to make precise.

In connection with the other matter——

The CHAIRMAN. Let's not get that confused with the other matter.

Mr. SOURWINE. I mean the other mention of Asiaticus.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know that Asiaticus had any part in the inquiry conducted by the Institute of Pacific Relations, the long inquiry that you people conducted in the late thirties?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't answer that. I was not in charge of the inquiry and I don't know who did participate and who didn't.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you recall that you commended Mr. Carter on the selection of Asiaticus on that inquiry?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't recall it.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not recall that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wouldn't have been at all surprised. I thought he was a good economist who knew economic conditions in China pretty well.

Mr. MORRIS. And it is your testimony that you did not know he was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't know he was a Communist. I would have said, speaking as of the late 1930's, that I would have thought he was possibly a Socialist, but not a Communist.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you testify in executive session that you did not know that Asiaticus had written for Imprecorr, the official publication of the Communist International?

MR. LATTIMORE. I believe I did.

MR. MORRIS. Page 86 and page 88.

THE CHAIRMAN. Show that to him. [Mr. Lattimore examining document.]

MR. LATTIMORE. The question here from Mr. Morris was, "Did you know that he had written for Imprecorr." And, "Mr. Lattimore: No; I didn't."

May I add at this time that I doubt very much whether I knew in the 1930's that there was such a thing as Imprecorr.

MR. MORRIS. To your knowledge, Mr. Lattimore, was Asiaticus considered a Marxist in IPR circles?

MR. LATTIMORE. I couldn't answer that, Mr. Morris.

MR. MORRIS. Do you have knowledge that he was considered a Marxist?

MR. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I do. I don't know and I don't think I ever did.

MR. MORRIS. I see. Did you know that Asiaticus had written a book published in Berlin under Communist auspices entitled "From Shanghai to Canton"?

MR. LATTIMORE. Here I am speaking from recollection which is not at all precise, but I believe I may have been told that by Wittfogel.

MR. MORRIS. Did you know that he had written the book From Shanghai to Canton from your own knowledge?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not from my own knowledge, no.

MR. MORRIS. Did you read the book?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

MR. MORRIS. What names did you know Asiaticus by? Did you know him by the name of Shippe?

MR. LATTIMORE. Shippe, or Shipper; yes.

MR. MORRIS. Hans Mueller?

MR. LATTIMORE. Hans Mueller? I don't think I did.

MR. MORRIS. Any other name?

MR. LATTIMORE. No, Not that I recall.

MR. MORRIS. When you corresponded with him you corresponded with him in the name of Shippe; is that your testimony?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is my recollection, yes.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, how many articles did Asiaticus write for you while you were editor of Pacific Affairs?

MR. LATTIMORE. My list here shows four.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, so we will be sure we are talking about the same man, I show you a volume of Pacific Affairs. Which one is that?

MR. LATTIMORE. This is volume 9 for June 1936.

MR. MORRIS. Does that contain an article by Asiaticus?

MR. LATTIMORE. It contains an article by Asiaticus.

MR. SOURWINE. May I see that, Mr. Lattimore? Mr. Lattimore, are any of these people who wrote for this particular issue of Pacific Affairs, Communists so far as you know?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge.

MR. SOURWINE. Harriet Moore?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Asiaticus?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Guenther Stein?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Lin Yu?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wang Yu-Ch'uan?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Wait a minute. Lin Yu I don't even remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. He wrote "Twin Loyalties in Siam."

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wang Yu-Chuan?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. H. J. Timperley?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. W. Wynne Williams?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't even recall him.

Mr. SOURWINE. C. J. Robertson?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't even recall him.

Mr. SOURWINE. A. Arthur Schiller?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say, then, that there are no Communist writers represented in that issue of the magazine; that is, the June 1936 issue?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In that issue certainly to the extent of my knowledge at the time as editor, no.

Senator WATKINS. May I inquire just what do you mean by your personal knowledge? Are you seeking to make a distinction between that and their reputation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. What name was read here? Harriet Moore? I have no personal knowledge that she is a Communist.

Senator WATKINS. Was she reputed at that time to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think so. I don't remember hearing that.

Senator WATKINS. Was she generally considered so in your IPR circle?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1936?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were any of those persons reputed to be Communists as far as you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On this list?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read into the record at this time the testimony of Mr. Wittfogel that appears at 309 in the open session?

Mr. MANDEL. I read from the testimony of August Wittfogel, dated August 7, 1951, on page 309, part I of the hearings, reading as follows—

Senator FERGUSON. Just one moment.

Senator WATKINS. What hearings, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. MANDEL. Hearings before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. Quoting:

Dr. WITTFOGEL. The Chi story I have told. No doubt I have said I discussed it with Lattimore. The Asiaticus story I told you and I talked to Lattimore after he came back here. We talked about Asiaticus, too, several times. I told him the story the way I knew it; I told Lattimore that.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read what the reference is to, Mr. Mandel, on page 308?

Mr. MANDEL. On page 308 Dr. Wittfogel says in answer to Mr. Morris' question:

Will you relate to us the circumstance of your meeting a man known as Asiaticus in Shanghai in 1937?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. The name Asiaticus was known to me in Germany as the name of a German Communist who had held a leading position in the German party, who was known as Heinz Moeller, and who I think in the middle of the twenties left Germany. His faction was defeated, and one of the ways of leaders of such groups would be to make themselves useful in Moscow and be reassigned, as Gerhard Eisler was later on.

This man went to China and participated in the early developments of the expansion of the Kuomintang regime, when there was cooperation with the Communist Party at that time, from Canton into Yangtze Valley up to 1927. And Moeller, who, like I think a number of other Communists held a position in the Kuomintang government, and Mr. Stalin would say "apparatus."

He worked there in some kind of press or publicity—

Mr. FORTAS. That is "as." I think you misread a word.

Mr. MANDEL (reading).

as Mr. Stalin would say "apparatus."

He worked in some kind of press or publicity center and put his articles or some others together in a book which was published I think in 1928 in Germany under the title, translated, "From Canton to Shanghai."

Mr. MORRIS. Did a Communist publishing house publish that Dr. Wittfogel?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. Yes, that is right, in Germany, and I was interested. He was a protege of Gerhard Eisler's, and I think this was not a very good book.

Mr. MORRIS. Keep going.

Mr. MANDEL. Yes. [Reading:]

It was poorly written, and I think it was dull stuff. So I inquired about the circumstances and I heard more about this Heinz Moeller. It was published at that time. It was just before the fall of Eisler; and Eisler wanted it, and he was then powerful. The book was printed.

Mr. MORRIS. You say you met Asiaticus in Shanghai in 1937?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us the circumstances?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. I met him in the house of, I think, some doctor, some people from Europe who I don't think were political. I don't remember any details about them. They said there was a man who would like to see me, and he introduced himself as Asiaticus-Moeller. He told me he had been expelled—maybe I knew it, I don't remember exactly how this came about—from the party but that he had made his peace with the great father in the Kremlin and that he had been back in Moscow and that he was in good standing again, and at that time he was writing for Izvestia, which would indicate indeed he was in good standing.

Mr. MORRIS. You say you did meet him in Shanghai in 1937?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Dr. Wittfogel, I would like to present to you a copy of a letter which we introduced into our official files here as exhibit No. 4 on the first day of the hearings.

Mr. MORRIS. That is enough, Mr. Mandel.

Mr. Mandel, will you get the next document? Will you identify this document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations headed "Meeting on Pacific affairs,

April 8; Motiliev, Voitinsky, ECC, OL, Harondar, HM." And there is a penciled notation which is photostated, marked "1936."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I offer you this document, and ask you if you ever have seen this before.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it that you want him to see the original?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I have ever seen it before.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember a meeting in April 8, 1936, in Moscow in which those people enumerated there were present?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I recall one or more meetings with members of the Soviet group of IPR. I couldn't tell you how many and I couldn't tell you the exact dates. I am perfectly willing to accept that this is the record of one of them.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I wonder if you would read on page 3 the full paragraph beginning with "O. L." The reference "O. L." is to you, is it not, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read aloud that paragraph, please, Mr. Lattimore? Will you read this aloud, please, this paragraph?

Mr. FORTAS. Did you say the third paragraph?

Mr. MORRIS. No, the only paragraph beginning with "O. L." The larger paragraph.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

O. L. asked if Motiliev had received both his long letters on the question of P. A. and Motiliev said that he had only received the second. O. L. said that his main difficulties had been two: (1) When he took over the editorship of P. A.—

That is Pacific Affairs—

it was after the last conference, and he and E. C. C.—

That is Mr. Carter.

did not want to determine a definite policy alone, since that would be a one-sided, American decision. Therefore, no very clear policy was determined and this is to be done at Yosemite, he hopes. (2) He has had trouble getting material from the different councils. The lack of articles on—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your voice a little. I cannot hear you.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Japan is not the lack of asking. The Japanese council has promised articles on rice, silk, and the cooperative movement. In the first five issues, it was never known whether there would be enough material until a week before the magazine went to press. At the beginning P. A. had no prestige and it was difficult to get people to write for it. Some of the articles in the first issues are padding, due to lack of material. Likewise, the Soviet council did not send in its articles. The one article received from them was made the leading article. It has only been in the last 2 or 3 months that O. L. has felt that he could freely turn down articles. In the case of the Isaacs article, there was not enough material for that issue. The Chinese council did not object to the article and would give no answer to it and no other article on the same subject. It is impossible to get in touch with the Chinese Communists to get an answer from them. O. L. did not know about the writer in China Today or he would have tried to get the answer published in P. A. rather than in China Today. However, when it was published in China Today, the question came up whether the precedent should be set of republishing materials from other magazines. It had never been done, and P. A. was supposed to publish new material. Therefore O. L. decided to print an extract of the answer and give it a prominent place. O. L. had previously tried to get other articles on the Chinese Revolution, but this was the only one he could get. It was made a leading article in New York. In the next issue of P. A. there is to be an

article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese council and the British council. He likewise does not represent the Soviet council. This will be a leading article and will represent a personal opinion.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the end of the paragraph?

Mr. MORRIS. Will you continue reading, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I thought you just wanted that one paragraph.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that a new paragraph?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. That is enough, then.

The CHAIRMAN. No. It goes over on the next page.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

Motiliev said that it would be better to put as leading articles one that represented the point of view of one of the councils. O. L. said that he was prepared to consider this idea—

Mr. SOURWINE. Actually the difference is that counsel and the Senators are looking at a mimeographed copy. Mr. Lattimore is looking at the photostat of the original. I believe as the photostat shows it, he has ended the reading of the paragraph. On the mimeographed copy it goes over to the top of the next page, and it can't be determined whether it is a new paragraph or the same paragraph because they are not indented.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, you testified before the Tydings Committee that you did not know Dr. Chi to be a Communist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I probably did; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I think we had better read into the record, Mr. Mandel, page 887 of the Tydings committee hearings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, will that last document be received into the record?

Mr. SOURWINE. As identified by Mr. Mandel as coming from the files of IPR and as being the document commented upon by the witness. Here is the page of the Tydings transcript.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask one question which I think the witness has already answered. The letters "O. L." stand for Owen Lattimore; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You so understand that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, this is the Tydings hearings—

Senator SMITH. I think Dr. Lattimore made it clear, but lest it may not be, the photostatic copy from which he read was a photostat of the original. Have you seen that before?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I ever saw it before.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask a question of Mr. Mandel. Mr. Mandel, is this a true and correct photostatic copy of an original instrument found in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MANDEL. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 478" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 478

MEETING ON PACIFIC AFFAIRS; APRIL 8; MOTILIEV, VOITINSKY, ECC; OL;
HARONDAR; HM

Voitinsky said that the magazine had been reviewed twice in Tikhii Okean and there the general opinion about it had been stated. Such a magazine which is important should have a definite aim. Although different opinions are expressed

in it, there should be a general line in it and this should be the struggle for peace. The general tenor of the articles should be to show that collective security is the only possible way to peace. This aim is so wide that it can be supported by writers of all shades of opinion. At present the magazine has no line and this is the main weakness.

Voitinsky said that the article by Whyte is interesting but incorrect in its approach. It is a program article, about IPR policy. It treats China and Japan on the same footing and shows no aggressor. How can there be an objective study of the Pacific if no aggressor is shown. Whyte says that the causes of the Pacific problems are internal—in China, currency; in Japan, lack of raw materials—and England and America should help to solve these problems. But when no aggressor is recognized, the proposals are idealistic and weak, for it is impossible to introduce a new economic policy before the aggressor is stopped.

Voitinsky said that in PA China is not treated as a subject, only as an object. Therefore the writers neglect the possibility of China itself affecting the solution of China's problems. This is historically incorrect, and it makes it impossible for students of the question to understand the current movements within China. The Isaaks article, which is written at a very low level and is incorrect, is an attempt to show something about the internal situation in China.

Voitinsky said that there was little in PA on the internal situation in Japan. This is due to the fact that Japan is not regarded as an aggressor. But it is important to know how strong Japan is socially and economically internally. Likewise there is little on the question of nationalities—about Mongolia, and the colonies in the Far East. No effort is made to show that Japan is trying to exploit national culture and national feelings. In fact O. L. in his earlier articles gave Japan the benefit of the doubt and said that Japan might help these peoples.

O. L. asked if the article on the Japanese Monroe Doctrine was not about these questions. Voitinsky said that it was good about the juridical aspects. But since the magazine represents an organization which is struggling for peace, there were much greater possibilities for writing on these subjects.

E. C. C. said that the constitution of the IPR states as its object the study of the conditions of the peoples on the Pacific. There is a controversy within the institute as to whether the object is entirely scientific study, or active effort to maintain peace.

O. L. said that the review of the magazine in Tikhii Okean was entirely correct when it said that PA reflects the chaotic conditions in the opinions in capitalistic countries.

Motiliev said that if the object is to reflect the conditions and life of the peoples, still PA does not study the real social and economic life inside the countries—not in Japan, Korea, and other colonies. An objective study would inevitably show exploitation by the Japanese. Likewise the internal conditions of China are not shown—what are the causes of the rise of red China; what are the causes of the contradictions in China; what are the tendencies within China. The same is true about Australia and the U. S. S. R.

O. L. asked if Kathleen Barnes' article did not give something on the United States. Motiliev said that it only gave one side of the picture of the Soviet Far East.

Motiliev said that even if the aim of PA was to characterize the general conditions, it was impossible to do this without a definite idea about them. When no definite idea is given for a magazine, the wrong idea is conveyed by it. If there is no position taken on the problem of Japan's aggression in China, which is now the fundamental problem in the Pacific, then it seems as if the wrong position had been taken. In practice PA gives a definite political analysis, which is one-sided and therefore incorrect. For instance the Eggleston article fully justifies Japan, and tries to prove that England and the United States are to blame for the far-eastern situation. O. L. pointed out that this article reflects a definite body of opinion. Motiliev said that he was not against publishing this article, but also PA must give an analysis of the contradictions that are found in Eggleston's analysis. This is very difficult to do, because the IPR has members in all countries involved. But in order to satisfy most of the members of the institute, Motiliev thinks, it is necessary that PA have a definite political position. As a result of the present absence of such a position, the magazine is in fact directed against the ideal of peace. Even if the IPR doesn't aim to work for peace, it certainly does not aim for war.

E. C. C. said that the magazine is not the whole of the institute. In some of the other IPR work these analyses of internal conditions are being given,

e. g., a book will appear this month by a Japanese on Japanese penetration of mandated islands; a study is completed by a Korean on land utilization in Korea; a study is being done on agricultural organization in New Zealand which shows the waste that there has been in the land policy there; the book *Key Economic Areas in Chinese History* is written by a Marxist and gives an analysis of Chinese internal development. O. L. said that in the next issue there was to be an article on the rise of land taxes and the fall of dynasties in Chinese history, which was written by a Chinese, treating China as a subject, not an object. E. C. C. said that PA will be without focus until the Soviet members contribute to it regularly. PA has never received the article from Voitinsky on agrarian problems in China. When Soviet articles appear regularly, they will make the issues clearer and will show up the negative quality of many of the other articles.

Motiliev said that another way to accomplish this was through greater objectivity in the editorial work. For instance the Isaacs article on Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution is written on a very low level and is incorrect. An article on this question by a bourgeois journalist of good standing would be interesting. But this is a Trotskyist article which doesn't reflect the opinion of any of the councils of the IPR. A very serious answer to this article was published in *China Today*, but only extracts from this answer were printed in PA. Motiliev said that the Soviet Council could not answer this article, but he had suggested that some of the Chinese leaders give an answer. Motiliev said he did not know who the editor of *China Today* is, but his answer expressed the opinion of 50 million Chinese. Motiliev asked why this article was made the leading article. The leading article should express the opinion of some one of the member Councils. Motiliev said that in general he did not think the magazine was objective, although some of its objects, such as trying to show different shades of opinions, were carried out. The Isaacs article is only one example. For instance the article on Fisheries, while on the whole objective, contains some incorrect information. Possibly this was due to the fact that the author did not know the facts. Motiliev wrote to O. L. about these inaccuracies and nothing appeared in PA about them. In general Motiliev thought that O. L. made it more difficult for himself by publishing leading articles like the Isaacs article and not publishing the answers to them.

O. L. asked if Motiliev had received both his long letters on the question of PA and Motiliev said that he had only received the second. O. L. said that his main difficulties had been two: 1. When he took over the editorship of PA, it was after the last conference, and he and E. C. C. did not want to determine a definite policy alone, since that would be a one-sided, American decision. Therefore no very clear policy was determined and this is to be done at Yosemite, he hopes. 2. He has had trouble getting material from the different councils. The lack of articles on Japan is not for lack of asking. The Japanese Council has promised articles on rice, silk, and the cooperative movement. In the first five issues, it was never known whether there would be enough material until a week before the magazine went to press. At the beginning PA had no prestige and it was difficult to get people to write for it. Some of the articles in the first issues are padding, due to lack of material. Likewise, the Soviet Council did not send in its articles. The one article received from them was made the leading article. It has only been in the last 2 or 3 months that O. L. has felt that he could freely turn down articles. In the case of the Isaacs article, there was not enough material for that issue. The Chinese Council did not object to the article and would give no answer to it and no other article on the same subject. It is impossible to get in touch with the Chinese Communists to get an answer from them. O. L. did not know about the writer in *China Today* or he would have tried to get the answer published in PA rather than in *China Today*. However, when it was published in *China Today*, the question came up whether the precedent should be set of republishing materials from other magazines. It had never been done, and PA was supposed to publish new material. Therefore O. L. decided to print an extract of the answer and give it a prominent place. O. L. had previously tried to get other articles on the Chinese Revolution, but this was the only one he could get. It was made a leading article in New York. In the next issue of PA there is to be an article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese Council and the British Council. He likewise does not represent the Soviet Council. This will be a leading article and will represent a personal opinion.

Motiliev said that it would be better to put as leading articles one that represented the point of view of one of the councils. O. L. said that he was prepared

to consider this idea, but often before he has not had an important article which represented a council. O. L. said that if the Soviet group would show in their articles a general line—a struggle for peace—the other articles would naturally gravitate to that line. O. L. said that he had no organizational authority to tell the councils what kind of articles they should send in. He hopes that this will be settled at Yosemite.

Motiliev said that it was a dangerous editorial mistake to publish the Chamberlin review. It is not because the review was about a book by Stalin, but because in the same review there was a review of a book by Chernavin. This is a very important political question for them here.

They have no objection to having Stalin's book reviewed and they are willing to answer a review, but the review must be done with due respect, to a person in Stalin's position. Motiliev asked why the book was given to Chamberlin who was known to be so anti-Soviet. (Incidentally Chamberlin's book has not been received here for reviewing.)

O. L. said that he had not realized Chamberlin's position, but as soon as he learned of the Soviet opinion about Chamberlain, he canceled an article on the Soviet press which he had asked from Chamberlin.

Voitinsky said that he had not entirely understood E. C. C.'s answer to the question of the aim of the institute. Voitinsky said that recently many organizations which had previously had no political opinions were taking definite positions. The IPR is a big organization and is a kind of unofficial league in the Pacific. Whyte in his article says that part of the aim of the IPR is to find a solution for the situation in the Pacific. Therefore the IPR must take some line on this question. Voitinsky said that he thought the IPR and PA must have as its aim the struggle for peace—through scientific study and research aimed in that direction. Voitinsky said that last year this point was not urged here, because the Soviet group was still new in the IPR, but more because the objective situation was not what it is today.

ECC said that this change in attitude toward political questions in the IPR was already reflected in the change in the agenda for the fifth round table. Originally this was to be about the changing balance of power in the Pacific—just an objective appraisal of the shifting balance. Now it is to discuss methods of peaceful change and solution of the problem.

O. L. said that he was willing to have P. A. reflect such a line, but these positive ideas can only be started positively. He cannot dictate to the other councils what they must write. He must first have an original article taking a stand, and this will make the others write to that point.

Voitinsky said that it would be possible to answer the Whyte article.

O. L. pointed out that his articles in PA had been criticized in Tikhii Okean, but never in PA. He said that when Motiliev wrote to him about the fisheries article, he had sent the corrections to New York, but they were too late to be included in the original article. He did not know that Motiliev wanted to have sections of his letter published. O. L. has considered starting a letter section in PA, but to date there hasn't been enough material to make it possible.

ECC said that the Isaacs and Chamberlin articles were great mistakes, and would not be repeated in the future. H. M. said that O. L. had nothing to do with the Chamberlin reviews. That was done on the responsibility of the New York Office.

Motiliev suggested that there be articles on some of the following: (1) Internal relations in China, Japan, and the Japanese colonies. (2) Economic development of the U. S. S. R. as a whole and the Soviet Far East. (3) General conditions in the Pacific, the contradictions between countries, the question of war and peace. Articles like Eggleston's should be printed, but they should be criticized and answered.

O. L. said that he tried to get an answer to this article from many people, but they all said that it was the opinion of the Australian Council and that there was no need to answer it. Voitinsky said that the American council should have answered it.

Motiliev made the following proposals as to organization of the magazine. A. The leading article should always express the opinion of a definite council. It is customary to have the leading article more or less official. B. Articles by unknown and irresponsible writers should not be published on important questions. But there should be articles by leading personalities who are of interest, no matter what they represent; e. g., Bywater and Asiaticus. C. There should not be criticisms of books and opinions of the leading personalities of the various member countries. It is unnecessary to have such criticism, it is not part of the work of the IPR, and it embarrasses the members of the councils.

Voitinsky said that now the Soviet group would try to write articles for P.A. O. L. said that if they would start it would give him a stronger hand with the other councils. The British have been good about providing articles so far, but the other councils have not been so good.

O. L. said that he wanted a Soviet review of the Webb book. Voitinsky said that it could be reviewed.

X I e KING EDWARD
STALIN
HIROHITO

The CHAIRMAN. What is the next question? I think you were asked to read, were you not, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked that it be given to the witness so that the question may be asked of him if he did so testify before the Tydings hearings.

(Mr. Lattimore examining document.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. The question is from Senator Hickenlooper:

During your acquaintance with Mr. Chi prior to the war or during the war did you believe him to be or did you learn him to be a Communist at any time?

Dr. LATTIMORE—

It should have been Mr. Lattimore, of course.

Dr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; no, sir.

Is that all you want me to read?

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment. You had two answers, meaning you answered both; yes sir?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I just repeated my answer, I suppose. I am reading the transcript.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think that answers counsel's question.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify before this committee in executive session that you never at any time knew that Dr. Chi was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I probably did. May I see the record?

Mr. MORRIS. Executive session, 155, top of the page.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Question by Mr. Morris:

Dr. Lattimore, did you ever at any time know that Dr. Chi was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Young Dr. Chi?

Mr. MORRIS. Young Dr. Chi.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you testify in executive session that only on one occasion did you meet Dr. Chi's father in China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I testified that I met Dr. Chi's father in China only on one occasion. Later my memory was refreshed and I wrote in to the committee explaining that I met him twice.

The CHAIRMAN. You were asked what you testified to.

Mr. MORRIS. You did testify to that effect and you did also send a letter to the committee stating that you had learned otherwise.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Is this the letter you sent to the committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is the letter, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that letter be received into the record as a change that Mr. Lattimore wanted to make in his testimony in the executive session before this committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see it.

Mr. SOURWINE. If that is the case, the witness should adopt this letter as his testimony now. I assume that is his desire.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Sure.

Mr. MORRIS. Except, of course, that he does go on record to show that he learned this some time ago and not today.

Mr. SOURWINE. He adopts this letter as written as his testimony now.

The CHAIRMAN. There is your letter; is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 479" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 479

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
WALTER HINES PAGE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Baltimore 18, Md., September 2, 1951.

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my recollection that in executive session of your subcommittee on July 13 I was asked about meeting Prof. K. C. Chi, then Commissioner of Education in Shansi Province, in China, in 1937, and that I confirmed that I had. It is further my recollection that I was asked whether I had met him in China on any other occasion, and that I replied that I could not remember that I had.

It has now been drawn to my attention that in a public session of your subcommittee Dr. K. A. Wittfogel testified that he and I had met Professor Chi, also in Shansi Province, in 1935. This testimony has refreshed my memory, and I wish to confirm that I did meet Professor Chi in 1935, in company with Dr. Wittfogel and, if I remember rightly, Dr. Woodbridge Bingham. I believe also that I remember that Professor Chi was advised beforehand of our coming to call on him by Dr. Walter Judd, now Representative Judd, who was then a missionary in that province, and whose mission was on cordial terms with the Chi family.

I wish to add to my previous testimony accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

[s] Owen Lattimore.
[t] OWEN LATTIMORE.

OL: c.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify in executive session before this committee that you had no reason to believe that Dr. Chi could be a Communist? That is 155.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Again young Dr. Chi?

Mr. MORRIS. Young Dr. Chi.

(Mr. Lattimore examining transcript.)

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Senator FERGUSON. And you had no reasons to believe that he could be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Had anyone ever told you he was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is enough.

Mr. Lattimore, did you in executive session before this committee testify that no one ever told you that Dr. Chi was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Probably.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't you just read it there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. You are referring to this? Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Your answer is "Yes"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My answer was "Yes"; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you not testify in executive session before this committee that no one had related to you the circumstances, the inevitable conclusion of which would have been that Chi was a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. I just read that in the transcript.

MR. MORRIS. That is page 156, another place, Mr. Lattimore. You may want to see it.

MR. LATTIMORE. I did see it just now.

MR. MORRIS. Very good. Your answer is "Yes"?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes.

MR. MORRIS. Did you ever receive an official report to the effect that Dr. Chi was a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recollect.

MR. MORRIS. Did you testify before this committee that you did not have any reasonable grounds to believe that Dr. Chi was a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. I believe I did.

MR. MORRIS. 155.

MR. LATTIMORE. This is my testimony:

In the case of Dr. Chi, my principal contact with him was during the war years, when he was holding extremely high and confidential positions under the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Senator FERGUSON. And you had no reasons to believe that he could be a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

MR. MORRIS. Will you read further? I think there is another reference there.

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes.

MR. MORRIS. Had anyone ever told you he was a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

MR. MORRIS. So your answer to that last question is——

MR. LATTIMORE. That that was my testimony.

MR. MORRIS. Did you testify before this committee in executive session that you had no evidence that he might be a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. I presume so.

MR. SOURWINE. The same page, Mr. Lattimore.

MR. LATTIMORE. What was that page?

MR. SOURWINE. 155.

MR. LATTIMORE. What was the question?

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question again.

MR. MORRIS. Did you testify before this committee in executive session that you had no evidence that he might be a Communist?

The CHAIRMAN. Page 155 of the executive hearing.

MR. LATTIMORE. Oh, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Had you any evidence that they might be Communists?

MR. LATTIMORE. In the case of Miss Chomeley I knew her much too little to have an authoritative opinion one way or another.

In the case of Dr. Chi, my principal contact with him was during the war years, when he was holding extremely high and confidential positions under the Chinese Nationalist Government.

MR. MORRIS. Well, did you testify before this committee in executive session that you had no evidence that he might be a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson then goes on:

And you had no reasons to believe that he could be a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

MR. MORRIS. So what is the answer to that question?

MR. LATTIMORE (reading):

MR. MORRIS. Had anyone ever told you that he was a Communist?

MR. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Had anyone ever related to you the circumstances, the inevitable conclusion of which would have been that he was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. That is, the answer was "No"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The answer was "No."

The CHAIRMAN. Then the answer to this question is "Yes," that he so testified?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think that is the same question, Mr. Morris; is it?

Mr. MORRIS. May I see page 155, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. FORTAS. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. SOURWINE. The record does speak for itself. It has been read here now by the witness and it is a part of the record. There is no point in quibbling over what it said.

Mr. FORTAS. That is how I characterize it. I agree with you.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think counsel's original question was intended to simplify it, but it hasn't turned out that way.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you not testify that Dr. Chi, as far as your contacts with him were concerned, held an extremely high and confidential position in the Chinese Nationalist Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that Dr. Chi wrote for China Today under the name of Hansu Chan?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't think I ever knew that.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever know it at all?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My memory is not clear. It may have been in one of the transcripts of this committee that I have read.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read the testimony on page 81 of the executive session, the executive session with Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. SOURWINE. If it is Mr. Lattimore's testimony, why not give it to him and ask him if he testified that way? This is a part of the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you read page 81—your testimony on that page relative to this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question again, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know he wrote for China Today as Hansu Chan?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that he contributed to China Today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I learned that some time ago. I didn't know it at the time that I knew him.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he not make a contribution under a pseudonym?

Mr. LATTIMORE. So I have been told.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember what the pseudonym was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. When were you told that, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that was in some publication by Kohlberg or some other member of the China Lobby.

Mr. MORRIS. When were you told that Dr. Chi wrote for China Today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think my answer in executive session covers my recollection of it, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is that, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That I read about it in some publication.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you give us the date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I can't.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know that China Today was a Communist or pro-Communist publication?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify before the Tydings committee that you did not know the New China Daily News to be Communist in 1942 or 1943?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I amplify my answer on the subject of China Today?

Mr. MORRIS. The question, Mr. Lattimore, is, Did you testify before the Tydings committee that you did not know the New China Daily News to be Communist in 1942-43.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I mean the previous question on China Today.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the previous question?

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know China Today to be Communist or pro-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I ever knew that until much later, and among my reasons for not thinking it Communist was the fact that its contributors included Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, Geraldine Fitch, now active in the China lobby; her husband, George Fitch, of the YMCA—

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying from memory, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I am testifying from looking up some copies of China Today recently.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Schwollenbach; Freda Utley, a former member of the staff of this committee; Emory Luccock, L-u-c-c-o-c-k, pastor of the American Church in Shanghai; Edward Hume, director of the Christian Medical Council; Harry B. Price; and Father Charles Meeus, M-e-e-u-s. In November 1938 it published an interview with Bishop Paul Yu Pin and in the same month Walter Judd spoke at a meeting sponsored by the American Friends of the Chinese People of which China Today was the organ. On the cover of the July 1939 issue was a picture of the Chiang Kai-sheks.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, at this point may I have referred to the record our exhibit No. 54 which was introduced in open session on August 42, 1951. Mr. Mandel, will you read that letter into the record at this time? I would like that to apply to this part of the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a letter dated December 13, 1939, addressed to Mr. Max Granich, China Today, 168 West Twenty-third Street, New York, N. Y. It is evidently a photostat of a carbon. There is a typed signature of Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Was the document taken from the files?

Mr. MANDEL. The document was taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the first paragraph, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes.

DEAR MR. GRANICH: Thank you for your letter of December 11. I am afraid that my position as editor of Pacific Affairs makes it impossible for me to join the editorial board of China Today. I am a member of the international secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This means that one of my employers is the Japanese council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. There has already been a considerable kick about my being on the board of Amerasia. It is probably better for me not to invite extra kicks by going on the board of China Today, which is more partisan, and more obviously partisan, than Amerasia.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can that be shown to the witness?

(Document shown to Mr. Lattimore.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, is that a copy of a letter which you wrote?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, it is.

There is another paragraph here that has not been read into the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you like to read it in, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. SOURWINE. The whole thing is in the record; is it not?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, it is, Mr. Sourwine. Would you like to read it, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading) :

I have been desperately busy the last few months completing a book, and consequently have published very little in magazines. I am expecting to write some articles in the next few months, but I think you will agree that these articles would have their maximum impact if not published in magazines which are devoted to "the cause of China."

Mr. MORRIS. "The cause of China" is in quotes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. "The cause of China" is in quotes.

Mr. MORRIS. That is in the record, Mr. Chairman.

Did you testify before the Tydings committee that you did not know the New China Daily News to be Communist in 1942-43?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 1942-43? Yes, I believe I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have introduced or a reply to the record at this time exhibit No. 35, which was introduced into the record on July 26, 1951, page 180. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document and read it into the record?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a document, of a carbon copy, in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is dated October 17, 1940. At the top are initials ECC and WLH. It is addressed to Mr. F. V. Field, American Peace Mobilization, 1116 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. The typed signature is Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read, Mr. Mandel.

Mr. MANDEL. Yes. [Reading:]

DEAR FRED: Enclosed I am sending you an article submitted to me by Asiaticus. For readers of Pacific Affairs, it would read like propaganda, and rhapsodical propaganda at that. As the article is also too long, however, we might be able to shorten it, pruning out a great many adjectives but still retaining the realistic points. However, it is too late for our December issue.

I am therefore sending you the article as is, to see whether you may have any suggestions for placing it.

The sooner you can look in on us, the better we'll be pleased.

Yours,

OWEN LATTIMORE.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I see that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you identify that letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is quite evidently a letter that I wrote; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a short recess in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. Just 1 minute.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The date is 1940, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I ask for a short recess in executive session?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. Could the committee retire, this room being as full as it is.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a. m. the subcommittee went into executive session.)

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the hearing was reconvened.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I add to an answer that I made to Mr. MORRIS sometime ago, when he was asking me about Communist contributors to Pacific Affairs?

The CHAIRMAN. Was that this morning?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This morning's session, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the question? We want the question first.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Could you remember the question, Mr. MORRIS? It was about Communist contributors to Pacific Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the reporter read the question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was a question something about "Did you ever publish Communist contributors?" or something of that sort.

Mr. MORRIS. When you were editor of the publication Pacific Affairs, did you ever publish an article by a person whom you knew to be a Communist?

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the question to which I refer. I merely wanted to point out—

The CHAIRMAN. What was your answer to it, please? Mr. MORRIS, will you give the question so the reporter can go through his notes?

Mr. MORRIS. The question was: When you were editor of the publication Pacific Affairs, did you ever publish an article by a person whom you knew to be a Communist? That was the seventh question on my list here.

(The record was read by the reporter as follows:)

Mr. MORRIS. When you were the editor of the publication Pacific Affairs, did you ever publish an article by a person whom you knew to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Apart from Russian contributions, no.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I simply wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman, that my memory had slipped a rather obvious cog, since, on page 6 of the statement that I read before this committee there is the following:

The CHAIRMAN. Page 6 of what?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Of my statement prepared for this committee.

* * * an article by a Chinese Communist which was clearly labeled as such and was presented as an example of what the Chinese Communists were saying.

Mr. SOURWINE. You identified that, I believe, under questioning, as an article written by Mau Ning, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I may have said that it might have been by him. My recollection is not clear. As I recall, it was an article about the Chinese Communists in northwest China which had been originally printed in China, and was translated and sent to us, and we published it, labeling it as a translation of a Chinese Communist article, giving it as an example of what the Communists were saying in China.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you take this issue of June 1936, Pacific Affairs, and tell us which article there is referred to as the

article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese council and the British council, referred to in the minutes which have been presented to you of the April 8, 1936, meeting in Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't point to such an article, Mr. Morris. I believe the note that was read was something about a Chinese Communist, wasn't it?

Mr. MORRIS. What note are you referring to, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The minutes of that meeting in Moscow.

Mr. MORRIS. There is no reference to a Chinese Communist writer here, the statement is—

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I see what the original text was?

Mr. MORRIS. That is a stencil, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

In the next issue of PA, there is to be an article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese council and the British council.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the question, please?

Mr. MORRIS. What is the Communist article that you referred to? According to these minutes, you say it is coming out in the next issue of Pacific Affairs, which you now have before you.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall. I don't believe it refers to this article by Asiaticus, if that is what you mean.

Mr. MORRIS. Does not the article by Asiaticus—is it not antagonistic to both the Chinese council and the British council?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think it is antagonistic to the Chinese council.

Mr. MORRIS. It talks about usury on the part of the Chinese Government, doesn't it?

Would you look at it a minute, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Where is the article now? Can you give me the page reference? Where is the statement about usury?

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean to say, Mr. Lattimore, while we are waiting to find that, that you were not referring to the Asiaticus article during this conference with Motiliev, Voitinsky, and the others?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; my recollection is that at that time, or just before that time, while I was in China, I had been trying to get hold of a Chinese Communist article of some kind, and that I thought I had, but eventually failed. My recollection is that happened several times. There may be some correspondence about it in the files.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are saying that, to the best of your memory, Asiaticus was not a subject for discussion at this conference?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my memory, this reference in the conference is not to Asiaticus.

Mr. MORRIS. When did that particular article go to press, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember.

Mr. MORRIS. May I get back to this other question about the usury?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the first paragraph on the top of page 167.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The whole paragraph?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. On the top of page 167.

Nor was this all. Besides the lucrative business for the banks and bondholders, there were other advantages, some of which may be quoted from clauses of the loan agreement. First of all, the loan was to be secured on "the entire revenues of the Chinese Maritime Customs." In addition to this, the Chinese Government undertook that "the administration of the Chinese Maritime Custom Service shall remain as at present during the currency of this loan." This makes it possible to understand another of the clauses reading as follows: "During the said term of 45 years, the amortization shall not be increased nor the loan redeemed nor converted by the Chinese Government."

The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corp., which alone took half of the loan, became at the same time the depository bank of the Maritime Customs, the biggest source of Chinese public income. The gigantic usury and national humiliation contained in this one loan agreement are guaranteed to this day by the British supervisory control of the Maritime Customs and executed by the Honkong and Shanghai Banking Corp., the trustees of almost all of the British loans to the Chinese Government.

Mr. MORRIS, I should like to point out that that paragraph would have been entirely welcome to the Chinese council of the IPR as of 1936.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the national humiliation referred to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That refers to the kind of loans—the kind of loan agreements that China had to sign before the time of the Nationalist Government, and protests against such loans and demands for revisions of such treaties were part of the policy of the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Mr. MORRIS. And what was the usury referred to, on whose part?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say that referred to the British. I may add that this particular article by Asiaticus was submitted to the British in advance, met with protests from them on the interpretation of the facts, but none of the facts were disputed and the criticism or suggestion was not made that it was an article by a Communist.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, if the chairman will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that we may get correctly what you referred to as your reference earlier in your statement to an article by a Chinese Communist, is that from page 6 of your statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You said it was clearly established in the Tydings committee hearings that in fact—

I had never called the Chinese Communists agrarian reformers, nor had Pacific Affairs carried articles calling them agrarian reformers, with the single exception of an article by a Chinese Communist which was clearly labeled as such, and was presented as an example of what the Chinese Communists were saying.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I had asked you at the time if that article that you referred to was not the article Agrarian Democracy in Northwest China by Mau Ming.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had forgotten the name Mau Ming, but by its title of the article, I recognize it. That is the article.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is the article that you did refer to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And does that appear in this issue of Pacific Affairs; does it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It does not appear in this issue of Pacific Affairs, and in the issue in which it does appear the article is identified, the original Chinese publication is identified, the name of the translator is given.

MR. SOURWINE. Now, in this conference that you were having, sir, on April 8, the memorandum recites that you stated that the next issue of Pacific Affairs—that is, the next issue after the conference—was to have an article by a Communist writer which would be antagonistic to the Chinese council and the British council.

Are you now stating that there was in fact no such article published in the next issue of Pacific Affairs, that is, this June issue that we have before us?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is my recollection. My general recollection of that period, as I say, is that as editor of Pacific Affairs I was trying to get something that would represent the Communist problem in China; this problem was of growing importance, other publications were trying to get material on it, and I was trying to find a Chinese Communist who would write an article for us; maybe it would have to be translated or something of that kind.

I never succeeded in getting one.

MR. SOURWINE. Where was that conference held, this meeting between yourself, Motiliev, Voitinsky, Harondar, and HM. I suppose that is Harriet Moore?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; that must have been Harriet Moore.

MR. SOURWINE. Where was it held?

MR. LATTIMORE. Where was it held?

MR. SOURWINE. What country and city?

MR. LATTIMORE. It was held at the office of the Russian council of the IPR, as far as I remember.

MR. SOURWINE. In Russia?

MR. LATTIMORE. In Russia, yes.

MR. SOURWINE. In Moscow?

MR. LATTIMORE. In Moscow.

MR. SOURWINE. Actually, that was April 8, and we are talking about the June issue. Had not the June issue already closed at that time?

MR. LATTIMORE. I couldn't tell you whether it had or not.

MR. SOURWINE. You had a 6-weeks lag when you were editing it from Baltimore, and a much longer lag when you were out of the country, isn't that right?

MR. LATTIMORE. I am not sure what the lag was. There may have been an article submitted which was considered, you know, just a Communist tirade and not what we want, and therefore thrown out, or something of that sort.

MR. SOURWINE. Certainly you had to close this book at least a month before it was printed, did you not?

MR. LATTIMORE. You may remember, Mr. Sourwine, that when I asked you about the lag in publication, I was extremely uncertain on the subject.

MR. SOURWINE. Well, you edited this magazine for some years, didn't you?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did.

MR. SOURWINE. What is the shortest lag you ever had between closing and printing? That is something you would remember.

MR. LATTIMORE. No; it is simply that I have a general memory that there was a lag. I don't remember exactly what it was.

MR. SOURWINE. Are you telling us here, Mr. Lattimore, that you could have edited a magazine for years and not known what the deadline was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I had edited a magazine that always had the same deadline, I would probably remember. But this was an extremely shifting business.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you say shifting?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; because I was editing from different places, and my general recollection is that the first few years, you see—I began in 1934—if we had an April issue, that it should appear in April, that in the early years, owing to delay in getting material, sometimes the April issue would appear after April, or the June issue after June.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not asking you when it appeared. I am simply asking you what was your minimum time lag, what was your deadline schedule, how long before the actual publication did you have to close the forms, did you have to have your copy in?

You dealt with that. You met that every quarter. Now, certainly you can give us some idea about what it was.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I met it in a different way in many quarters, Mr. Sourwine.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not answering the question at all, Mr. Lattimore. Get at the question, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am answering it to the best of my ability.

The CHAIRMAN. Give your best judgment, if you cannot do any better, as to what the lag was. That is the question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe there ever was any definite lag, unless maybe after 1938, when I was editing from Baltimore and we were close at hand.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had to have your copy in at least a week before the magazine was out in print, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't tell you. I never handled that. I sent my stuff to the New York office, and the New York office handled the whole question of printing, printing contracts, distribution, mailing out, and so on. I never had anything to do with it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are testifying under oath here, sir. Are you telling this committee as editor of this magazine you don't know whether you had to have your copy in at least a week before the publication date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am saying, Mr. Sourwine, that I don't remember what the deadline was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether you had to have it in at least a week before the publication?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should think probably at least a week; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know whether it had to be at least a week?

Mr. LATTIMORE. But the publication date itself would vary, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. By publication date, you are probably talking about the date appearing on the magazine, and I am talking about the date that it actually came off the press. Don't you know that you had to have your copy in at least a week before the actual publication came off the press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your estimate of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not estimating. I am asking you to state categorically, do you know or do you not know that you had to have your copy in at least a week before that magazine came off the press?

MR. LATTIMORE. All that I can testify, Mr. Sourwine, is that we used to correspond back and forth with New York, and wherever I was, and they would say "Will the copy be in by" such and such a date, and when the copy was in, it was up to them to get it to the printer and get it out.

MR. SOURWINE. Are you saying that you do not, then, know that you had to have your copy in at least a week before the magazine came off the press?

MR. LATTIMORE. I do not know anything more than that I would, by correspondence, fix a date with the New York office when I would regard my copy sent in for the magazine as complete.

MR. SOURWINE. And would that date bear any relationship to the date at which you hoped to get the magazine off the press?

MR. LATTIMORE. It would bear a varying relationship.

MR. SOURWINE. Would you, when you were fixing that date, think about the time when the magazine would probably come off the press, if you met that deadline?

MR. LATTIMORE. I was not thinking in terms of when it would come off the press. I was thinking in terms of getting it out and distributed.

MR. SOURWINE. Well, would you think, when you were fixing the deadline for getting copy in of that, in terms of when you would get the magazine out and get it distributed?

MR. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, you have all of the documents of the IPR.

THE CHAIRMAN. Strike that from the record, if you please. Mr. Lattimore, when the chairman calls your attention to this, please desist from further expression.

The question, Mr. Lattimore, has been propounded to you, and you answered it this morning or yesterday when you said that probably 6 weeks, at times, was the lag. Now, if you do not know what the lag was, state to the counsel that you do not know. If you know what it was, state to the counsel that you know. If you cannot, then give your best estimate as to what the lag was.

MR. LATTIMORE. I can't state what the lag was. When Mr. Sourwine first asked me that question, I thought it was rather a trivial question. If he wanted to have 6 weeks, I was perfectly willing to have it.

THE CHAIRMAN. There are no trivial questions here. We try to get away from the trivial stuff. We got away from that yesterday. We closed that yesterday.

MR. SOURWINE. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, when you, as editor of this magazine, would fix a date by which you were going to try to get your copy in—in other words, a deadline—did you think of that deadline in relation to the time when you would be able to get the magazine out and distributed?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did.

MR. SOURWINE. Now, what was the relationship in your mind there between the deadline which you fixed and the time when you would be able to get the magazine out and distributed?

MR. LATTIMORE. At this date, I don't know. As I have already said, I think it varied from quarter to quarter.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much did it vary?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did it vary by as much as a month from quarter to quarter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It might easily have.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean that when you fixed your deadline, Mr. Lattimore, you didn't know within a month when you were going to be able to get the magazine off the press, if you met that deadline?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the first part of my editing of Pacific Affairs, when I first started editing it from China, later when issues had to be edited while I was traveling as in this case from China all the way to America, it would vary considerably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think, Mr. Lattimore, that you could possibly have gone on off to Russia, be there in April, and have left the question of your June issue up in the air?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; there was an assistant editor in New York, and to cover contingencies for a thing like that I would, like my traveling, for instance, I would try to have extra articles on tap for that issue so that the assistant editor could make a last-minute choice and get out a full issue.

I may point out that this Communist article which I was expecting could easily have been an article mailed from Peking to New York without my seeing it, in the manner in which that periodical was edited, and it may never have come through, or may have come through and been rejected.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you through?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lattimore, at the time you were having this conference on the 8th of April——

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. SOURWINE. The conference in Moscow with Voitinsky and Motiliev and others, don't you know now, and didn't you know then whether the copy was all in for the forthcoming June issue of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember at all, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you said here "In the next issue there is to be an article by a Communist writer," were you not referring to an article which had already been edited, the copy on which had already been sent to the printer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not necessarily. I could easily have been referring to an article that was promised.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Sourwine, may I suggest there that the language is antagonistic. I would think that that would presuppose that at that time the article was in existence, and Dr. Lattimore had known it and had seen it, because he was pronouncing it antagonistic.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is the point I was attempting to make, Senator. Isn't that true, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, an article by a Chinese Communist would automatically be displeasing to the Chinese council.

The CHAIRMAN. What is our question? Just a moment.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked him if it was not true that he was referring to an article which was in existence which was antagonistic.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; not that I recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, do you think it is possible that this magazine, Pacific Affairs, could ever have come off the press in less than a month after the time that the copy was all in?

Mr. FORTAS. Just a moment. Mr. Lattimore wants to consult me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question, please.

(The record was read by the reporter.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Sourwine, I am incompetent to answer that question.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the June issue. Do you know when it came off the press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. He says he is incompetent to answer that question.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked him another one.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will show you the table of contents page and ask you the question again. Do you know when that magazine came off the press; that is, the June issue for 1936?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't know when it came off the press.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is a time stamp and a copyright number on that page, are there not? What is the date stamp there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This stamp on here?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is that a copyright stamp?

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you recognize it as such?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't. I don't think I have ever seen one before. The stamp here, if it is a copyright stamp, is May 8, 1936.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there a copyright number there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is a circle with a C in it, and C-1-B-299322. It is the first time in my life I have ever seen such a mark. Perhaps it is a copyright mark.

Mr. SOURWINE. You edited the magazine for how many years?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I edited the magazine for nearly 7 years.

Mr. SOURWINE. And this is the first time that you have ever seen the symbol, a circle with a C in it, or knew what it meant?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The first time I have ever seen it.

Senator SMITH. May I inquire, is that on other copies also?

Mr. SOURWINE. There is a similar copyright stamp on all other copies that we have been able to find in this volume, sir.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Does it show a considerable variation?

Mr. SOURWINE. There is some variation, Mr. Lattimore. That question had best be answered by giving the facts.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, did you not know that a copy was sent to the Patent Office?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My knowledge of copyright procedure, Senator Ferguson, is extremely vague. All I know about copyright procedure is that I believe anything that is to be copyrighted has to be deposited in the Library of Congress. Isn't that right?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to state this for the record, the issue here, and I show it to the Chair as I speak, of Pacific Affairs for March bears the copyright symbol and number B-289470, and the date February 5, 1936. That is a variation of 3 days from the other one. That is, this is the March issue which was copyrighted February 5.

The June issue, the date which was given, was copyrighted May 8. The September issue bears copyright number B-309436, was copyrighted August 20. And the December issue copyright B-320637, bears the date September 10, 1936.

I might also inform the committee, and if the committee desires testimony or an affidavit on this point it can be secured, a telephone check was made by the staff of the committee with Mr. Clyde S. Edwards, Chief of the Serials Division of the Library of Congress, who furnished this information:

That Pacific Affairs dated June 1936 was stamped May 11, 1936, the date when that piece was received in the Periodicals Division for shelving; that the contents page, May 8, 1936, bears the copyright stamp OCIB-29932, and that is the date when the issue was received in the copyright office for registration, and that number is the copyright registration number.

We are informed by Mr. Edwards over the telephone that the official records of the Library of Congress so show.

If I might point out just one more thing. That means that this magazine was off the press on May 8. It was off the press sufficiently in advance of May 8 to have, by that date, reached the Library of Congress as the official depository for copyright. It was then less than 1 month after the date on which the witness has testified that in Moscow he was stating that this issue was to have in it an article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese council and the British council.

I would now like to ask you once more, Mr. Lattimore, whether you still want to say that that article which you were referring to there was not then in existence and the copy had not then been sent to the printer?

MR. LATTIMORE. I don't believe it could have been, Mr. Sourwine, I have a general but clear recollection that there are a number of cases in my editorial correspondence with various people in which I referred to a future article as a certainty, and then it never came out in the magazine.

MR. SOURWINE. You were not in this conference discussing Asiaticus at all; is that your statement?

MR. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge and recollection, the question of Asiaticus never came up.

MR. SOURWINE. Who is Bywater?

MR. LATTIMORE. Hector Bywater—I am not certain whether he was British or American. He, in the 1930's, was more or less the Hanson Baldwin of his time. He was a writer, especially on naval strategy.

MR. SOURWINE. Was he pro-Communist, anti-Communist, conservative, liberal?

MR. LATTIMORE. I would say conservative.

MR. SOURWINE. Have you looked at the last page of this memorandum which has been shown you?

MR. LATTIMORE. No; I haven't.

THE CHAIRMAN. Have we a photostatic copy?

MR. SOURWINE. What we have here is typed. We can give him the photostatic copy if he prefers.

You have the photostatic copy there if you wish?

MR. LATTIMORE. The last page?

Mr. SOURWINE. The last page. And look at the third paragraph from the end of the page. Will you read that paragraph aloud, please?

Mr. MORRIS. Will you identify Mr. Motiliev, Mr. Lattimore, too?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Motiliev was the head of the Soviet council.

Motiliev made the following proposals as to organization of the magazine: (a) The leading article should always express the opinion of a definite council. It is customary to have the leading article more or less official. (b) Articles by unknown and irresponsible writers should not be published on important questions. But there should be articles by leading personalities who are of interest, no matter what they represent; e. g. Bywater and Asiaticus. (c) There should not be criticism of books and opinions of the leading personalities of the various member countries. It is unnecessary to have such criticism; it is not part of the work of the IPR, and it embarrasses the members of the councils.

Mr. SOURWINE. What magazine was referred to there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He was referring to Pacific Affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was referring to Asiaticus, too; wasn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He also refers to Asiaticus.

Mr. SOURWINE. Having refreshed your memory by reading that paragraph what do you say now about whether Asiaticus was discussed at that conference?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Motiliev may have brought up the subject of Asiaticus.

The CHAIRMAN. Then he was discussed at the conference; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He was discussed by Mr. Motiliev.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say, Mr. Lattimore, whether you identified to these gentlemen who were at the conference the Communist writer to whom you referred, who was to have an article in the Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not identify him as Asiaticus?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my recollection.

Senator FERGUSON. Could I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Could there be any other author in that particular magazine which was the one published after you were in Moscow that could have been the Communist you were talking about?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson, this is referring back to the conversation in 1936—

The CHAIRMAN. Answer that question.

Mr. LATTIMORE (continuing). And my memory is necessarily—

The CHAIRMAN. Look at the magazine and answer the question.

Senator FERGUSON. And if there are any others that would be in a class of being a Communist outside of the one we have been talking about.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not think Senator Ferguson, that this article to which you have referred, the Asiaticus article, or any other article in that issue, could be referred to as Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the question. That is not the question at all. Strike that answer, Mr. Reporter, and read the question to the witness.

(The record was read by the reporter.)

Senator FERGUSON. We were talking about Asiaticus. You say it is not him. Is there any other that it could be?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I amend my answer, then, to say that it is not he or any other.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator FERGUSON. Today, do you believe that Asiaticus was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Today, according to the best of my knowledge, I believe he very likely was. I don't know of my own knowledge.

Senator FERGUSON. You qualify it by "very likely." You would not say he was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not of my personal knowledge; no.

Senator FERGUSON. From anything that you have read?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have read other people's opinions, and my opinion would be second-hand.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, do you remember the context of the page that I showed you of that article? You have it there before you. Will you look at it again and tell me whether there is anyone else on that page whom you now know or believe to have been a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The top name on the list is Harriet Moore, who has refused to answer the question whether she was ever a Communist; and, therefore, it would now be my supposition that she probably was.

Mr. SOURWINE. And were you referring to Harriet Moore in this conference in Moscow when you spoke of a Communist writer who was to have an article in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there any other person on that table of contents listed as an author of an article who is now known to you or believed by you to have been a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is nobody there known to me or believed by me to be a Communist, with the exception of Harriet Moore, and I am perfectly willing to accept Asiaticus as a Communist. But I don't know it of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then is it true, Mr. Lattimore, that, on the basis of what you know or believe now, that article by Asiaticus meets the description which you gave in the Moscow conference of an article which you said was to be in the next issue of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe this Asiaticus article meets the description.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you now believe Asiaticus to be or to have been a Communist, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very likely; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. He did not represent the Soviet council; did he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; he didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. This was a leading article; was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was one of the main articles. Technically, the leading article is the first article in any issue, and I don't think we refer to subsequent articles.

The CHAIRMAN. Get the answer.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In that sense, it was not a leading article. The leading article is always the first one.

The CHAIRMAN. He did not ask you for the sense. Was it or was it not a leading article? It is very easy to answer that question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I am correct, Senator, in saying it was not a leading article.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did it appear in the magazine?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Second space.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much space was devoted to the first-place article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Page 157 to page 165, about eight pages.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much space was devoted to the Asiaticus article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 165 to 177. That would be about 12 pages.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was there any article in the magazine in greater length than the Asiaticus article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What was that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. An article by Guenther Stein, the title of which is "Through the Eyes of a Japanese Newspaper Reader"; and, without looking it up, I believe it is a review of the Japanese press.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that the same Guenther Stein who was associated with the Sorge espionage ring?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not know that he was associated with the Sorge ring.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did this article represent a personal opinion, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Which article?

Mr. SOURWINE. The article by Asiaticus.

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was this article antagonistic to the British council?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The British council criticized it; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you state, however, that it was not antagonistic to the Chinese council; is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is correct; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And it is on that basis that you say that the article, even on the basis that you now know, does not, in your opinion, meet your description here of the article that you thought would be printed in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Partly that, and partly my recollection that in 1936 we were trying to get hold of a Communist Chinese contribution.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to ask this: When Motiliev—

Mr. MORRIS. You say you were trying to get in touch with them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We were trying to get hold of a Chinese Communist article.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated that now on three or four occasions.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1936, that was good editing, in my opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. When Motiliev spoke of Bywater and Asiaticus, did you understand him as using the two names as antithetical, as in any sense being opposite poles of opinion or approach?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not necessarily opposite poles.

Mr. SOURWINE. He said there should be articles by leading personalities who are of interest, no matter what they represent; e. g., Bywater and Asiaticus.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you understand "e. g.," to mean?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Examples of different kinds of opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. But you did not take it that he was using the two names as in any sense antithetical?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Contrasting but not necessarily representing extreme poles.

Mr. SOURWINE. He did not, so far as you understood it, use the name "Asiaticus" in the sense of a Communist writer or a pro-Communist writer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not to my recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the public record at this time pages 16 and 17, from the executive session testimony of E. Newton Steely, 4213 Woodberry Street, University Park, Md., a member of the Board of Appeals and Review, Civil Service Commission, on February 25, 1952.

Mr. SOURWINE. Together with the document there identified?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Sourwine, together with the document identified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in the record?

Mr. MORRIS. It is in our executive session record, Mr. Chairman. We would like it in the open session.

Senator FERGUSON. I move, Mr. Chairman, that it be made part of this open session.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of this open session.

Mr. MORRIS. And the exhibit attached?

The CHAIRMAN. And the exhibits attached.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that?

Mr. MANDEL. Excerpt from the testimony of E. Newton Steely, 4213 Woodberry Street, University Park, Md., a member of the Board of Appeals and Review, Civil Service Commission, on February 25, 1952, before the Senate Internal Security Committee, pages 16 and 17:

Mr. SOURWINE. As now refreshed, can you testify whether you did tell Mr. Owen Lattimore about the Communist record of Dr. Chao-ting Chi?

Mr. STEELY. I think so, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you?

Mr. STEELY. Relying on the statement I made a day or two after the incident allegedly happened, at that time I said I did. I would say that statement is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You brought in the question you made in a day or two after the incident happened. What brought that into the picture?

Mr. STEELY. Looking at the document just handed me.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean the document just handed you is a copy of a statement you made a day and a half or two days after the incident?

Mr. STEELY. Will you repeat that question?

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean that the document just handed you which you just glanced at is a copy of a statement you made a day or two after the incident of the conference with Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. STEELY. Apparently so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this for the record as identified by the witness.

Senator FERGUSON. I wish you would look at this document again before I receive it and look at the statement here in the third paragraph from the bottom on page 1. You may want to look at the other two pages.

I will receive it as Steely Exhibit No. 2.

(Document referred to was received as "Exhibit No. 2" and filed for the record.)

Senator FERGUSON. That indicates that after he looked at it, it was received in evidence.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 1, in the report itself?

Mr. Mandel is reading a paragraph commencing on the bottom of page 1.

Mr. FORTAS. Mr. Chairman, may we see the entire transcript of this, because it has referred to what has gone before—the entire transcript of the record of your executive session? Mr. Sourwine starts “As now refreshed.”

Senator FERGUSON. Let the record show that it is being handed to you.

Mr. FORTAS. Thank you.

Mr. MANDEL. This reads as follows:

Dr. Kung Chuan Chi has been investigated by the Commission for his position as assistant language editor (Chinese), OWI, and his case is now pending before the Commission. In view of the fact that Mr. Lattimore is relying upon Dr. Chi's recommendation regarding Mr. Hong, the OWI representatives were also informed of the unfavorable information secured regarding Dr. Chi and his son, which included testimony to the effect that the young Dr. Chi is or was, until recently, a Communist and that he at one time was a delegate to the Third International in Moscow, and to the effect that the older Dr. Chi was removed from his position as commissioner of education in the Shansi Province because of Communist activities.

Mr. MORRIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

(Exhibit referred to as “Steeley Exhibit No. 2” was marked “Exhibit No. 480,” and “Exhibit No. 480-A,” and are as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 480

SEPTEMBER 2, 1943.

WM. H. McMILLEN:

As requested by you, Mr. Frank Marsh and Admiral McCullough of the Office of War Information were interviewed on August 31, 1943, relative to the case of Chew Sih Hong, Assistant Field Representative in the New York Office of OWI. Mr. Owen Lattimore, Director of Pacific Operations, OWI, who is sponsoring Mr. Hong and upon whose recommendation OWI requested that this case be reopened, was also present during this interview.

Mr. Hong was originally investigated in New York for this position and was rated ineligible by the Commission (see Minute 4 of December 4, 1942). The file also shows that on November 30, 1942, the Commission was informed that Mr. Hong's services were terminated at the close of business November 15, 1942, as a result of information furnished the OWI by the Commission in a letter dated October 26, 1942.

The Commission was subsequently informed under date of July 27, 1943, by Admiral McCullough that the information furnished it by Mr. Elmer Davis, under date of November 30, 1942, regarding the termination of Mr. Hong's services, was somewhat in error as Mr. Hong was separated from the New York Office of OWI for duty with the Army and that upon his return in the Spring of 1943 he was again employed in the New York Office as the New York Office was not advised of the fact that Mr. Hong had been declared ineligible by the Civil Service Commission.

On the basis of Rear Admiral McCullough's letter of July 27, 1943, this case was reopened for the purpose of interviewing Mr. Owen Lattimore of San Francisco and some additional investigation was also made.

During my interview with Mr. Marsh, Mr. Lattimore, and Admiral McCullough, the evidence secured during investigation of Mr. Hong was discussed and they were advised fully regarding the substance of the derogatory information.

As reported by Investigator H. R. Memering, who interviewed Mr. Lattimore in San Francisco, Mr. Lattimore does not know Mr. Hong personally and in recommending him for retention in the Service, he is relying upon Dr. Kung Chuan Chi, Assistant Language Editor (Chinese) in the New York office of OWI. Mr. Lattimore has known Dr. Chi since about 1935 when he met him in Shansi Province in China. Mr. Lattimore is also personally acquainted with Dr. Chi's son, Dr. Chi Chao-Ting. Mr. Lattimore added little to the testimony given Mr. Memering in San Francisco.

Dr. Kung Chuan Chi has been investigated by the Commission for his position as Assistant Language Editor (Chinese), OWI, and his case is now pending before the Commission. In view of the fact that Mr. Lattimore is relying upon

Dr. Chi's recommendation regarding Mr. Hong, the OWI representatives were also informed of the unfavorable information secured regarding Dr. Chi and his son, which included testimony to the effect that the young Dr. Chi is or was, until recently, a Communist and that he at one time was a delegate to the Third Internationale in Moscow and to the effect that the older Dr. Chi was removed from his position as Commissioner of Education in the Shansi Province because of Communist activities.

Mr. Lattimore devoted considerable time to a discussion of factional strife among the Chinese and possible interests on the part of witnesses giving derogatory testimony regarding Mr. Hong. He appeared inclined to explain away all accusations of communism made against Mr. Hong on this basis. He also advanced as a reason for believing the Chinese Hand Laundry Alliance not to be a Communist organization the fact that this organization was composed of small-business men whose interests would be affected adversely under communism. Mr. Lattimore said he could not understand why the story that the elder Dr. Chi was removed from his position as Minister of Education in the Shansi Province because of Communist activities would be circulated. Mr. Lattimore also stated that Dr. Chi was known to Congressman Walter H. Judd of Minnesota and that Congressman Judd, a former missionary, spent some time in Shansi Province during the time Dr. Chi was an official there. It was pointed out to Mr. Lattimore that testimony regarding Dr. Chi's removal was secured by the Commission both in New York and San Francisco. The information received in San Francisco came from a source found to be reliable in the past by the Commission. The informant did not know Dr. Chi personally but had to inquire about him to secure this information. That this latter source should be biased against Dr. Chi in making this statement appears to be unlikely.

After a lengthy discussion of the various angles in the case, such as the intricacies of Chinese politics, possible motives witnesses testifying might have, and so forth, as well as the derogatory testimony itself, Mr. Lattimore, Mr. Marsh, and Admiral McCullough were asked whether, in view of the information in the case, they felt that Mr. Hong should be retained. Their statements were substantially as follows:

Mr. Lattimore stated that wished to keep Mr. Hong on the job, that he had an efficient set-up in the Chinese Section in New York and wanted to keep it that way, that he has explicit confidence in Dr. Chi, that Mr. Hong is under careful supervision and even if he were a Communist that he is not in a position where he could do any damage, that the selection of suitable Chinese was a delicate matter and it is extremely difficult to obtain a competent employee who does not have connections which might constitute leaks in the organization, that under the present set-up with Dr. Chi and Mr. Hong there had been no instances of confidential information getting into unauthorized channels and that there had been no attempts on Mr. Hong's part to use his present position for the spreading of Communist propaganda, and so forth. Mr. Lattimore also pointed out that Mr. Hong was recently used by the Army to teach Chinese to 224 officers in India. Mr. Hong was highly praised for this work in a letter from Col. Gilchrist of the United States Army.

The substance of Mr. Lattimore's statements was to the effect that he wants to retain Mr. Hong and is still relying upon Dr. Chi's recommendation and knowledge of Mr. Hong, all evidence to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Marsh stated that he recognizes the intricacies of Chinese politics and he feels that if Mr. Lattimore still wants to employ Mr. Hong, knowing the nature of the testimony against him, the risk involved, etc., he would recommend that Mr. Lattimore be permitted to retain Mr. Hong as an employee of OWI in his present position.

Admiral McCullough said that if Mr. Hong was to be removed on the basis of the evidence that he had heard in the case that he felt that others higher up in the organization should also go, that others had been retained against whom the evidence was more damaging than it was against Mr. Hong, that he would go along with Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Marsh in favor of Mr. Hong's retention in the Service.

In view of the fact that Mr. Lattimore is placing so much reliance upon Dr. Chi, whose case is also pending before the Commission at the present time, it is suggested that Dr. Chi's investigation be considered in connection with the Hong case.

Mr. Lattimore was asked whether there was anything about Mr. Hong's services which could not be performed by other Chinese Translators and he said "No" but that he wished to keep his present organization in view of the fact that it was functioning efficiently.

In view of the testimony obtained during the subsequent investigation of Mr. Hong in San Francisco and the evidence secured in the investigation of Dr. Chi regarding Communist activities on the part of him and his son, I can see no reason why the Commission should disturb its previous rating of ineligibility in Mr. Hong's case.

E. NEWTON STEELY.

(Exhibit 480-A is testimony from the E. Newton Steely executive session before this committee and was requested to be inserted by Mr. Fortas, counsel to Mr. Lattimore, and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 480-A

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF E. NEWTON STEELY ON FEBRUARY 25, 1953, VOLUME 185

* * * * *
Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember having a discussion with Owen Lattimore in 1943?

Mr. STEELY. Yes; I recall the discussion.

Mr. MORRIS. During that discussion with Mr. Lattimore did you inform Mr. Lattimore about the Communist record of a man named Dr. Chao-ting Chi?

Mr. STEELY. I am sorry, that comes directly under that area.

Mr. MORRIS. Chi was not a Government employee, was he?

Mr. STEELY. Chi at that time was at the head of some section of OWI.

Mr. MORRIS. You are not thinking of Mr. K. P. Chi, are you?

Mr. STEELY. No. I was thinking of the Dr. Chi who was sponsoring Hong.

Mr. MORRIS. We are not asking about that Mr. K. P. Chi. Dr. K. P. Chi, as you say was a man who was sponsoring a man who was then under investigation for loyalty. We are not going to ask you about that man.

Mr. STEELY. I wonder if you would mind giving me his full name?

Mr. MORRIS. Kung Chuan Chi is the man you referred to.

Mr. STEELY. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. We are not asking you any questions about that particular man. That is K-u-n-g C-h-u-a-n C-h-i. We are not going to ask you any questions about that Mr. Chi.

Mr. SOURWINE. He is the man who is the Government employee; is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are talking about another Chi, Dr. Chao-ting Chi, C-h-a-o hyphen t-i-n-g C-h-i.

Mr. STEELY. As far as I can recall I never heard of that Chi. This Dr. Kung Chuan Chi I understand from the report had a son. What his name was—

Mr. MORRIS. Chao-ting Chi.

Mr. STEELY. I do not know whether he was an employee or not.

Mr. MORRIS. I am telling you he was not. We want to ask you about the conversation that you had with Mr. Lattimore with respect to the younger Dr. Chi who was not a Government employee at the time.

* * * * *
Mr. SOURWINE. You volunteered the information here that you had an interview with Mr. Lattimore, did you not?

Mr. STEELY. Yes. I mentioned that in connection with my statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us where it was?

Mr. STEELY. Yes. That was in the office of Admiral McCullough who at that time was the Security Officer for OWI. I believe it was in the Social Security Building.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are not asking for records or files. We are asking you this time only whether on the occasion of the conference with Mr. Owen Lattimore which you testified about, you did have with him, you told him about the Communist record of Dr. Chao-ting Chi.

Mr. STEELY. That is the one?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. STEELY. Gentlemen, I cannot recall the details of that conversation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you tell the committee the answer to that question if you are able to refresh your memory with regard to it?

Mr. STEELY. I might say to you my only connection with this case was about a one-hour interview. I had nothing to do with the rating of the case or the previous investigation of the case. That is one hour that was spent approximately eight and one-half years ago.

Mr. STEELY. My statement was to the best of my recollection I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your recollection is good on that?

Mr. STEELY. No, not particularly good. I have handled hundreds of cases since then.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any doubt in your mind you did so inform him?

Mr. STEELY. I have no doubt as far as Kung Chuan Chi is concerned, but I am not sure about the other Chi he is asking about. To the best of my recollection I did, but I can't be sure.

Senator FERGUSON. You knew there was a father and son?

Mr. STEELY. Yes, from reading the file?

Mr. SOURWINE. If your recollection could be refreshed so that you were sure in your own mind what you had done, would you then testify to this committee as to what you had done in that regard?

Mr. STEELY. As to whether I informed him?

Mr. SOURWINE. As to whether you informed Lattimore of the Communist record of Chao-ting Chi, the younger Chi. You have said to the best of your recollection you did. If your recollection should be refreshed so that you were sure you did, would you so testify?

Mr. STEELY. I think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Morris, do you have a document there? I do not want to have you identify this document. I want to hand it to the witness and ask him if this refreshes his recollection in that regard.

Mr. SOURWINE. I might say in justice to this witness, Mr. Chairman, this document was not obtained from this witness and I am quite sure this witness did not know it was in the possession of the committee up until the time it was handed to him.

Mr. STEELY. I have no knowledge of it being in your possession.

Senator FERGUSON. Is there any doubt about the fact this was your statement?

Mr. STEELY. It apparently is a photostatic print of a memorandum. I couldn't tell you whether it is an exact copy unless I checked with my word. I can't identify this as being an exact copy. It is addressed to Mr. McMillen and it is not signed. This has written "E. Newton Steely" which is my name.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recognize any of the pencil writings on there?

Mr. STEELY. No, sir. You mean these?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, the various marks.

Mr. STEELY. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Does it not refresh your memory?

Mr. STEELY. It refreshes my memory in this way; it is quite similar, if not an exact copy, of a statement that I made shortly after my interview with Mr. Lattimore. I can't say that is definitely it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does it truly recite what is does say with regard to that interview?

Mr. STEELY. I can't answer the question without checking with the original.

Mr. SOURWINE. No, the question of a true recital would have nothing to do with the original of this memorandum.

Mr. STEELY. My independent recollection of that interview is not sufficient to enable me to say that is a true recital.

Mr. SOURWINE. Except with regard to the original question as to whether you did inform Mr. Lattimore of the Communist record of Chao-ting Chi; is that correct?

Mr. STEELY. That statement is correct, I think, and it is based upon the part of which you call my attention which apparently is my statement. I don't say it isn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your independent recollection as now refreshed is that you did tell Mr. Lattimore about the Communist record of Chao-ting Chi; is that correct?

Mr. STEELY. No. I have a recollection that is independent of that statement in there as to whether I went in there with the son or not. I think I did.

Senator FERGUSON. You certainly would not the next day make a statement you did, would you?

Mr. STEELY. I would not. If that is a correct copy of the report that I made, I did. Anything that I said in that report which was made at a time that it was fresh in my mind and following an interview on which I had taken notes would be correct.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you any doubt as to the correctness of that?

Mr. STEELY. No; I do not have any—my position is this: Looking at it, I think it is a copy of the statement I made. But as to whether it is a true recital or an exact copy, I can't say.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is a photostat?

Mr. STEELY. Apparently.

Senator FERGUSON. Would this refresh your memory? The third paragraph from the last:

"During my interview with Mr. Marsh, Mr. Lattimore, and Admiral McCullough, the evidence secured during investigation of Mr. Hong was discussed and they were advised fully regarding the substance of the derogatory information."

Mr. STEELY. That no more than the other.

Senator FERGUSON. Does that not lead you to believe this is a copy?

Mr. STEELY. As far as my belief is concerned, yes. As to my testimony that it is, that is something else.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you about the young Chi who was not a Government employee. I am asking you whether you had information about him, testimony to the effect that in 1943 he was or has been until recently a Communist and that he at one time was a delegate to the Third Internationale in Moscow?

Mr. STEELY. All information that I had at that time was gotten out of the report of investigation. If I informed Mr. Lattimore to that effect, I had that information and he was told about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Conversely, if you had it, did you inform him about it?

Mr. STEELY. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. This statement says that you did inform him about it, doesn't it?

Mr. STEELY. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you think you did?

Mr. STEELY. I think so, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Does that refresh your memory? We are not talking about anybody that had a job with the Government.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever know that this younger man, the son, had attended the Third Internationale in Moscow?

Mr. STEELY. Did I know it?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, from any documents or anything else?

Mr. STEELY. Basing my reply upon this document, I must have read that somewhere in the file; otherwise, I never heard of him before.

Senator FERGUSON. So you have every reason to believe that did come to your knowledge?

Mr. STEELY. I must have if that is a correct copy of the report of the interviews.

Mr. SOURWINE. I don't mean to put you on the spot. All we can ask is your understanding.

Mr. STEELY. I must say you do a good job unintentionally, if I may say so.

I would interpret this to mean information that was obtained as a result of investigation by the FBI or the other investigative agencies of the Government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Steely, do you recall whether or not you told Mr. Lattimore that the New China Daily News was a Communist publication?

Mr. STEELY. No, sir; I don't.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever know whether it was a Communist publication?

Mr. STEELY. I never heard of the paper except when I read the file before I went down to see Mr. Lattimore. Whatever the file said about it is all I knew about the China Daily News.

Senator FERGUSON. Did it say that?

Mr. STEELY. I don't recall.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you look at the file before you came up here?

Mr. STEELY. Hurriedly.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you find that in it?

Mr. STEELY. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you say it wasn't in it?

Mr. STEELY. No, sir. I probably had just a few minutes to look at that file. It took me all morning to try to get it, as a matter of fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be forgiven, my attention was momentarily diverted, and I missed the connection with the file the witness was talking about. What file are you talking about?

Senator FERGUSON. About the file in the record of the Civil Service Commission. It is about a newspaper.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is why I am uncertain. Are you talking about a file regarding this newspaper you were just asked about, or some other file?

Mr. STEELY. As I understood the Senator's question as to whether I knew the new China Daily was a Communist paper, my answer was I had never heard of the paper except what information I may have gotten from seeing the Commission's file.

Mr. SOURWINE. What file are you talking about, a file on this paper?

Mr. STEELY. The file pertaining to the investigation of Kung Chaun Chi and this other man, Hong.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are testifying here you could have acquired information about the North China Daily News in no other way than in connection with that particular investigation?

Mr. STEELY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How could you be sure of that?

Mr. STEELY. I never heard of the paper otherwise.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you hear of it in that connection?

Mr. STEELY. If I ever heard of the paper, if that is the name, it must have been where I got the information.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why must it have been there? Did you ever investigate another matter involving another Chinese?

Mr. STEELY. I didn't investigate this case. I went down to make an interview.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is a very interesting statement. As I understand it, you have now testified you do not remember ever having any knowledge about the North China Daily News.

Mr. STEELY. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you ever did have such knowledge, you got in in connection with a specified case. That is the testimony which is unusual.

Mr. STEELY. I do not see your point there. As I said a moment ago, I never heard of the North China Daily News or the China Daily News, whichever is the correct name.

Senator FERGUSON. New China Daily News.

Mr. STEELY. If it is referred to in that memorandum, all the information I got pertaining to those two cases or anything mentioned in there before going down to Lattimore was gotten from the Commission's file.

Mr. SOURWINE. All the testimony about these two cases was gotten from the Commission's files, but we are asking now about a particular newspaper. You have testified you have forgotten when you ever knew anything about it.

Mr. STEELY. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you did know something about it, shouldn't it be obvious you could have learned that in connection with anything you have now forgotten?

Mr. STEELY. You wouldn't learn it looking at the television or you wouldn't learn it from reading books. You have to get it out of some—

Mr. SOURWINE. Your testimony would be credible if you said, and perhaps you did, that if you ever knew anything about that paper, it was information you got from the Commission's file.

Mr. STEELY. I thought that is what I said.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understood it was information you got from these particular files and that is different.

Mr. STEELY. This is the only Chinese case I ever had anything to do with.

Mr. SOURWINE. Even admitting the probability, if you did get it, it was in connection with this case, actually if you do not remember now anything about the paper, you can't say whether you ever did, or if you ever did, where you learned it, can you?

Mr. STEELY. I still think if I ever did hear of it, it must have been from this.

Mr. MORRIS. You said just before you came down here you had a quick look at a particular file. Did you see that particular paper we have shown you in that file?

Mr. STEELY. I saw one comparable to that. I don't know whether it is an exact copy or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were looking for that?

Mr. STEELY. Certainly.

Senator FERGUSON. To refresh your memory?

Mr. STEELY. That was the one thing I had to do with the case.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you read a statement in that one by Dr. Chi, young Dr. Chi?

Mr. STEELY. I think so. I think the statement shown me here—there were about three pages of that. I had just a few minutes to glance at it. I couldn't tell you all that is in there now.

Mr. MORRIS. It was substantially the same statement you read earlier today?

Mr. STEELY. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. You read over this paper down in your files?

Mr. STEELY. I glanced at it. I didn't have time to read it carefully.

Senator FERGUSON. Having read over this down in the office, this one paragraph you have been shown, do you not remember so that you can say without doubt that this is a copy of that document?

Mr. STEELY. I have stated, Senator, that I think it is. When you say without doubt, you have to compare each statement contained therein. I think it is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say it either is a copy of the same document or it is a clever simulation of it?

Mr. STEELY. I have said I think it is.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no further questions.

Senator FERGUSON. I do not want any doubt about whether this is a genuine document. You did not give it to us.

Mr. STEELY. I think that is an exact copy but I can't swear it is. I can swear I think it is.

Senator FERGUSON. You haven't any reason to doubt that it is?

Mr. STEELY. No.

Senator FERGUSON. That is all.

There is another document there that should be in evidence.

Mr. STEELY. This is a copy of the subpoena.

Senator FERGUSON. We want that other paper that you read.

Mr. STEELY. Yes; this is here.

Senator FERGUSON. That will be exhibit No. 3.

(Document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 3" and filed for the record.)

(Thereupon, the committee was recessed at 4:30 p. m. subject to the call of the Chair.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to introduce or refer to the record at this time, refer in the record at this time, the open session testimony of Mr. Karl August Wittfogel, pages 288, reading as follows:

Mr. MORRIS. Dr. Wittfogel, did you tell Mr. Lattimore about your experience with Dr. Chi in Germany in 1929?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. We talked a great deal about Dr. Chi—Mr. Chi, I mean.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you amplify that conversation you had with Owen Lattimore about your previous experience with the then Mr. Chi?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. You see, there wasn't only one conversation. There were many. We had a lot of time. We traveled for days and sometimes we stayed for a half day or a day in a Chinese inn. Mr. Lattimore was very much interested in Chi as quite a brilliant man. He was just writing the thesis I have referred to, Key Economic Areas in Chinese History.

Since I had met Chi, too, we discussed the things which, from my point of view, were Chi's interest in my ideas which he later on dropped without much major difficulty, so I don't know. I had practically a vested interest in Chi as a man who took up some of my ideas and Lattimore was interested in him. So naturally I told him about the circumstances I met him under, and that Chi had worked in the Comintern and came back at that time via Germany to America and that he was going on doing this political work.

Mr. MORRIS. You did tell him both of your encounter with the then Mr. Chi in Germany as well as your encounter with Jaffe and Bisson in 1934?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. I sure did.

Mr. MORRIS. Was there any episode that took place that would corroborate your recollection of the fact that you had these conversations with Mr. Lattimore? Did you visit anybody connected with Chi?

Dr. WITTFOGEL. That is right. Professor Chi, who I think has come up in one of those epic features of the Lattimore story, namely, this letter he wrote to Mr. Barnes about Mr. Chi, where he mentions the father and the son Chi. There he refers to exactly this old Professor Chi who had a high position at the university. I think he was commissioner of education at that time of the Province of Shansi, and he had been head of the law school.

We were kind of interested in how this Papa Chi would take his son's Communist adventures, and naturally we approached the matter subtly. You know that a Chinese is a very dignified man and well restrained. Like other fathers, you could see the papa was not too happy with the way his son developed, but he accepted it as the fact. He loved him nevertheless.

And then on page 301, we have, still in Dr. Wittfogel's testimony :

Point 2: When you asked me about whether Lattimore knew that in these early days I was a Communist—he has later written me a letter in which he told me that he hasn't been aware of this—we do not have to refer to the nonexistent television set. As I said, all our talks about Chi the son and Chi the father made sense only in connection with the background of the Chis' story when it was perfectly clear that we were dealing with a man who had this Communist background, and my relations were in the same set.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before you go into point 2, Doctor, at one point in line with your previous testimony that you and Mr. Lattimore had gone to see the elder Chi, partially at least for the purpose of finding out how he reacted to his son's Communist escapades—

Dr. WITTFOGEL. Not quite. We were in the town where he lived and we thought of looking him up.

There is other testimony in that that is already in the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FORTAS. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the transcript of this executive session, which I have just been looking through hastily, contains a good deal of additional material which, in my opinion, affects the probative value of the excerpts that have been put in the record, and also contained some material that is irrelevant, really, to the issues here. It seems to me that counsel might want to consider putting in some more of this executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for counsel. We will see about that.

Mr. MORRIS. We will come to a decision on that, Mr. Fortas.

Mr. FORTAS. May I at sometime take this up with you, and tell you what I noted?

Senator FERGUSON. The other questions and answers that you want in, will you mark those?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes, if I may keep this until we get a few moments.

Mr. MORRIS. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have introduced into the record, from the article Pacific Affairs, June 1936, to which reference has been made—

The CHAIRMAN. What year?

Mr. MORRIS. June 1936. I would like to introduce the whole page of contents, together with page 155, which is a short sketch of the contributors in the current issue.

It mentions here, under the second article :

"Asiaticus" is the well-established pen name of a German writer who was formerly, under this name, the correspondent in China of Die Weltbühne, and other German left-wing papers. He published, under the same name, a book called Von Kanton Bis Shanghai, 1926-27, which in 1929 was published in a Japanese translation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt Mr. Morris' statement, to place something else in the record at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. We are placing that in the record? You asked that that be inserted into the record?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(Material referred to was marked Exhibit No. 481 and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 481

PACIFIC AFFAIRS

[Vol. IX, No. 2—June 1936]

	Page
Years of Fulfillment—Harriet Moore-----	157
The Financial Cutting Edge in the Partition of China—"Asiaticus"-----	165
Through the Eyes of a Japanese Newspaper Reader—Guenther Stein-----	177
Twin Loyalties in Siam—Lin Yu-----	191
The Rise of Land Tax and the Fall of Dynasties in Chinese History—Wang Yu-Ch'uan-----	201
Makers of Public Opinion About the Far East—H. J. Timperley-----	221
The Settlement of the Australian Tropics—W. Wynne Williams-----	231
The Rice Export From Burma, Siam, and French Indo-China—C. J. Robertson-----	243
Pacific Affairs bibliographies: No. II: Native Customary law in the Netherlands East Indies—A. Arthur Schiller-----	254
Book reviews. See also next page-----	264

Editor: Owen Lattimore—Managing Editor: Catherine Porter

Associate Editors: W. L. Holland and Bruno Lasker. Editorial Correspondents: P. D. Phillips, Melbourne; Arnold J. Toynbee, London; G. deT. Glazebrook, Toronto; D. K. Lieu, Shanghai; Roger Levy, Paris; Tomohiko Ushiba, Tokyo; J. H. Boeke, Leyden; Guy H. Scholefield, Wellington; Conrado Benitez, Manila; Frederick V. Field, New York.

Pacific Affairs is published quarterly at Federal and Nineteenth Streets, Camden, N. J., by the Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, U. S. A.; E. C. Carter, secretary-general. Executive and editorial offices, 129 East Fifty-second Street, New York; Hilda Austern, business manager. Printed at Federal and Nineteenth Streets, Camden, N. J., U. S. A. Subscription price \$2 per year, post free; single copies 50 cents. Entered as second-class matter at the Camden Post Office at Camden, N. J., under the act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1936.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS ISSUE

	Page
Australia and the Far East, edited by I. Clunies Ross—H. J. Himjerley-----	264
Australia in the World Depression, by E. Ronald Walker—Linden A. Mander-----	267
Canada: An American Nation, by John W. Daffoe—A. Gordon Dewey-----	269
My Country and My People, by Lin Yatang; and T'ien Hsia Monthly—Charlottee Tyler-----	271
Sun Yat-sen: His Life and Its Meaning, by Lyon Sharman—Paschal M. D'Elia-----	276
Japan's Place in the Modern World, by E. H. Pickering—M. Matsuo-----	278
Japan's Policies and Purposes, by H. Saito—Jerome D. Greene-----	281
The Social and Economic History of Japan, by Eijiro Honjo—Hugh Borton-----	284
The Manchu Abdication and the Powers, by John Gilbert Reid—R. T. Pollard-----	287
Special Correspondent With Bandit and General in Manchuria, by A. R. Lindt—O. M. Green-----	289
Organized Labor in Mexico, by Marjorie R. Clark—Harry Conover-----	290
New Zealand, by W. P. Merrell—J. B. Condliffe-----	292
Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb—Kathleen Barnes-----	294
The Soviet State, by B. W. Maxwell—Ryuichi Kajii-----	296
Soviet Russia Fights Crime, by Lenka von Koeber—Margaret Miller-----	299
The United States in World Affairs in 1934-35, by Whitney H. Shepardson and William O. Scroggs; and Survey of International Affairs, 1934, by Arnold J. Toynbee and V. M. Boulter—A. Whitney Griswold-----	301
America's Foreign Relations, by Louis M. Sears—Edgar McInnis-----	303
Commodity Control in the Pacific Area, edited by W. L. Holland—H. Belshaw-----	304
Migration and Planes of Living, 1920-34, by Carter Goodrich, B. W. Allin and Marion Hayes—Bruno Lasker-----	309
Road to War, by Walter Millis; A Better Economic Order, by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan; and The Need for Constitutional Reform, by William Y. Elliott—D. W. Brogan-----	311
Eastern Industrialization and Its Effect On the West, by G. E. Hubbard, assisted by Danzil Baring—E. F. Penrose-----	314
Trade and Trade Barriers in the Pacific, by Philip G. Wright—C. F. Remer-----	317
Neutrality: Its History, Economics, and Law. Vol. I, by Jessup and Deak; Vol. II, by Phillips and Reede; Vol. III, by Turlington; Vol. IV, by Jessup; and Can We Be Neutral?, by Dulles and Armstrong—Lawrence Preuss-----	321

Books reviewed may be purchased through this office, and will be mailed, post free, at the publisher's list price. Orders should be sent to Pacific Affairs, 129 East 52d Street, New York City.

HARRIET MOORE—is a Research Associate of the Institute of Pacific Relations, who has spent several periods of study in the U. S. S. R. during recent years.

"ASIATICUS"—is the well-established pen name of a German writer who was formerly, under this name, the correspondent in China of *Die Weltbühne* and other German left-wing papers. He published, under the same name, a book called *Von Kanton Big Shanghai, 1926-27*, which in 1929 was published in a Japanese translation.

GUENTHER STEIN—formerly correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, is now correspondent for several English newspapers in Tokyo. He is the author of *Made in Japan* (London, 1935).

LIN YU—an Associate Editor of the *China Critic*, of Shanghai, has lived in Siam. He edits the Oversea Chinese column of the *China Critic* and is an occasional contributor to the Chinese press.

WANG YU-CHUAN—is an undergraduate of the National Peking University at Peiping. He has contributed to the leading Chinese economic journals, and the material on the present article is appearing also, in the Chinese, in *Shih Huo* (Food and Commodities).

H. J. TIMPERLEY—is an Australian journalist of many years' experience in the Far East, who is now correspondent in China for the *Manchester Guardian*, and advisory editor of *Asia*.

W. WYNNE WILLIAMS—is a member of the Australian Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

C. J. ROBERTSON—is attached to the *Institut International d'Agriculture of Rome*. He is the author of *World Production and Consumption of Sugar* (London, 1934).

A. ARTHUR SCULLER—is Assistant Professor of Law at Columbia University.

AMONG THE REVIEWERS ARE—

LINDEN A. MANDER—Associate Professor of Comparative and International Government, University of Washington. **A. GORDON DEWEY**—Chairman, Dept. of Government and Sociology, Brooklyn College. **CHARLOTTE TYLER**—a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations secretariat, specializing in Basic English. **PASCHAL M. D'ELIA, S. I.**—now Professor of Missiology at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, has spent 16 years in China; is the author of *The Triple Demism of Sun Yat-sen*. **M. MATSUO**—with the South Manchuria Railway Company, New York. **JEROME D. GREENE**—Secretary of the Harvard Corporation. **HUGH BORTON**—a graduate student at Tokyo Imperial University. **R. T. POLLARD**—Dept. of Oriental Studies, University of Washington. **O. M. GREEN**—for many years editor of *North China Daily News*, Shanghai. **HARRY CONOVER**—an associate editor of *Pacific Weekly* and a teaching assistant in economics at the University of California. **J. B. CONDLIFFE**—a member of the Economic and Financial Section of the League of Nations. **KATHLEEN BARNES**—a member of the staff of the Institute of Pacific Relations, working in Soviet research. **RYUICHI KAJI**—a staff member of the *Asahi Institute of the Far East*, Tokyo. **MARGARET MILLER**—until recently Lecturer in Commerce at the University of Liverpool, and attached to its research staff;* **A. W. GRISWOLD**—Instructor of History and research assistant in the Institute of International Studies, Yale University. **EDGAR M. INNIS**—Associate Professor of History, University of Toronto. **H. BELSHAW**—Professor of Economics, Auckland University College, New Zealand, and editor of *Agricultural Organization in New Zealand*. **BRUNO LASKER**—Associate Editor of *Pacific Affairs*. **D. W. BROGAN**—Fellow and Tutor of *Corpus Christi College*, Oxford. **E. F. PENROSE**—of the Food Research Institute; author of *Population Theories and Their Application*. **C. F. REMER**—Professor of Economics, University of Michigan; author of *Foreign Investments in China*. **LAWRENCE PREUSS**—Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan.

Opinions expressed in *Pacific Affairs* are the individual opinions of the contributors or reviewers. Neither the governing body (the Pacific Council) nor any of the constituent bodies (the National Councils) of the Institute of Pacific Relations holds itself responsible for such statements of opinion.

The Editors cannot undertake to return unsolicited manuscripts unless accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes or International Reply Coupons.

*Has frequently visited the Soviet Union.

Mr. SOURWINE. Discussion was had earlier today about the publication *China Today*. I hold in my hand the 1939 issue of that magazine. I would like to ask that the masthead and table of contents be inserted in the record at this point.

The masthead indicates the editorial board consists of T. A. Bisson, Philip J. Jaffe, Maxwell S. Stewart, and Robert Norton; that the managing editor was Max Granich; the business manager Dorothea Tooker; contributing editors Theodore Draper, Miss Haru Matsui, Michael Rothman, Harold Ward, Gen. Victor A. Yakhontoff.

The table of contents shows articles by Ting Ling, T. A. Bisson, Ma Hai-teh, James Bertram, Julius Loeb, E. Guy Talbott, Dr. M. S. Bates and Esther Carroll, in addition to the features which are also shown in that table of contents. May that be admitted?

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the editor?

Mr. SOURWINE. The editor was Max Granich.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the tie-in?

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore was questioned this morning with regard to his knowledge of this publication, and a letter was inserted, his declination to serve on the editorial board.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(Material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 482," and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 482

CHINA TODAY

Editorial board: T. A. Bisson, Philip J. Jaffe, Maxwell S. Stewart, Robert Norton

Managing editor: Max Granich

Business manager: Dorothea Tooker

Contributing editors:

Theodore Draper

Miss Haru Matsui

Michael Rothman

Harold Ward

Gen. Victor A. Yakhontoff

Julius Loeb, cartographer

Vol. 5, No. 5—February 1939

With the Editors	2
Our Children, by Ting Ling	4
China Greet the New Year, by T. A. Bisson	5
Where Nippon Sits On a Volcano, by Ma Hai-teh	7
May Day In Tokyo, by James Bertram	8
Two Fathers of Their Countries, by Julius Loeb	10
What Will Congress Do? by E. Guy Talbott	12
Poison For Profit, by Dr. M. S. Bates	13
Flashes From China, edited by Grace Granich	16
Slipping Past Japan's Censor, edited by Manville Rodgers	17
Books, Films	18
America in Action, by Esther Carroll	19

Published monthly at 168 West Twenty-third Street, New York, N. Y., by American Friends of the Chinese People. Single copy 10 cents. Yearly subscription \$1. For foreign countries except Canada add 50 cents. Entered as second class matter, October 24, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to ask one question which would be irrelevant elsewhere, and may even be irrelevant here.

Do you know the author Ting Ling, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I met him in Yenan, in 1937.

Mr. SOURWINE. Ting Ling is a pseudonym?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a pseudonym, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the name of the author that writes under that pseudonym?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know it at the time you met her?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't think I did. I don't think I ever knew it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. I have two more things on this same issue, Senator.

This is in connection with the book we referred to From Canton to Shanghai, published by Agis Verlag. On page 53 of this book appears a statement in German, and reference is made to "the Communist Party, the sole leader of the national and social revolution."

Mr. Fortas, you may want to amplify, you may want to select other excerpts from the book to go into the record. But we would like to have this, together with what you want to add, inserted into the record by way of characterizing that particular book.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the connection?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with Asiaticus, the Asiaticus article we referred to, there is an item here giving a short sketch of the author Asiaticus. This is at a time when Mr. Lattimore was the editor of the publication.

It mentions in here that he is the author of this particular book, which we have questioned Mr. Lattimore about, and this is an excerpt from that book which indicates that the writer believed that the Communist Party is the leader of the national and social revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to insert this into the record?

Senator FERGUSON. That is the book that Mr. Lattimore never heard about.

Mr. MORRIS. According to his testimony.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. And it is in here as a note.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The note referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 483" and was read in full by counsel.)

Mr. SOURWINE. That is the question I intended to ask, whether Mr. Lattimore ever read this book either in the German original or in the Japanese translation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I never.

Mr. MORRIS. The articles by Asiaticus in Imprecorr have already been introduced in the record. May they be referred to in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. They may be referred.

(See pp. 47-50, pt. 1, for reference to Imprecorr.)

We shall recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. FORTAS. I have read this transcript and I have marked in the portions that I should like to have be inserted in the record and which I think are necessary in order to set the other excerpt in its correct context.

Mr. MORRIS. That will be done, Mr. Fortas.

(See exhibit No. 480A, p. 3161.)

Mr. SOURWINE. I wonder if I might make a short statement at this time. Might the record show that the document which was offered this morning was offered particularly as a document which had been accepted in the executive record, and the reason for the shortness of the excerpt was that we were attempting only to establish that fact, and then consideration be given to the consideration of counsel with regard to the addition of the other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. You may proceed, Mr. Sourwine, or whoever is going to proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to a point that was made this morning. We were discussing the minutes of April 8, 1936. I think I would like—

The CHAIRMAN. Taken where?

Mr. MORRIS. Minutes of a meeting in Moscow, at which were present several Soviet officials and representatives of the American IPR and the Pacific Council of the IPR. We had a lengthy discussion on it. I think inasmuch as the subject treated in the April 12 minutes is very much the same, I would like that introduced into the record at this time instead of later on as we had planned, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, you may bring it forward.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, headed, "Meeting, April 12, Motiliev, Voitinsky, ECC, O. L., H. M., Harondar."

Mr. MORRIS. And what is that, Mr. Mandel? What is that document?

Mr. MANDEL. That is a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a photostat of a document.

Mr. MANDEL. Photostat of a document.

The CHAIRMAN. Of a document found in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, can you recall attending a meeting in Moscow on April 12, 1936, at which the people named in that document were present?

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE—Resumed

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall it, but I assume that there was such a meeting and that I was there.

The CHAIRMAN. In the initials in there that were read, the "O. L." was you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That would be myself.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give Mr. Lattimore one of these stenciled copies so we can make reference to the same document and it will be a lot clearer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a stencil—

Mr. MORRIS. That is a stencil of that document and I think we can make the same references.

I would like to call your attention to page 2, and would you go down to the eleventh line, the sentence beginning "O. L." in the eleventh line.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I read through the document as a whole first?

Mr. MORRIS. It will take quite some time. It is a long article, Mr.

Chairman. I would like to direct the witness' attention to that one particular paragraph first, and then we can discuss the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't see any reason why he can't testify as to that and then read it through.

Mr. MORRIS. Just read that one paragraph, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Beginning "O. L."?

Mr. MORRIS. Beginning with "O. L." in the eleventh line.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

O. L. said that that would make it possible to have two Soviet articles in one issue.

Mr. MORRIS. May that go into the record now, Mr. Chairman?

Senator FERGUSON. The document?

Mr. MORRIS. The document.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It is authenticated. You mean the photostatic copy.

Senator FERGUSON. I think this record ought to show that the director of research, when he put these articles in, has been sworn, and they are really going in under that auspices.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mandel has been sworn.

Senator FERGUSON. That is what I mean, but I think the record ought to show that.

The CHAIRMAN. It may show it again, of course, by all means. Did you want him sworn again?

Senator FERGUSON. No. I think when an exhibit goes in like this the record ought to show.

The CHAIRMAN. That it goes in under the auspices of the research director.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 485" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 485

MEETING: APRIL 12, MOTILIEV, VOITINSKY, E. C. C., O. L., H. M., HARONDAR

I. E. C. C. explained that the discussions at the Round Tables at the conference were not simply questions and answers by the representatives from the countries whose economy was being studied. The questions in the preliminary agenda attempt to anticipate all the subjects which may be brought up for discussion. Moreover the round tables do not follow the agenda completely. The agenda is just used as a general guide.

Motiliev asked how the members of the conference were divided between the round tables. E. C. C. said that each round table had members from each country and from each profession, if possible.

Voitinsky said that in Whyte's article there was a proposal that the conference should reach some conclusions and make some proposals, i. e. in respect to China's currency problem and Japan's problem of raw materials. These are economic questions, but they have great political importance. How will these proposals be worked out at the conference? E. C. C. said that the opinion expressed in that article was Whyte's personal opinion, and, while he was an influential member of Chatham House, the article had not been seen by the Chatham House staff and did not represent an official opinion of Chatham House. However, Whyte's proposal reflected the general Chatham House interest in whether or not the British Government was serious about Hoare's suggestion in re raw materials. E. C. C. said that he thought the government would end up perhaps by granting a loan to Japan to help finance purchases of raw materials. E. C. C. said that all such proposals would be considered by the Pacific Council and the Research Committee before the conference and some tentative conclusions would be reached. These in turn would be modified by the results of the conference itself.

II. E. C. C. explained that the Soviet Council should have a representative at each of the committee meetings scheduled to be held before the conference opens.

III. E. C. C. asked if the Soviet members of the Council would be willing to speak to small groups in various American cities. Motiliev said that this could probably be arranged and it would be better to plan for this after the conference, rather than before.

IV. O. L. said that he would like to meet the Soviet suggestions as far as possible, in re having a more definite line expressed in PA. He has not been able to do this before, because he has not had close cooperation from the various Councils. He said that if the Soviet group would start on such a line, he would be able to make the others cooperate more fully. Voitinsky said that the main trouble was that the articles in PA did not come out against the aggressor, and the aggressor was not analyzed from within, therefore there were no indications of the internal weakness of the aggressor.

O. L. asked for an article on the structure of the Japanese Empire. This might bring out the point that continental aggression was not antithetical to maritime aggression, but the two supplemented each other. Voitinsky said that this would probably be possible. He also suggested that there should be an article on aggression against Outer Mongolia, as this was so important now.

O. L. said that he had asked Dimanshtein for an article on Birobidjan. Voitinsky suggested an article on Japanese policy in Korea. This has already been done in Tikhii Okean. The same material could be used for another article for Pacific Affairs. O. L. said that this had been done in regard to the article on the Chinese Land Tax. A Chinese version of the article had appeared, but this was revised to meet the needs of a non-Chinese audience. The material was the same, but differently organized. O. L. said that he would like about six articles a year from the Soviet Council. Voitinsky said that they would do one on Outer Mongolia to be ready for the next issue (to be mailed May 20) and then one on Korea and one of the Japanese Empire. He said that he personally would like to write an article in reply to Whyte's article. O. L. said that that would make it possible to have two Soviet articles in one issue. Voitinsky said that these articles would be done on the same basis of the materials which had already appeared in Tikhii Okean, but "would be polished for export." He said that the articles would have to be translated here. O. L. brought up the question of editing the vocabulary in left and Soviet articles. In regard to the Asiaticus article he had to revise the vocabulary considerably, or otherwise the article would have been discounted as propaganda. In the Kantorovitch article O. L. had edited out a number of things, but the New York office had put them back in. Voitinsky said that that would be impossible with their articles, because they cannot give in on their point of view. No such editorial changes could be made without their approval. He said that they understood the problem of PA and knew what sort of thing they would have to write for it.

O. L. said that they wanted book reviews from the Soviet Council in every issue. There could be as many as three per issue. Voitinsky said that they could get the Webb book reviewed. Voitinsky said that it would also be interesting to have Tikhii Okean reviewed in each issue. This would get across their point of view.

V. E. C. C. explained about the Ten Year History of the IPR; Condliffe writing the section on economic research; Boeke on cultural and anthropological; Whyte on political. He wants the Soviet Council to read these sections and then write a further section on what the Soviet Council considered important in the IPR work and what future policy and work should be followed. Although the book concentrates mainly on the research work of the IPR, it will also treat the whole activity.

VI. E. C. C. said that Holland was very pleased with the Soviet plan to make the studies of the cotton industry and of Standards of Living. He explained that the IPR did not try to make every council join every research project. The Soviet Council should just do those things which were important from their own point of view.

O. L. mentioned that in the June issue there would be a bibliographical article by Schiller. He would like to have such an article from the Soviet Council. Voitinsky thought that this could be done.

VII. E. C. C. said that Liu Yu-Wan would like to know as soon as possible when Motiliev would be in China, so he could make plans for him.

VIII. Motiliev said that he thought Romm would be named to represent them in New York on the staff before the conference. This could not be confirmed until Bucharin came back, but he thought this would be worked out. E. C. C.

explained that it would also be desirable to have a Soviet person on the international staff in the period between conferences. He suggested someone like Rogov.

IX. E. C. C. said that he would like to have Harondar send him a list as soon as possible of the Soviet representatives on the international committees. He also wondered if after the discussions which have been held here, it would be possible to have a Soviet correspondent on PA again.

X. E. C. C. explained about the International Studies Conference, its organization and its development. He said that the IPR is a member of the conference and in the past has had an observer at the conferences, usually someone from England. This year the conference is to be held in Madrid and will be the first of two conferences on the subject of collective security, etc. E. C. C. has the right to appoint anyone he wants to represent the IPR there. He will send the complete agenda, and the papers that are already prepared when he gets to Paris. He will also find out if any other Soviet organization is represented in the conference. If the Soviet IPR would like to send someone, he will arrange it. They might prefer to wait until next year, when the final conference on collective security will be held. Last year the Soviet ambassador in London attended the conference as an observer, but the general policy of the conference is not to have government officials attend as members. Motiliev said that this question would be considered by the committee, and he would notify E. C. C. of the decision.

XI. E. C. C. explained the controversy between himself and the Honolulu group.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you continue reading, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Voitinsky said that these articles would be done on the same basis of the materials which had already appeared in Tikhii Okean, but "would be polished for export. He said that the articles would have to be translated here. O. L. brought up the question of editing the vocabulary in left and Soviet articles. In regard to the Asiaticus articles he had to revise the vocabulary considerably, or otherwise the article would have been discounted as propaganda. In the Kantorovitch article O. L. had edited out a number of things, but the New York office had put them back in. Voitinsky said that that would be impossible with their articles, because they cannot give in on their point of view. No such editorial changes could be made without their approval. He said that they understood the problem of PA and knew what sort of thing they would have to write for it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is meant by the term "their" as used in the context?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I assume that it means the Soviet Council of the IPR.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that this is clearly not a stenographic transcript, it is a memorandum written by somebody, not myself. This is the first time I have ever seen it, and I cannot guarantee the accuracy of any particular phrase.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting took place, is that right, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The meeting took place; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And minutes were made of the meeting?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Minutes were made of the meeting. I don't know who made the minutes. It doesn't seem to show here and they were not shown to me before.

The CHAIRMAN. The parties named in the minutes which you have before you now, in the manuscript before you, were there to your knowledge?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sure they were there. In my present recollection I can't recall who was there.

Mr. MORRIS. Isn't it apparent from reading those minutes, Mr. Lattimore, that at that particular time it was apparent to you that Asiaticus articles had already been taken up by Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably I had had an article from Asiaticus, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Is not the article we were discussing this morning in the June 1936 edition of Pacific Affairs, the first article that Asiaticus ever wrote for Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I think it is. He may have sent something before that was not accepted and not printed. This is the first one that was printed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't edit Asiaticus' article between April 8 and April 12 while you were in Moscow, did you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember doing any editing in Moscow, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. So if you had had it and edited it by April 12, you had had it and edited it by April 8, isn't that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, do you recall in connection with the Asiaticus article that you had to revise the vocabulary considerably or otherwise the article would have been discounted as propaganda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Morris, I remember——

The CHAIRMAN. I think you had better answer that yes or no and then explain, Mr. Lattimore. That is susceptible of an answer yes or no, and you may explain afterward.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I remember that I considered——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mr. Lattimore. I tried to guide you in the proper course, and you don't seem to want to follow it.

Mr. FORTAS. May I have the question?

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question to the witness.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. That is susceptible of an answer yes or no, and then you may explain, if you have an explanation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I remember clearly I considered that his writing was very strongly anti-British and I was willing to retain anything where his facts would support it but I edited out anything that I considered merely anti-British verbiage.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you——

The CHAIRMAN. Let's go back just a minute. To whose article were you referring in your last answer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The article by Asiaticus.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, as a matter of fact, did you not force through that Asiaticus article over the objections of certain British interests?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, Mr. Sourwine; I did not force it through. I followed the usual practice of sending an advance copy and asking for objections, if any. I don't have the correspondence, but my strong recollection is that they objected to certain interpretations of the facts, but not to the facts themselves, and our procedure in such cases was not exclusively in the case of the British, but always to go ahead and publish the article.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document that I have just handed you.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of an original letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations on the letterhead of Pacific Affairs, dated December 13, 1937, addressed to Mr. Edward C. Carter, signed Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this letter introduced into the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 486" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 486

Cable: Inparel, New York

Telephone PLaza 3-4700

PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Published Quarterly by the Institute of Pacific Relations

HONOLULU, HAWAII

316 Dillingham Bldg.

Office of the Editor, 129 East 52nd Street, New York City

13TH DECEMBER 1937.

Mr. EDWARD C. CARTER,

*Institute of Pacific Relations,**Mechanics Institute Building, Post Street,**San Francisco, California.*

DEAR CARTER: A boat left for San Francisco the day after we got in here, but I did not get off my intended letter to you on account of the rush of dealing with PACIFIC AFFAIRS material, end of the year accounts, and so forth. Consequently I am getting this ready for the Clipper.

Bill and I are much encouraged to find that in submitting our joint memorandum to you we were actually converging on a line of development which you had already begun to mark out. I am looking forward to our early meeting in California, so as to get new arrangements under way as rapidly as possible.

Evidently the December number of PACIFIC AFFAIRS has had to be somewhat deferred owing to the slowness of the mails. I guess we were wise not to try to hold on longer in Peiping. If we had stayed, we might have been badly in arrears by the time the March number was due. It appears now that I can go on from here to San Francisco and still be in time for final consideration of the March number.

As you may know, there have been heartfelt promises from Saionji for a major Japanese contribution for March. While in Tokyo I was impressed by Saionji's brains and forthrightness. Nevertheless, I dare not put more than the usual faith in an article promised from Tokyo. It is therefore comforting to have actually in hand a very good article which Bill secured from Uyeda on "pigmy" industries. Our Japanese Council is probably having a pretty grim time. They said very politely that they would have liked to have me longer in Japan; but it was quite clear that while they were glad to see me for a moment and to get fresh and independent information about China, a longer stay might have been embarrassing to them. The morning after our arrival at Tokyo the breakfast newspaper contained an account of the dismissal of Yanaihara for "pacifist" opinions expressed long ago, these being held by the Home Office to be "dangerous to peace and good order. * * *

Of the material awaiting me here the most interesting was the Hubbard article on the Soviet Five Year Plans, which Holland and I have read with, probably, curious expressions on our faces. While waiting for whatever reaction it may detonate in Motylev, I may as well review several considerations that are likely to turn out to be pertinent.

In the first place, it is a calamity that in spite of our combined and persistent urging, the Soviet Council has never contributed adequately to PACIFIC AFFAIRS. As a result, this very skillful attack threatens to make an impression on readers who have not had the prior advantage of reading constructive presentations of problems of major Soviet interest, by Soviet authors.

In the second place, Motylev and his colleagues told you and me in Moscow that they did not object to adverse criticism, if expressed by people of leading reputation, or people representing important bodies of opinion. Hubbard cannot

lightly be refused a hearing. He has an important influence and standing among "people who count" in England; otherwise he would not be retained as an expert by the Bank of England.

In the third place, this article comes to us, though we did not ourselves request it, through Chatham House, one of the major organs of the IPR. As editor, I necessarily recall that I forced through an article by Asiaticus on British capitalist financial policy in China, against the protests of Chatham House. This would make it difficult for me to refuse the Hubbard article on the ground that it is impolitic. It is true that Asiaticus has no connection with our Soviet Council, but it is equally true that he is regarded by Chatham House as a representative Marxist spokesman. Chatham House, therefore, will undoubtedly consider that it has by precedent a claim to make stringent criticisms of Marxist policies and Soviet achievements.

There are several points in Newton D. Baker's letter of proposals concerning the General Purposes Budget for 1938 on which I should like to consult you as early as possible.

I am glad to see that an effort will be made to reduce the budget of PACIFIC AFFAIRS. I wonder, however, whether the changes thus far proposed will prove practical.

I notice that the estimated income of PACIFIC AFFAIRS has been raised from \$4,800 to \$5,100. This presumably would mean an increased circulation and therefore increased printing costs. Yet the estimate for "printing and cuts" has been cut from \$4,400 to \$3,800.

It may prove possible to reduce the appropriation for travel, which has been put at \$800 for 1938. Owing to our forced return from China, there has been a considerable excess in travel over the 1937 estimate of \$700. It occurs to me, however, that you may have overlooked an item for \$500 set aside for travel in the 1937 appropriation from the Research budget for my Inner Asian project. On consultation with Bill, it seems to us both that this \$500 has not yet been touched; if it were applied to the 1937 excess, it might prove possible to save on the 1938 appropriation.

I notice that there was an item of \$1,000 for promotion in 1937, which has been reduced to \$400 for 1938. I should like very much to know what expenditures were charged against this fund in 1937, and what were the results.

You must have had a terrific time of it riding the double crisis of adjustments within the IPR and application of the IPR's resources to the present crisis. We are looking forward eagerly to hearing from you something of the interesting consultations you must have had already, and plans for the present and future. Our problems always seem to come down to the fact that however difficult the present, the future is not cut off.

Yours,

Owen Lattimore /s/
OWEN LATTIMORE.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Morris, can the letter be shown to Mr. Lattimore and ask him if it is a letter which he wrote?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you look at these letters and determine whether or not it is a letter written over your signature, photostat of a letter over your signature?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is clearly a letter over my signature; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like this introduced into the record with the question addressed to Mr. Lattimore this morning, "To your knowledge was Asiaticus considered a Marxist in IPR circles?"

The CHAIRMAN. You may read it and insert it in the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you read the paragraph at the bottom of the stencil page beginning "In the third place"?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

In the third place, this article comes to us, though we did not ourselves request it, through Chatham House, one of the major organs of the IPR. As editor, I necessarily recall that I forced through an article by Asiaticus on British capitalist financial policy in China, against the protests of Chatham House. This would make it difficult for me to refuse the Hubbard article on the ground that it is impolitic. It is true that Asiaticus has no connection with our Soviet Council, but it is equally true that he is regarded by Chatham House as a

representative Marxist spokesman. Chatham House, therefore, will undoubtedly consider that it has by precedent a claim to make stringent criticisms of Marxist policies and Soviet achievements.

Senator FERGUSON. May I ask the question whether or not he was a Marxist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. He was apparently a Marxist in the opinion of the Chatham House.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you disagree with that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wouldn't as of 1937 have been qualified to agree or disagree.

Senator FERGUSON. What do you say now?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think he probably was.

Senator FERGUSON. What made you change your mind?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think the identification of various things that he has written as having been published by Communist publishing houses, and so forth, which I didn't know at that time.

Senator FERGUSON. Does not this document that you have here of the minutes of the meeting in Moscow indicate the same thing? That was in what year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is written at the end of 1937, and that document is in the middle of 1936.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. So prior to this, the minutes of a meeting indicated that he was a Communist or a Marxist, isn't that correct, and you were in the meeting?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think the minutes of the meeting indicates that he was a Marxist or a Communist.

Senator FERGUSON. Let's see the minutes.

Senator O'CONNOR. While Senator Ferguson is looking at that, may I ask one question which may clarify this?

The CHAIRMAN. He is in consultation with his counsel right now.

Senator O'CONNOR. I am sorry. I did not mean to interrupt you.

I wonder, Mr. Lattimore, in light of the text of this in which it is said "I necessarily recall that I forced through an article by Asiaticus on British capitalist," whether there is any further comment you desire to make in view of your previous answer that you had not so forced the article through.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, simply that by my recollection I didn't force through articles against the opinion of the British any more than I forced them through against anybody else, but I wouldn't dispute the phraseology, that in a casual letter to somebody I said I forced it through. It is a phrase you can use when you have overridden an objection, I think.

Senator FERGUSON. Then you didn't mean that you had forced it through?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What is that?

Senator FERGUSON. You did not mean this at all?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is a question of the choice of words, Senator Ferguson.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe he didn't mean his answer to Mr. Sourwine.

Senator FERGUSON. I was wondering.

Senator O'CONNOR. I was wondering which of the two.

The CHAIRMAN. Which of the two do you mean?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is simply the question of a use of words. My recollection is that I wouldn't have said that I forced it through. My

recollection was that I said I had overridden the objection or something of that kind, but since I see that I did say that I forced it through, I accept it that I said I forced it through. But I think the difference between forcing it through and overriding an objection is not very significant.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, there wasn't any doubt about the article being very critical of the British.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No doubt about its being very critical of the British.

Senator FERGUSON. And you would say the British strenuously objected to it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Again a question of choice of words.

Senator FERGUSON. What word do you want to use?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say, without having seen the original correspondence from the British, that my recollection is that they strongly objected.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, and that it would take something more than just a few words to have it put in over their objection, would it not? Don't you think the word "forced" is the proper word in here?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Forced or overrode. I don't see any great difference between the two.

Senator FERGUSON. Does this now refresh your memory on this as to what you did do in relation to this article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This refreshes my memory that I overrode the British in spite of their objections, and if you like, forced it through.

Senator FERGUSON. Would it not also indicate to you that that is the article that you were mentioning when you were in Moscow, because of what you said here?

Mr. FORTAS. What is this?

Senator FERGUSON. In this 13th of December 1937 letter, the one he just read.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it must have been the same article, but that doesn't mean that I thought it was a Communist article.

Senator FERGUSON. All right, now we find that in Moscow you were talking about someone writing as a Communist an article, and you now come to the point where you call this same writer a Marxist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't call him that.

Senator FERGUSON. Wait. But he is called a Marxist by those who want the article kept out.

Mr. MORRIS. Or representative Marxist.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. Does that not indicate to you that it is the same man you were talking about in Moscow as a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. It does not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Is it because of your previous answers on this record that it does not refresh your memory?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, because I have such a clear memory that I had been trying to get a Chinese Communist article.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think that is just exactly what you did get, a Chinese Communist article, but you got it from a German? Is that not exactly what you got?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I got an article from an anti-British German whom I regarded at that time as a social-democrat. He is identified as I recall in the contributors paragraph there in Pacific Affairs as a contributor to left-wing journals. May I complete that?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As of 1936 my knowledge of any differences between left-wing social-democrats, how far social democrats are Marxist, the difference between social-democrats and Communists, and all the rest of it, was so vague that I would be quite capable of loose phraseology.

Senator FERGUSON. Then, Mr. Lattimore, do you think it was fair, as an editor of a paper, to foist upon the public, particularly Americans, an article by this person and under an editor that doesn't know the difference between a social-democrat, a Marxist, and a Communist? Do you think you were fair then, doing that without understanding these terms and who they were?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I was not only fair, but that I was fairly representative of American editors at that time, 1936.

Senator FERGUSON. As you see it now, what do you think about your work?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I see it now, I think I did a job of editing a magazine participated in by a number of nations necessarily dealing often with controversial topics in a manner of which I am not ashamed.

Senator FERGUSON. Why didn't you go into the proposition as to whether or not this man was a representative Marxist spokesman?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because as of 1936 I didn't think it important.

Senator FERGUSON. You didn't think it made any difference whether he was a Marxist spokesman, a Communist, or a left-winger; is that true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think even in 1936 I would have made a distinction between Communist Party members or Russian Communists and various kinds of European social democrats and so forth, but that is merely my recollection. It is awfully hard for me to remember exactly what my attitude was on those subjects 18 years ago, or 16 years ago.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, you allowed him to write other articles and put them in this magazine after the 13th of December 1937, when your letter speaks of him as a Marxist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. You allowed him to write more articles after that and put them in your magazine, is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Then did you understand that he was writing as a left-winger, a Marxist, or a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I understood, as I remember describing him in the contributors' identification paragraph there, as a left-winger.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever describe him later as a left-winger?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember. That could easily be checked from copies of Pacific Affairs. You see, after all, this is a British description of a man as a representative Marxist.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think they ought to know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't see why I should have accepted them as authoritative on that subject, no.

Senator FERGUSON. But you said you had trouble recognizing. Don't you think you might have taken the advice of some experts, the British, on Marxists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't think that the particular British that were writing to me on the subject were any more experts on the subject than I was.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you consider you were an expert?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't. The whole point in my mind at the time was that the man had an anti-British attitude, and the question was one of the propriety with which he stated his anti-British point of view.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you agree, Mr. Lattimore, that the effect upon the public whether this was permitted by stupidity or intention would be the same as far as this magazine was concerned?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What impression?

Senator FERGUSON. Of these Communist writings.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think it is Communist writings, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. You did not think that article was the writing of a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't.

Senator FERGUSON. Even today you do not think so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Today I would say that my opinion is that the man was probably a Communist. I do not think the articles were Communist and I do not think the articles further Communist propaganda.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not think so?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't, not even to this day.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that because you do not recognize Communist propaganda?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, because as of the general standard of publishing and discussion in 1936-37, I wouldn't consider it Communist propaganda.

Senator FERGUSON. I am talking about today. You have read the article. You know what you think of it today. You read part of it here this morning.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My opinion of it today is that in 1936-37 it was not Communist propaganda.

Senator O'CONNOR. Could you let me ask one question there. Mr. Lattimore, when did you come to the realization that Asiaticus was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know that "realization" is the exact word.

Senator O'CONNOR. When were you convinced?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The proceedings of this committee have shown that he published books with Communist publishing houses, and there is a phrase there, something about the great Communist Party this, and that, and so forth. On that I would accept that he was a Communist.

Senator O'CONNOR. Are we to understand that until the formation of this committee you were not sure or were not convinced that Asiaticus was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, that would be the correct way to put it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the record the Asiaticus article that appears in Pacific Affairs, June 1938. It runs from page 237 through 252. May that be made part of the

record? Mr. Lattimore has a copy of that article, I am sure. It is an exchange between Edgar Snow and Asiaticus.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The nature of the article having come into the discussion, I think it is proper to put it in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 487" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 487

[Source: PACIFIC AFFAIRS, Vol. XI, No. II, June 1938]

"ASIATICUS" CRITICIZES "RED STAR OVER CHINA"

In view of the extraordinary interest aroused in all countries by Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China*, we print herewith some correspondence which gives "Asiaticus" criticism of Snow's study of the Chinese Communists, together with a letter from Mr. Snow himself. We have considerably condensed all three letters, owing to necessities of space, but trust that in doing so we have not done injustice either to "Asiaticus" or to Mr. Snow.—EDITOR.

To the EDITOR OF PACIFIC AFFAIRS:

SIR: Edgar Snow, the first foreign writer to enter Chinese Red territory, has done in *Red Star Over China* an excellent and well-documented piece of reporting. His book is a unique historical contribution. However, even nonpartisanship and honest investigation do not necessarily prevent errors of outlook and interpretation in presenting facts personally seen and truthfully related. When Snow leaves actual reporting and turns to theory, he makes many essential mistakes about the Chinese Communist movement, the historical position of Soviet China and the Red Army, the Soviet Union and Communism in general.

His fundamental conception is plain: a revolution led by Communists, like that of Soviet China, must necessarily be a proletarian revolution with immediate Socialist aims. He found little that could properly be called Socialism in the Chinese Soviet region, in spite of his emphasis on the enormous revolutionary changes in the Chinese Soviet region. He tends to explain this by saying that the agrarian revolution, without actual Socialist changes, gave the Reds an "immediate basis of support"; they could not, while confined in the remote interior, "try out Communism in China," which is what some people think the Reds have been attempting in their little blockaded areas" (p. 212). Obviously, the inference is that the Reds would "try out communism" if they could gain control of the great cities.

This is certainly wrong. The policy of the Chinese Communists makes it quite unmistakable that their only immediate aim was to carry through that Chinese revolution which was actually going on; which was not a Socialist but a nationalist revolution, against imperialist domination, combined with a bourgeois-democratic revolution aimed at eradicating the powerful feudal remnants in rural China and getting rid of the patriarchal, absolutist reactionaries. The political organization of the Chinese Communists (Red Army and Soviets, under Communist leadership) was never intended for any other purpose. The only difference between cooperation with the Kuomintang now and in the former period (1926-27) is that there are now Soviet areas in which this movement has been under the majority control of workers and peasants ever since the Kuomintang, going against Sun Yat-sen's teachings, compromised with imperialism and feudal reaction in 1927. The institution of Soviets (meaning Councils) does not imply that China is attempting what Russia accomplished in 1917; it is more like the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905, led by proletarians, which saw the first historical appearance of Soviets.

Nevertheless, Chinese Communism is a model child of Marx. Engels once said that Marxism is essentially the doctrine of the conditions necessary for the victory of the workers. The appearance in history of centralized, independent national states, with democratic constitutions, is one of those conditions, and so is the liberation of the peasants from feudal chains. Long before the epoch of Socialist revolution, beginning in 1917, the struggle against feudal absolutism and for democratic liberties and national defense against aggressors was part of the "minimum program" of the Socialist or Communist movement, an essential step

toward the "maximum program" of proletarian revolution and a Socialist economy. Therefore the Chinese Communists, in throwing everything into a struggle for national, bourgeois-democratic revolution, are not betraying the Socialist revolution but preparing the way for it in the future—although it may be a long way from Chinese victory against Japan and over the reactionaries in China to a Socialist revolution.

Snow interprets Chinese Communism as an attempt at Socialist revolution when he argues (p. 441) that "the assistance expected from the world proletariat failed to materialize," and that "in the Communist International Program it is clearly recognized that successful proletarian movements in semicolonial countries such as China 'will be possible only if direct support is obtained from the countries in which the proletarian dictatorship is established' (i. e., in the U. S. S. R.)." As a matter of fact China is justified in expecting help not only from the world proletariat but from all progressive forces which support democracy, peace, and resistance to aggression; and not only from the U. S. S. R. but from all democratic and peace-loving peoples—not necessarily through intervention, but through international collaboration to prevent imperialist intervention.

It is a mistake to suggest, as Snow does (p. 212), that the Chinese Communists used land redistribution merely as a maneuver to gain the power that would enable them to press forward to thoroughgoing Socialist changes, including collectivization. The liberation of the Chinese peasantry was an aim in itself, because the peasantry will follow any political party that is ready to fight for the relief of peasant misery. Imperialist conquerors and their reactionary Chinese agents are the worst enemies of peasant liberation. It is quite different with great numbers of the smaller Chinese bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia; and so long as they are willing to abolish feudal exaction and tax extortion as part of their program for national salvation and democratic reform, the peasants will not hesitate to follow them. Snow believes that the Kuomintang would not "sign its own death-warrant" (p. 445) by genuinely realizing bourgeois democracy; but the Chinese nation can only survive through unification and immense sacrifices on the part of all classes, especially the peasantry, and therefore if the Kuomintang, as the party of the bourgeoisie, were to prevent the sweeping reforms that are necessary if China is to survive, it really would be signing its own death-warrant. In a time of general sacrifice, the ruling party can only retain leadership if it considers the interests of those whom it calls on to follow it. Snow himself makes it clear (p. 445) that "some recognition of the demands of the majority will have to be made by the tiny minority which now monopolizes the State economy and policing power."

But no "tiny minority" can enforce its will over the majority in China, in present circumstances. The Japanese want nothing better than to cooperate with all internal enemies of progress and rejuvenation in China, and therefore those who lead the Chinese cannot afford to isolate themselves from the great majority of the nation. The Chinese Communists, as the party of the workers and poor peasants, have come to the fore not because they are under the delusion that the peasants can thus easily be made into fighters for Socialism, but because of their vital interest in a complete victory of national bourgeois-democratic revolution, which must be established before the goal of Socialism can become an actual political issue. Even if the bourgeoisie were to surrender to imperialism, leaving the Communists in complete power in all of China that remained unconquered, an immediate "thoroughgoing" Socialist revolution would not be a practical question, because such a Communist government would still consist only of the executives representing the majority of the Chinese people, in a struggle still focused on national independence and peasant liberation, even though the proletariat might have the hegemony in a union of workers, peasants, and the small bourgeoisie.

What Snow evidently has in view is the Socialist revolution in the Soviet Union. In Russia, however, the proletariat was already in the vanguard. Not only had there already been successive stages of revolution, but there was a more mature base, nationally, socially and economically. The collectivization of rural economy in the Soviet Union came after a proletarian revolution, when the key economic positions had been in Socialist hands for more than a decade. The struggle for bourgeois-democratic revolution and national independence, which may yet take decades in China, was already over in the Soviet Union. Snow evidently realizes this but he seems to think the Chinese Communists may have a short-cut scheme and that "the victory of the revolution in China may hinge on the ability of the U. S. S. R. to make the transition from a program of Socialism in one country to Socialism in all countries, to world revolution" (p. 449).

Disregarding Snow's evidently confused idea of the program of "Socialism in one country" and his implication that somehow this hinders "Socialism in all countries," or world revolution, it may be pointed out that even if the Soviet Union should change its mind and begin to promote "Socialism in all countries," beginning with China, the fact would still remain that Socialism cannot be constructed in China until imperialist aggression has been defeated and the bourgeois-democratic revolution completed. Marx, in the preface to *Capital*, states that:

One nation can learn from others, and should do so. When a society has discovered the natural laws which regulate its own movement, it can neither overleap the natural phases of evolution, nor shuffle them out of the world by decrees. But this much, at least, it can do: It can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs (*International Publishers, N. Y., 1929, p. 864*).

The Soviet Union has always offered to China the opportunity, whenever China might be willing to take it, to make use of Soviet revolutionary experience for the national liberation of China. According to Snow, however:

* * * the Soviet Union in fact did not extend to the Chinese comrades the promised "assistance and support of the proletarian dictatorship" in any degree commensurate with the need. On the contrary, the great help, amounting to intervention, which the Soviet Union gave to Chiang Kai-shek until 1927 had the objective influence of bringing into power the most reactionary elements of the Kuomintang. Of course, the rendering of direct aid to the Chinese Communists after 1927 became quite incompatible with the position adopted by the U. S. S. R.—and here is the well-known contradiction between the immediate needs of the national policy of the Soviet Union and the immediate demands of the world revolution—for to do so would have been to jeopardize by the danger of international war the whole program of Socialist construction in one country. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the influence of this factor on the Chinese revolution was very great (p. 441).

He goes on to describe the Chinese Communists, "deprived of an ally," continuing "to struggle alone for the 'hegemony of the bourgeois revolution.'"

Presumably Snow uses "bourgeois revolution" in inverted commas because he cannot see that the Chinese revolution is bourgeois, and doubts whether the Chinese Communists see it that way. Probably his inference is that this is all "tactics," aimed at eventual Communist leadership of a Socialist revolution. This prevents him both from seeing the historical function of the Kuomintang when it was struggling against the old Peking Government, the warlord scourge and imperialist intervention, and from seeing that the Communists joined the Kuomintang solely in order to advance this struggle—just as Marx and Engels supported the German bourgeois revolution of 1848. The Kuomintang's accession to power meant a historical advance for China, even though the Communists could not prevent the reactionary elements within the Kuomintang from taking advantage of this. The Soviet Union was not responsible for this turn of events. Its advisors were not attached to Chiang Kai-shek merely personally, but to the National Government and the elected leadership of the Kuomintang and the Army. They supported the Kuomintang majority in advocating a centralized civilian government controlled by the Kuomintang, not by the Army. Chiang Kai-shek opposed the transfer of the National Government, to which Borodin was attached, from Canton to Wuhan; his moves against this Government and the eventual surrender of the Kuomintang opposition, leading to abandonment of Sun Yat-sen's policy of cooperation with workers and peasants and the Communist Party, brought Soviet advisorship to the Kuomintang to an end. This advisorship, from 1923 to 1927, had represented aid not merely to the Chinese Communists but to the Chinese national revolution.

The Chinese Red Army began its existence with the military uprising at Nanchang in 1927, with which communism, according to Snow, "first became an independent force (p. 51). It had really been an independent force, however, from the moment the Communist Party of China was founded. It was prominent in cooperation with the Kuomintang until 1927; in the Shanghai general strike of 1925; in the 1925-26 strike and boycott against Hongkong; in the armed uprising, together with the Nationalist Army, against Chang Tsung-chang's hordes before Shanghai in 1927. In the subsequent 10 years, just as much as in the present cooperation in the national war of resistance, the Chinese Communists have directed their activities mainly toward the national and bourgeois-democratic revolution; and this does not in the least contradict their function as an independent class force aiming historically toward Socialist revolution. Marx and Engels began to make the working class conscious of its historical position and

mission by cooperating with all democratic forces, and taught it to rely on its own strength and not to follow the other classes blindly even in the course of this cooperation. Their teaching was: cooperation with the bourgeoisie when it works against feudalism and for democracy, and resistance to it when it compromises with reaction and betrays democracy.

In compliance with these principles, the Chinese Communists regarded the Kuomintang's abandonment of the revolutionary policies of Sun Yat-sen, in 1927, as a menace to the national and bourgeois-democratic revolution. They have struggled, ever since, to reinstate these policies throughout the nation. They believe (p. 77) that the decade since 1927 "has richly validated their thesis that national independence and democracy (which the Kuomintang also set as its objective) cannot be achieved in China without an anti-imperialist policy externally and an agrarian revolution internally." Surely this means that, while changing their tactics to suit different situations, they have continuously fought for the national and bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Has the Communist International (of which the Chinese Communist Party is a member) failed to help Chinese Communists, and has assistance from the Soviet Union and the world proletariat "failed to materialize," as Snow suggests? He sees the reason for this "failure" in the "well-known contradiction between the immediate needs of the national policy of the Soviet Union and the immediate demands of the world revolution," thus making the Comintern "a kind of bureau of the Soviet Union" (pp. 478 and 441). Would Snow also say that the world proletariat is an institution of the Soviet Union? To him the Soviet Union under Stalin has been responsible for changing the Communist International by "transition from an organization of international incendiaries into an instrument of national policy of the Soviet Union" (p. 376). He speaks of the Comintern as having to "limp along as a kind of poor stepchild which might be officially disinherited whenever it did anything malaprop" (p. 479). This is a characterization of the Comintern which will be acclaimed by outright Fascists as well as by the Trotskyites. Snow's failure to see the working out of the historical process, however, has already been corrected by Mao Tse-tung, who in an interview with Snow (p. 167) declares that "the Communist Party of China was, is and will ever be, faithful to Marxist-Leninism." The truth is that the Chinese Communist Party, as an integral part of the Comintern, has learned the revolutionary theory and practice for which the Comintern stands. By fighting in the vanguard of the actual Chinese Revolution it has carried forward China's struggle for liberation from imperialism and aggression; a cause in which national independence and the people's livelihood are combined; a cause which is not only China's but that of all workers, all over the world, and which has consistently been upheld by the Comintern. Therefore, the Chinese Communists today represent not only the workers and peasants of China, but the entire nation, in their fight for national liberation, and therefore they stand for democratic freedom as a whole.

Though representing a partisan view, these remarks may perhaps be useful toward the establishment of a real understanding of the position and character of the present program of the Chinese Communist Party.

"ASIATICUS."

SHANGHAI, *January 1938.*

EDGAR SNOW REPLIES

TO THE EDITOR OF PACIFIC AFFAIRS.

SIR: I appreciate the privilege of having seen an advance copy of the long remarks on my book, *Red Star Over China*, by "Asiaticus." My first reaction was sheer amazement that anyone could read my book and emerge from the task with impressions so directly antipodal to those which I hoped to convey. Unfortunately, "Asiaticus" approaches my book chiefly as theorist; but it seems to me a not entirely scientific use of theory to develop his criticism, not on the basis of what I actually wrote but on his own theory of what I really meant to write.

"Asiaticus" desired to prove that the Chinese Communists did not in the past, and do not now, propose to establish Socialism in China, but only bourgeois democracy. This is all right, for no doubt some people still believe that the Communists want to create Communism in China in the next five minutes (not that they wouldn't like to, at that, if it were possible). The thesis of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not original with "Asiaticus"; he assumes

that I have never heard of it, and do not accept it. The main burden of his criticism is that what I really meant to say was that the Chinese Communists strive to seize power and immediately construct Socialism. Yet nowhere in my book do I take such a position. What does the book actually say? In the last chapter, which is the only section dealing avowedly with theory, and that of necessity but briefly, I wrote:

"A popular and never-dying notion of the Communist movement in China is that it is anticapitalist in the sense that it does not see the necessity for a period of bourgeois or capitalist economy, but wants right away to proclaim Socialism. This is rubbish. Every pronouncement of the Communists has shown clearly that they recognize the 'bourgeois character' of the present revolution. The struggle has been not over the nature of the revolution so much as over the nature of its leadership. The Communists recognize that the duties of that leadership are to realize, as quickly as possible, two primary historic tasks: first, to overthrow foreign imperialism and establish national independence (that is, liberate China from its semicolonial status); second, to overthrow the power of the landlords and gentry and establish democracy" (that is, liberate the masses from "semifeudalism").

Only after those tasks have been accomplished, the Communists foresee, will it be possible to move toward socialism.

But how can these victories be won? For a while the Communists hoped to win them with the bourgeoisie. But when the counter-revolution occurred in 1927, when the Kuomintang (the party of the landlords and bourgeoisie) abandoned the revolutionary method against both imperialism and "feudalism," they became convinced that "only a worker-peasant democratic dictatorship, under the hegemony of the proletariat" could lead the bourgeois revolution—which in China did not assume a definitive form immediately after the overthrow of the imperial monarchy, but only at the time of the Great Revolution—1925–27.

The Communist saw that the Chinese capitalist class was not a true bourgeoisie, but a "colonial bourgeoisie." It was a "compradore class" with the character of an excesscence of the foreign and finance monopoly capitalism which it primarily served. It was too weak to lead the revolution. It could, in fact, achieve the conditions of its own freedom only through the fulfillment of the anti-imperialist movement, the elimination of foreign domination. But only the workers and peasants could lead such a revolution to its final victory. And the Communists intended that the workers and peasants should not turn over the fruits of that victory to the neo-capitalists whom they were thus to release, as had happened in France, Germany, Italy—everywhere in fact, except in Russia. Indeed, they should retain power throughout a kind of "N. E. P." period, a brief epoch of "controlled capitalism" and then a period of State capitalism, followed at last by a speedy transition into Socialist construction, with the help of the U. S. S. R. All this is indicated quite clearly in Fundamental Laws of the Chinese Soviet Republic.

"The aim of the driving out of imperialism, and destroying the Kuomintang," repeated Mao Tse-tung in 1934, "is to unify China, to bring the bourgeois democratic revolution to fruition, and to make it possible to turn this revolution into a higher stage of Socialist revolution. This is the task of the Soviet" (pp. 437–438).

This is no doubt inadequate, but it seems to state very clearly that even had the Reds seized power they would have had no hope of instantly creating a Socialist utopia. Yet evidently "Asiaticus" thinks that the book does not mean what it says here and elsewhere (the thesis is also explained on pp. 76–80), but that what I actually meant to say was that the Communists want "right away to proclaim Socialism" despite my description of such notions as "rubbish."

In the above-quoted chapter I endeavored to explain how and why the Communists broke with the Kuomintang in 1927, the nature of the armed struggle for power in the next 10 years, and finally the basis on which the Communists engaged in a common struggle with the Kuomintang against Japan. The unprecedented intensification of the imperialist invasion was the main reason for the present reconciliation between the opposing class forces represented by the Communists and the Kuomintang, but the question of the hegemony of the revolution remains in abeyance, depending on the outcome of the war.

"Asiaticus" does not seem to understand this question of hegemony of the revolution very clearly. He thinks that the Communists were fighting only for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and that the Kuomintang fought for it too. If that were so it would be impossible to explain the past decade of civil war. Actually they were both fighting for that, but also for something more.

They fought also over the real issue of the hegemony of power, over whether the Chinese revolution was to be a "worker-peasant democratic dictatorship under the hegemony of the proletariat," or whether it was to resolve into a dictatorship under the hegemony of the Kuomintang. During their armed struggle for power (1927-1936) the Chinese Communists never conceded the role of leadership of the revolution to the Kuomintang—any more than the latter conceded it to the Communists. It was only after the submission of the Red Army last August to the high command of the Central Government—in which the hegemony was clearly not proletarian—that the Communists recognized the leadership of the bourgeoisie in the present stage (the struggle for national independence) of the still uncompleted revolution.

It is therefore not quite correct to say, as "Asiaticus" does, that in the past the "only immediate aim" of the Chinese Communists was the realization of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Throughout the period of the Soviets and civil war the Communists' "immediate aims" were to complete the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, bourgeois-democratic revolution, and also to complete it in the form of the worker-peasant democratic dictatorship under the hegemony of the proletariat. Or, as this was expressed in the Constitution of the Chinese Soviet Republic itself:

"It shall be our task to finally establish this dictatorship throughout China. It shall be the aim of this dictatorship to destroy all feudal survivals, to annihilate the might of the warlords in China [among whom the Communists then classified Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang armies—E. S.] to unite China, systematically, to limit the development of capitalism, to build up the economy of the state, to develop the class-consciousness and organization of the proletariat, to rally to its banner the broad masses of the village poor, in order to effect the transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat." [Italics mine—E.S.]

"Asiaticus" trouble is that he ignores the significance of the new stage in the Chinese Revolution, and in the relations between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party, which began with the actual achievement of the United Front. But even though the present anti-imperialist struggle against Japan, which is manifestly revolutionary war, has been initiated by, and is still under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, with the loyal cooperation of the Communists it is a grave error in dialectical thinking to imply from this that the Communists would not be prepared, if conditions imposed the task upon them, to accept the full hegemony of the revolutionary war themselves.

It is a mistake to assume that during the civil war the Communists were fighting for the bourgeois-democratic revolution for the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, they were from the beginning of the Soviet movement to its end fighting for proletarian hegemony of the revolution of the bourgeoisie, and for the ultimate ("maximum program") realization of Communist society, and this remains today a goal which gives to the Marxist-Leninist proletarian leadership its invincible morale and revolutionary determination. "The Communist Party will never abandon its aims of Socialism and Communism," as Mao Tse-tung recently said:

It will still pass through the stage of democratic revolution of the bourgeoisie to attain the stages of Socialism and Communism. The Communist Party retains its own program and its own policies. The party program is Socialism and Communism and this different from the San Min Chu I. Its policy program is more thorough compared with those of any other party and clique within this country, but it does not fundamentally contradict the program of the San Min Chu I.

"Asiaticus'" error is that he does not distinguish between this role of hegemony and the nature of the next stage of the Chinese revolution itself. Chen Tu-hsiu suffered from some such view in 1927, when he advocated that the Communists submit to the Kuomintang and bourgeois hegemony of the revolution, and later on the Trotskyist emphasized the same view. They ignored the validity of the Chinese Soviets (which they regarded as peasant rebellion merely) because they denied the possibility of the proletarian role of hegemony in such a worker-peasant movement, and its ability to realize the tasks of bourgeois-democratic revolution. "Asiaticus" evidently does not take that position, because he approves of the Soviets as progressive, but his inadequate conception of the Communists' aim for hegemony of power leaves unexplained one deep side of the nature and intensity of revolutionary struggle in China during the pre-United Front epoch.

As concerns the remainder of "Asiaticus'" review, which attempts to interpret the historic relationship between the Comintern, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Communist Party, it must be apparent that this poses very great questions, which are changing in their nature each day. It is introduced by "Asiati-

cus" in such a manner as to require lengthy discussion, or none at all, and I feel I have already more than exhausted the courtesy of your space. It does not seem to me, however, that "Asiaticus" correctly represents my attitude toward the Comintern and the Soviet Union, which is objective, I hope, and somewhat critical, but not antagonistic nor unfriendly, as one might conclude from his review.

Red Star would in any event have been a book far short of perfection, because it was completed before the Sino-Japanese war broke out it is all the more subject to alteration. There are errors of fact in it, and doubtless errors of judgment and analysis, and some of these concern the Soviet Union; but none of them represent a hardened prejudice. The views I have expressed are subject to revision. I do not claim to be a trained Marxist; I am only an amateur at theory, and I am anxious to be corrected in this respect, as in others. But the charge that I believe the Chinese Communist movement "can only be one" with "immediate Socialist aims" would, if it were true, destroy any value my book might otherwise possess, and I am unable to let it go unchallenged.

EDGAR SNOW.

SHANGHAI, *January 1938.*

"ASIATICUS" HOLDS HIS GROUND

TO THE EDITOR OF PACIFIC AFFAIRS.

SIR: I must congratulate Edgar Snow on admitting that his views do not represent a hardened prejudice. However, my criticism of his erroneous conceptions of the character of the Chinese Revolution are only confirmed by his reply. He quotes his own statement that the Chinese capitalist class was "not a true bourgeoisie," but a "colonial bourgeoisie," and therefore was "too weak to lead the revolution." I cannot grasp how a bourgeoisie subjected to foreign or colonial domination ceases to be a true bourgeoisie. We know from history that even in independent countries like Germany, Tsarist Russia and Japan the bourgeoisie did not lead the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, but surrendered politically to feudal, absolutist forces, being satisfied with economic domination for itself. It might happen, however, that a "colonial bourgeoisie," if denied economic expansion and national independence, might be forced to lead the national bourgeois revolution in spite of its peculiar weakness in such a situation. This weakness could only be overcome by arousing the masses of people to democratic action. This was the idea of Sun Yat-sen, who was both an anti-imperialist and a democratic leader. In justice to Sun Yat-sen it must be pointed out that, contrary to Snow's opinion, the theory of the Chinese bourgeois revolution being at the same time a revolution against imperialist domination was not only clarified and developed by the Communist Party but also profoundly realized and taught by Sun Yat-sen himself. It had a foremost place in his revolutionary policies and the San Min Chu I.

Snow states that I make the mistake of assuming that the "Communists were fighting for the bourgeois-democratic revolution for the bourgeoisie." It is he who is utterly mistaken, not I. The bourgeois-democratic revolution is historically both for the bourgeoisie and for the expansion of the capitalist order; just as the proletarian revolution is both for the proletariat and for Socialist transformation. He states in his book that the idea that the Communists were fighting for the bourgeois-democratic revolution for the bourgeoisie imputes "futility to the heroic sacrifices of thousands of lives in the struggle to assure the Socialist future of China." Here I can only refer him to the heroic sacrifices during the bourgeois-revolutionary periods of the American War of Independence and the Civil War; to the sacrifices made for the French Revolution and the sacrifices made by workers and peasants during the long-drawn-out period of bourgeois revolution in Russia, in 1905 and again in 1917.

The split in the Chinese revolutionary United Front in 1927 occurred because the Kuomintang compromised with feudal forces and with imperialism, and turned against the democratic forces of the workers and peasants and the small bourgeoisie of the cities. In so doing it surrendered its former position of leadership in the national bourgeois revolution. It was the Communists who continued the fight. In so doing they took over the leadership of the revolution, but the historical character of the revolution remained the same, and the Communists were not "fighting for that but also for something more." The workers and peasants were not fighting "for the bourgeoisie," but for their own

national and democratic freedom, and the relief of their own misery. This is what gives the proletariat the interest to struggle to assure a Socialist future. However, their economic and political interests combine with the bourgeois aim for economic and political domination, because this aim means the overthrowing of the combined forces of feudalism and of imperialist domination. It is characteristic of the period of bourgeois-democratic revolution that all democratic forces follow the leadership which actually exists and really leads the revolution. The necessity for proletarian leadership, and the possibility of realizing it, arise only when the bourgeoisie does not lead the revolution, or actually oppose it, by submitting to feudal forces, or to feudal forces combined with or led by imperialist aggressors. Even so, proletarian leadership, or the hegemony of the proletariat among the democratic forces, does not mean opposing the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class, or preventing it from rejoining the revolutionary front. It is only a continuation of the revolution, which the bourgeoisie has betrayed, in contradiction to its own class interests. It is only in a proletarian revolution aimed at overthrowing the bourgeoisie and realizing Socialism, that it is impossible to consider the interests of the bourgeois class.

In speaking of "immediate Socialist aims," I did not of course mean "springing into Socialism right away." I simply defined the historical character and mission of a proletarian revolution. Snow states that the Chinese Communists, after attaining power, would have to go through an "N. E. P." period of controlled capitalism, leading first to state capitalism and then to a speedy transition to Socialist construction, with the help of the U. S. S. R. This however does not mean retaining power, which is characteristic of proletarian hegemony in a bourgeois-democratic revolution. It applies to the position of the proletariat under a proletarian dictatorship, acquired by the victory of Socialist revolution. The N. E. P. period in the Soviet Union, and that of controlled capitalism and state capitalism, were only possible after the victory of Socialist revolution. The Russian Communists, in aiming for this revolution, never concealed its character or confused it with bourgeois-democratic revolution. On the contrary, they pointed out the fundamental difference in character and historical sequence of these two kinds of revolution. During the earlier bourgeois-revolutionary revolution they made heroic sacrifices for decades, following a clear and distinct revolutionary theory about the aims and possibilities open to the democratic forces within the frame of bourgeois revolution. The theory of the Chinese Communists is in no way different. They have always aimed at the realization of the national bourgeois-democratic revolution, which is the only one within the scope of historical realism in China today. It is true that their party program represents not only "something more," but very much more. The propaganda for their final aims will always express this aim, which is confined to the direct interests of the workers and poor peasantry and does not apply to the interests of the broad democratic front of a national bourgeois revolution. Any attempt, open or covert, to introduce the struggle for this "something more" during the fight for bourgeois national revolution would mean the isolation of the proletariat and the Communists from the national and democratic revolutionary front. This has been further emphasized by the new developments of which Snow speaks. The Chinese bourgeois revolution, aiming at unification, centralization and the national independence of China, as well as at peasant liberation and democratic victory, means the revolutionary creation of a modern state. As such it is distinctly different from the later period of struggle to realize Socialist revolution for China.

In 1905 Lenin foresaw that, in the event of the overthrow of Tsarism by the bourgeois-democratic revolution, there would be a long period of democratic rule in Russia with a bourgeois-democratic republic, but under a government of workers and peasants. By 1917, however, the situation had become quite different. The Russian bourgeoisie had by then attained full economic domination, and to a great extent political power also, under the Tsarist regime, which took part in an imperialist aggressive war in the interests of the Russian bourgeoisie. The collapse of Tsarism was thus the beginning of a revolutionary crisis directed against both imperialist war and the rule of the bourgeoisie, and accordingly the belated achievement of peasant liberation offered direct support for the victory of Socialist revolution.

The enormous difference between this and the present revolutionary issue in China is obvious. The main interests of the Chinese nation are still unification, centralization and national independence, which had been attained in Russia long before 1905, by which time the Russian bourgeois landlord regime was suppressing and exploiting other nationalities. Finally, there is in China the

revolutionary bourgeois party and a government created by revolution as well as a very broad mass of small bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, whose aim is complete unification and centralization, and the national identity which is menaced by the imperialist aggressor. In Russia, the revolutionary organization of the workers had already become the only leadership in the bourgeois-democratic revolution against Tsarism. The main problem for Chinese Communists and their main tactical question ever since their existence as a party is, therefore, not competition for leadership but the duty of assuring, as the most conscious of the democratic forces, that the national bourgeois-democratic revolution shall actually proceed under conditions of the broadest possible cooperation and unity of all democratic forces. They must make full use of every possibility of achieving a free China, nationally organized as a democracy of the whole people. Then and only then can the issue of attaining "something more"—social freedom for the proletariat and the poor, led by a powerful working class in an industrialized China—become actual and urgent. There is no doubt that this will finally be attained, for the historical progress of the Chinese nation will not stop with the victory of national bourgeois revolution, but will only proceed more rapidly.

Snow has called me a theorist and he speaks of himself as an amateur. Theory is nothing but knowledge of the essential facts and knowledge of how to apply them. To be an amateur is not an advantage but a handicap, especially for a writer who has done and is doing such valuable work as Edgar Snow in the cause of China's struggle for freedom. I hope he will overcome the handicap—the sooner the better.

"ASIATICUS."

Mr. MORRIS. When did you first meet Frederick V. Field, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think—I am sure it was in 1933 at the Banff conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify before the Tydings committee in 1950 that while you were dealing with Frederick V. Field you did not know him to be a Communist or that you had seen no evidence that he was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume I did. May I see the record on that?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; Tydings committee, page 816. Mr. Lattimore, will you read from page 816. I will give you a copy of the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee a year ago. Page 816, the last paragraph that is completed on the page, the last sentence reading—Do you have it, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Moreover, at that time I had seen no evidence attributing either Communist beliefs or support to Field. I am now told that he was then an active supporter and financial backer of Norman Thomas.

Mr. MORRIS. Now will you read on page 817 the first full paragraph, beginning "Budenz"?

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Budenz has publicly mentioned the names of only two alleged Communists who wrote for Pacific Affairs under my editorship, James S. Allen and Frederick V. Field. These men wrote articles which were published 12 and 13 years ago. At the time that I accepted their articles, however, I had no reason whatever to believe either of them to be a Communist.

Mr. MORRIS. The question, therefore, Mr. Lattimore, is, Did you testify before the Tydings committee in 1950 that while you were dealing with Frederick V. Field you did not know him to be a Communist or that you had seen no evidence that he was a Communist?

Mr. FORTAS. Mr. Chairman, there is a little confusion here. I believe that this says "during this period." May we examine the transcript to see what this period refers to?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; you have a copy there.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the proceedings before the Tydings committee?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I believe it is during your editorship of Pacific Affairs.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your question?

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify before the Tydings committee in 1950 that while you were editor of Pacific Affairs you did not know Frederick V. Field to be a Communist or that you had seen no evidence that he was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify before the Tydings committee that you never believed Field to have been a Communist or to have had vigorous Communist sympathies? Page 888 of the Tydings committee.

Mr. FORTAS. That is during the same period, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. That is a question addressed to you by Senator Hickenlooper, the middle of the page [reading]:

During that association did you believe at any time, or were you reliably informed by Mr. Field—I will put it specifically—by Mr. Field, on information, that Mr. Field was a Communist or had vigorous Communist sympathies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. Quite the contrary. As far as I knew, Mr. Field was a man who had an interest in the economies of the Pacific region, and who was rather a liberal young man. My acquaintance with him, my discussion of political topics with him, was so casual that it was not even—not until the other day did I even learn that he had at one time been a supporter of Mr. Norman Thomas. At that time I didn't know it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right, that is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, I wonder if you will identify this document?

Mr. MANDEL. I have here a handwritten letter on the letterhead of the United States Lines, dated October 22, 1936, addressed to "Dear Fred," signed with a signature, an initial signature.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I offer you a photostatic copy of that letter and ask you if you will identify that signature and that letter as yours.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Mandel, did that come from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, that is, the document of which this is a photostat?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, this is mine.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the first four paragraphs, Mr. Lattimore. We have here a stencil copy which may be easier to read.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, it would be.

The CHAIRMAN. May I have the original, please. I just want to see it a minute.

Mr. FORTAS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you read the first four paragraphs of that letter, please?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

DEAR FRED: One of the first things I did after the tumult and the shouting was to read over the edited version of my Pacific Affairs editorial as a result of which I am now wagging this old gray head.

Your editing of the sentence about the nonexpansive characteristics of the Soviet Union demonstrates that you are a perspicuous political economist but allows also the inference that I am the better editor.

Considering the character of Pacific Affairs the character of most of its readers and also my limited attainments as a writer, I still think there is a good deal to be said for my original version, though not to the point of overriding your decision, if you think there are other arguments more valid than the following:

You defined my sentence, if I remember the phrase, as "describing a characteristic rather than the causes of the characteristic." This was all I had attempted to do. As a reasonably intelligent observer, I can be expected to note a characteristic; but whereas you can define the causes of the characteristic with authority, I could not. Therefore phrases like "imperialistic expansion," and "forces which cause capitalistic nations to seek foreign outlets" read a little out of character over my signature.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read another paragraph, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

Granted the signature, I think the admittedly incomplete phrasing first used is more persuasive, I wrote the piece as a whole with the limited object in view of creating an impression (not a scientific definition), of Japan as a "menace," and I thought this could most effectively done—

I suppose the word "be" is left out—

by carefully avoiding the political-economic vocabulary, which is (again, over my signature) unnecessary for political economists and too assertive—

I suppose that means "assertive"—

for the peural public.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that "puerile public"?

Mr. MORRIS. Would you like to look at the original, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. For the general public; "too assertive for the general public."

Mr. MORRIS. For the general public?

Mr. LATTIMORE. For the general public; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, what did you mean when you said to Mr. Field, "Whereas you can define the causes of the characteristic with authority, I could not."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would have to see the article that was being discussed before I could recall what I was writing about.

Mr. MORRIS. That is all the answer you can give to that question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Apparently, Mr. Lattimore, that was a letter in longhand; was it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. So it wasn't dictated and not read. It was written by you in longhand.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Written by me in longhand.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you identify this document, Mr. Mandel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Can you identify the article I was writing about, Mr. Morris?

The CHAIRMAN. Wait just a minute.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you insert it in the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You asked for it. I will insert it in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 488" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 488

[Handwritten letter]

UNITED STATES LINES

ON BOARD S. S. WASHINGTON

22 Oct. '36.

DEAR FRED: One of the first things I did after the tumult and the shouting was to read over the edited version of my Pacific Affairs editorial, as a result of which I am now wagging this old grey head.

Your editing of the sentence about the non-expansive characteristics of the Soviet Union demonstrates that you are a perspicuous political economist but allows also the inference that I am the better editor.

Considering the character of Pacific Affairs, the character of most of its readers, and also my limited attainments as a writer, I still think there is a good deal to be said for my original version, though not to the point of overriding your decision, if you think there are other arguments more valid than the following:

You defined my sentence, if I remember the phrase, as "describing a characteristic rather than the causes of the characteristic." This was all I had attempted to do. As a reasonably intelligent observer, I can be expected to note a characteristic; but whereas you can define the causes of the characteristic with authority, I could not. Therefore phrases like "imperialistic expansion", and "forces which cause capitalistic nations to seek foreign outlets" read a little out of character over my signature.

Granted the signature, I think the admittedly incomplete phrasing first used is more persuasive, I wrote the piece as a whole with the limited object in view of creating an impression (not a scientific definition) of Japan as a "menace" and the Soviet Union as not a menace, and I thought this could most effectively be done by carefully avoiding the political-economic vocabulary, which is (again, over my signature) unnecessary for political economists and too assertive for the general public.

However, you decide. In any case, there's is need to be urgent to what Catherine will tell you is a Little Brown Girl degree. She needn't get out the cold chisel and mutilate the plates or anything like that.

One of the things I'm going to make an effort at is the stirring up of discussion and controversy that will carry over from number to number and so keep up a livelier interest in *Pacific Affairs*. I'm going to work on this in England, partly to make English subscribers realise that *Pacific Affairs* is not all American and partly to make American readers feel that it isn't just a case of foreigners contributing sedate articles which Americans contribute all the aggressive opinions. My article was intended to open things up, not to close the issue by a too definite and accurate defining of the mainsprings of action. For instance, I might with luck get Peter Fleming to write in saying that perhaps the Soviet Union isn't a menace in Outer Mongolia, but how about Sinkiang? Then we'd be off for a long gallop, because Fleming can draw an accusation that looks pretty good for readers of the *Times*: but he can't sustain it. Maybe he knows that, of course, and won't stick his neck out.

I'm sorry our going away party wasn't a party at all. It was nice of you to turn up in Sholls; but my God, I'd thought I was sending out invitations, and had been looking forward with vulgar enthusiasm to too many drinks too early in the day. A hell of a come-down it turned out to be.

And now what do you think has happened? This damn-fool ship has all kinds of internal immigration restrictions, and I can't get near enough that high-flying but low-living secretary of mine to give her any work to do, and so have to communicate with you by manual labour in this beetle-spoon. At the same, apparently all her family use this captain, so she gets asked up to the bridge for cocktails while we limply plod the deck keeping track of our progeny. Maybe Carter can handle a situation like that, but Jesus, you know me.

This is a swell trip, though. Unbelievably flat seat. Practically no passengers. David is learning to swim in the pool, and demonstrates his Arizona technique on the rockinghorse in the playroom. I can find breezy places where my pipe doesn't start a rush for the lifeboats and read some of the books I've been toting around for months, and work on a review of Chi's book for Karl August's magazine. Have we been in America these last few months? They say so, but you know how these rumours get around.

So long Fred, and don't forget about that magazine. I'm with you in my dim way, and if you'll really send along the dummy, I'd like to try to be of use even in the practical details.

Yours,

(Signed) OWEN LATTIMORE.

MR. MORRIS. I was going to ask Mr. Lattimore what he knows about the article.

MR. LATTIMORE. This is October 22, 1936, and there is something lower down indicating that the article is already at the printers. Let's see, how did our articles run, October or December 1936. Which one I am not sure.

MR. MORRIS. You have Pacific Affairs for 1936 in front of you.

MR. LATTIMORE. This is 1938.

MR. SOURWINE. This is the 1936 volume, Mr. Lattimore. There is an article in September by you, sir.

MR. LATTIMORE. The letter is written in October, apparently about an article that is still to be published.

MR. MORRIS. Let's have the 1937 Pacific Affairs.

MR. LATTIMORE. Let me see if it sounds as if it were the article entitled "Land and Sea and the Destiny of Japan" in the December issue of Pacific Affairs, 1936. Page 586. I think it must be a reference to this article.

MR. MORRIS. When you say "this article," Mr. Lattimore, you mean—

MR. LATTIMORE. "Land and Sea and the Destiny of Japan," Pacific Affairs, December 1936, which is an article about what I called the defensive position of Russia at that time in the Pacific and what I defined as the aggressive position of Japan.

MR. SOURWINE. Does that article contain a reference to the non-expansive characteristics of the Soviet Union? Do you find that? That would be the identifiable feature, would it not?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes. May I read the paragraph.

MR. MORRIS. Yes; please do.

MR. LATTIMORE. I think really to make sense I need to read two paragraphs, page 588:

While, therefore, the rise to continental power of the Soviet Union, not foreseen at the time of the Washington treaties, has now changed the balance of power in Asia, it cannot be said that a "nationalistic rivalry" between the Soviet Union and Japan over colonial regions to be exploited is necessarily implied. The position of the Soviet Union—

Remember, this is 1936—

is defensive while that of Japan is aggressive, and if the Asiatic expansion of Japan cannot be attributed either to "laws" of geographical proximity or to the "realistic" necessities of competing in expansion with the Soviet Union, then the motivating impulse must be looked for in Japan itself. In this connection a Canadian writer has recently pointed out that czarist Russia was expansionist in terms of both trade and political empire while the Soviet Union, because it changed the nature of its internal economy, is not. He then draws attention to the fact that for centuries Japan was not driven toward the mainland of

Asia by any inevitable urge. The energy of expansion appeared when private capital in its western form invested in industry was introduced into Japan, creating a demand for external markets—

This is quoting from the Canadian author—

for the principal reason that the decision as to how the national income shall be spent or invested are made by men who see higher profits in foreign expansion than they do in internal reconstruction.

There is a footnote to an article called *Pacific Problems* and the *IPR*, by F. R. Scott, *Canadian Forum*, Toronto, October 1936.

Mr. SOURWINE. That article as printed does not appear to contain the phrases which in your letter of October 22 to Mr. Frederick Field you indicated were objectionable to you, does it, to wit, the phrases "imperialist expansion" and "forces which cause capitalistic nations to seek foreign outlets"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would have to read through the whole article just to see if they are there.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was going to ask you if you didn't know, as a matter of fact, that your objections prevailed and that they were again eliminated from the article.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Maybe they were, but I didn't know it.

Mr. MORRIS. You say it in your letter, do you not, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I think I say in the letter—

Mr. MORRIS. You say:

Therefore, phrases like "imperialist expansion" and "forces which cause capitalistic nations to seek foreign outlets" read a little out of character over my signature.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right. Because I was not a political economist.

Mr. MORRIS. Then can you answer, what did you mean when you said to Mr. Field in this letter, "whereas you can define the causes of the characteristic with authority, I could not"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I regarded Mr. Field at that time as primarily an economic expert on the Far East.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this second letter I gave you?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations dated October 3, 1939, addressed to Owen Lattimore, typewritten signature Frederick V. Field.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you look at that document, photostatic copy of the document, and tell us whether or not you recall having received such a letter. Will you read that letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. I don't recall the letter at all, but it is obviously one that was written to me and that I received. At least I presume I received it. I will read from the mimeographed copy.

EXHIBIT 489

NEW YORK, October 3, 1939.

DEAR OWEN: I have read your piece called *Third Alternative* on the current policies of the Soviet Union and for once in my life I must admit to having a negative reaction to one of your manuscripts. I have the notion that you are straining arguments, that you are not perfectly sure of your ground, and that you are attempting to project your ideas into the future when no prophecies can now be put to paper, particularly in a journal like *Pacific Affairs*.

To criticize your manuscript in any detail will practically involve me in writing an article myself, and this I am by no means prepared to do. I don't know enough of the answers to write the kind of careful and complete interpretation without which nothing at the moment should, I believe, be put on paper. Partial explanations are likely to be more misleading than enlightening.

If I were to try and work out my own thoughts on Soviet policy I think I should start by attempting to compare the conditions of the present war, the second imperialist war, with those of the first imperialist war.

MR. MORRIS. Excuse me, Mr. Lattimore. That is October 3, 1939, just 1 month after the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, is that right?

MR. LATTIMORE. I accept that.

I should first say that both wars were similar in that they were imperialist wars, in the Marxist sense of the word. I should immediately add, however, that they contained an essential difference, the difference being the concrete existence of the Soviet Union with 21 or 22 years of revolutionary experience now as contrasted with its nonexistence during the first war.

The next step would be, I believe, to recall the slogans of revolutionary groups during the first war; namely, to transfer the imperialist war into a civil war or into a series of civil wars. This object came off only in czarist Russia during the last war, though pretty substantial attempts were made in a number of other countries. I judge that the slogan of the present war is exactly the same, but that again the concreted existence of the Soviet Union makes its application in the present war something quite different than in 1914-18. The problem today from a revolutionary point of view is the same as it was in 1914: The British must get rid of their Chamberlains, the Germans of their Hitlers, the French of their Daladiers. But this time the Soviet Union operates as a powerful and concrete force to aid in these civil war efforts.

In attempting to carry out the civil-war slogan today the Soviet Union is, I believe, working along two hypotheses. The first, which in their minds is by all odds the most desirable but at the same time the most improbable, is an immediate cessation of hostilities, an immediate stopping of the imperialist war. It is, I think the revolutionary belief that the stopping of the war immediately would almost automatically mean the overthrow of the Chamberlain, Daladier, and even Hitler groups, for no one of those rulers could go back to their people who have already been aroused. Even if the people of these countries did not immediately overthrow their rulers as a result of a peace today, the class struggle in all the countries concerned would have been so accentuated as to promise internal democratization as—

Apparently that is a misprint—

at a very early date. The second alternative hypotheses and a more likely one is that there can be no immediate peace and that this imperialist war will be fought out for some time. This will be unfortunate from the revolutionary point of view because workers will be fighting workers; workers are the people who make the armies and who are slaughtered. The historical result, however, will be the inevitable overthrow of ruling groups in all the belligerent countries. There is every probability that the civil-war slogan will succeed over a widespread area.

It is an interesting commentary on Soviet policy during the first month of the war that Hitler apparently went into the war in order to secure Poland and in order to secure domination over the Balkans and the Baltic countries. During the first 4 weeks he had apparently been preceded in every one of these purposes by the Soviet Union. It would also seem to me that the British and French went to war not in order to smash Hitlerism as an end in itself but to smash Hitlerism in order to form a strong European block which would eventually attack communism. What a licking this idea has taken in the first 4 weeks.

I fear that I have written you a very long letter and that what I have said compares unfavorably with your own manuscript which I started out by denouncing. However, I feel that if we can keep our thoughts to the level of discussion and letter writing for a few weeks there will emerge something sufficiently well thought out to warrant publication in Pacific Affairs. Please let me hear from you.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, when you received that letter did you consider that that was evidence that Mr. Fields had vigorous Communist sympathies?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember receiving the letter, and my recollection has been that I began to think that Mr. Field was a close fellow traveler of the Russians at the time of the American Peace Mobilization, which I think was 1941, wasn't it? But judging from this letter, my memory was in error by about 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. This letter has not been admitted in evidence. Do you wish it to be?

Mr. MORRIS. Will you receive that into evidence, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received in evidence.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 489" and was read in full.)

Mr. MORRIS. You were editor of Pacific Affairs on October 3, 1939, were you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you testify before the Tydings committee that you did not have a desk in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Lauchlin Currie?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a close associate of Lauchlin Currie?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I would not say close. My work brought me into considerable contact with him for a very short period.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you in fact have an office in the State Department Building with Lauchlin Currie?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had the use of one room of Mr. Currie's offices in that building.

Mr. MORRIS. To what extent did you establish yourself in that office?

Mr. LATTIMORE. To the best of my recollection, I was living in Baltimore, came over to Washington occasionally, had the use of that room and I suppose it would be one of the extensions of Mr. Currie's phone or a phone in his office. I don't believe I kept files there.

Mr. MORRIS. How often did you use that office?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is impossible for me to recall clearly now, but I should say probably several days a week.

Mr. MORRIS. For what period of time?

Senator O'CONNOR. Several days a week, over what period of time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I got back from China about, I think, the beginning of March 1942 and went back to China in the late summer. Part of that time I was not much in Washington because when I first came back I had rather bad dysentery from living in Chungking, and later in the summer in the hot weather I had a recurrence of it. But I don't remember the exact period.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the period during which you occupied the office in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the period in which I used that office when I was in Washington, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question propounded to you.

Senator O'CONNOR. It would be accurate to say you used it several times a week over a period of 4 or 5 or 6 months?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you there regularly every day or nearly every day?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I was. I think it was usually 2 or 3 times a week.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you make a practice of being there as regularly as your health would permit?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I was supposed to be home partly on leave, but also the Generalissimo requested me to familiarize myself with the work of the various agencies in Washington that were concerned with aid to China. So when some question of aid to China was up, I was likely to be in Washington more consecutively, and there would be lulls when I spent most of my time at home.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't, then, count this office in the State Department Building as one that you went to regularly, that you intended to go to as regularly as your health would permit?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wouldn't consider that I went to that building on any regular schedule, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Nor stayed there any regular hours?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Nor stayed there any regular hours.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, on whose recommendation were you proposed to the Generalissimo as an assistant?

Mr. LATTIMORE. President Roosevelt.

Senator O'CONNOR. And from whom did he receive the recommendation, if you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The only one I know was—let me think. I think I was asked to submit two names, and I submitted the names of Admiral Yarnell and President Isaiah Bowman, of Johns Hopkins. I believe President Bowman was the only one he consulted.

Senator O'CONNOR. You don't know who suggested your name to President Roosevelt?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I never knew that. As I said at the time of the Tydings hearing, I perhaps a little vainly simply took it for granted that if people were looking for somebody in the far-eastern field, my name would naturally be one of those considered.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony, Mr. Lattimore, that you never told anybody that Lauchlin Currie had arranged for that appointment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Arranged that appointment?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It depends on how you mean arranged the appointment. He arranged the appointment for me to see the President, but I don't believe he arranged to have me appointed as adviser.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever tell anybody that he had arranged to have you appointed as adviser?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think so.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, do you recall testifying in executive session before this committee that your use of Currie's office was so irregular and so infrequent that it would be impossible to characterize it any other way, other than the way you have just described it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As irregular and infrequent? That is approximately as I have described it just now, isn't it?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. Mandel, will you identify this letter, please?

MR. MANDEL. It is a photostat—

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't had an answer to that last question.

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; that is the way I testified.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

MR. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a copy of a letter, the copy being from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 12, 1942, addressed to "Dear Mr. Kizer," and the typewritten signature "Owen Lattimore."

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you look at that letter and see if you can recall having written it?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; I wrote this.

MR. MORRIS. Will you read the last paragraph, please.

MR. LATTIMORE. The last paragraph:

My home address is as typed above, and my home telephone is Towson S46-W. I am in Washington about 4 days a week, and when there can always be reached at Lauchlin Currie's office, room 228, State Department Building; telephone National 1414, extension 90.

Yours very sincerely,

OWEN LATTIMORE.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you testify in executive session that you never at any time at the request of Lauchlin Currie took care of his correspondence at the White House while he was away?

MR. LATTIMORE. I may have. May I see it? That would certainly be my recollection now.

MR. MORRIS. Page 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN, may this be received in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be received in the record, having been identified.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 490" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 490

RUXTON, MD., *June 12, 1942.*

DEAR MR. KIZER: Your letter of May 23, for a small but weight-carrying committee to head up American interest in China, during the war and during the negotiation of peace, is one that interests me very much. I think your suggestion of Judge Schwellenbach to head the committee is positively brilliant.

I hope that you will soon in fact be in Washington, as your letter half prophesies. It would be easy to talk out such a project more quickly and thoroughly than it could be done by letter.

My home address is as typed above, and my home telephone is Towson S46-W. I am in Washington about 4 days a week, and when there can always be reached at Lauchlin Currie's office, room 228, State Department Building; telephone National 1414, extension 90.

Yours very sincerely,

OWEN LATTIMORE.

MR. LATTIMORE. That is what I stated, and that is my recollection now.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this letter, please?

MR. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations dated July 15, 1942, marked "W. W. L., and W. L. H., Strictly Confidential, The White House, Washington," addressed to Mr. Edward C. Carter, and the typewritten signature is Owen Lattimore.

MR. MORRIS. Will you look at that letter, Mr. Lattimore, and tell us whether you can recall having sent that letter?

MR. LATTIMORE. No; I evidently sent it, but I don't recall it.

Mr. MORRIS. Will that be admitted into the record, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It may be admitted into the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the first paragraph of that letter, please?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

DEAR CARTER: Currie asked me to take care of his correspondence while he is away and in view of your telegram of today, I think I had better tell you that he has gone to China on a special trip. This news is absolutely confidential until released in the press.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 491," and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 491

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 15, 1942.

Confidential.

Mr. EDWARD C. CARTER,
Institute of Pacific Relations.

DEAR CARTER: Currie asked me to take care of his correspondence while he is away and in view of your telegram of today, I think I had better tell you that he has gone to China on a special trip. This news is absolutely confidential until released in the press.

In view of the fact that all kinds of delay in travel are likely to occur, August 22 and 23 would be a more likely date for him than August 15 and 16. The later date would also suit me better.

As to a place for the meeting, I imagine that Princeton is the best, in spite of certain inconveniences. Considering the people you are going to have, if you held the meeting in either New York or Washington, too many of them will be interrupted all the time or hauled right out of the meeting.

In your list of suggested attendants at the meeting, James Shoemaker would probably be a better representative of the Board of Economic Warfare than W. T. Stone. I knew that it is a bad thing to suggest too many people for a conference of this kind, but a name that might interest you is that of Gordon Bowles, who is now also with the Board of Economic Warfare. He has been with them so short a time that as far as representing the Board is concerned, he could not compare with Shoemaker. He would be valuable, however, for his knowledge of Japan, Korea, and parts of India. You have probably known him longer than I have, but just in case you should not know him, I might say briefly that he is the son of a very famous Quaker missionary in Tokyo and was partly educated in Japanese schools and in the Tokyo Imperial University.

Your tentative agenda seems to me quite adequate in general coverage and as specific as it can be made when we shall be discussing a very fluid situation which makes it difficult to define in advance the most important subjects of discussion. One minor comment that occurs to me is that under Paragraph 8 you mention individually the Philippines, Thailand, Korea, and India, but not Malaya, Netherlands India, or Indochina.

Yours very sincerely,

[S] OWEN LATTIMORE.

Mr. MORRIS. Did the top officials of the State Department—

Mr. FORTAS. Excuse me just a moment, Mr. Morris.

(Mr. Lattimore conferred with counsel.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Morris, I should like to add to what I have just said that this refreshes my recollection and that I believe that Currie told his secretary to open his mail and to pass on to me anything that might be of concern to me.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I am asking you if you can reconcile the statement you have just made with your testimony in executive session which reads as follows—

The CHAIRMAN. The page?

Mr. MORRIS. Page 26:

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, isn't it a fact that when Currie went away for a period of time he would ask you to take care of his mail at the White House?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. When I was back on leave from China in the summer of 1942 Mr. Currie allowed me to use an outer office attached to his office.

Mr. MORRIS. What do you mean allowed you to use it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He said there was an empty office there with a desk and a chair in it, and I was living in Ruxton and when I came over to Washington and had appointments to see people, and so forth, I used that as the place where I hung my hat.

Mr. MORRIS. Tell me this, Mr. Lattimore. Is it your testimony that you did not at the request of Lauchlin Currie take care of his mail at the White House when he was away?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That certainly is my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, will you please read that paragraph that you read in that letter? Read it out loud.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Currie asked me to take care of his correspondence while he is away and in view of your telegram of today, I think I had better tell you that he has gone to China on a special trip. This news is absolutely confidential until released in the press.

Obviously my memory was inaccurate.

Mr. MORRIS. That is written on White House stationery, is it Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, dictated to Lauchlin Currie's secretary.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with the testimony before this committee that Lauchlin Currie aided an espionage ring in Washington during the war?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't remember seeing that.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you read Miss Bentley's testimony to that effect?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I didn't.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony you have not read all of the published hearings of this committee, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I haven't read all of them.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with the testimony before this committee that Lauchlin Currie had informed agents of an espionage ring that the United States was about to break the Soviet code?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't remember reading that. Oh, I think I have read that in the press, but I don't remember reading it in the transcript.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this letter, please.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated October 27, 1942, addressed to Joseph Barnes, typewritten signature Edward C. Carter.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is previous exhibit No. 103, and I would like to read it into the record in connection with the testimony of Mr. Lattimore at this time in connection with his association with Currie.

The CHAIRMAN. In this hearing?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, sir. Mr. Carter in this letter writes as follows:

DEAR JOE: Recently in Washington, Lauchlin Currie expressed to me the hope that some day soon when you are in Washington you would give him the privilege of a private talk. As you know, he is an intimate friend and admirer of Owen Lattimore and has himself made two visits to Chungking. You and he

would find a great deal in common, not only in matters Chinese, but in affairs elsewhere. I do hope that you can see him soon.

His office is in the State Department Building, but you reach him through the White House exchange.

I read that in connection with Mr. Lattimore's answer on the extent to which he knew Mr. Lauchlin Currie.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was read in full and has previously been marked Exhibit No. 103.)

Mr. MORRIS. I believe Mr. Sourwine has a question.

Senator SMITH. May I ask one question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lattimore, this letter is written to Mr. Joseph Barnes. You knew Mr. Barnes, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I have known Mr. Barnes since 1934.

Senator SMITH. You and he were friends, were you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We were and are very good friends.

Senator SMITH. This may be entirely erroneous, but some suggestion was made that he was a kinsman of yours. Is he, or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Was a what?

Senator SMITH. Kinsman, a cousin. I want to clear that up, either way.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes?

Senator SMITH. Someone said, I believe, that your mother was a Barnes and this man was kin to you. Is there anything to that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether there is anything to it or not.

Senator SMITH. At least we got that part cleared up.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, during the period when you had the office of desk space in the White House Annex that you described, did you have access to confidential information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I did.

The CHAIRMAN. State Department, as I understand it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. State Department. No; I don't think I did. I might have if Currie showed me State Department material bearing on something that he was doing for the President in connection with aid to China, but my memory is absolutely unclear on that subject.

Senator O'CONNOR. Did he show you such material?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have just said I may have, but I have no clear recollection at all on the subject.

Senator O'CONNOR. You do refer to the information that you were sending to Mr. Carter as confidential. You knew that the nature of his trip was one which couldn't be made public.

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I said in the letter there, I didn't want to take the responsibility of broadcasting it that he had gone on a trip until it was in the press. May I add the reason for that?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The reason for that was, of course, a military security reason because when people were going to China, flying in over the hump it was extremely dangerous. The flying itself was dangerous enough. Japanese fighters were within range. It was considered advisable to avoid any tip-offs that might set the Japanese watching for chances to shoot down planes at a particular interval of time.

Senator O'CONNOR. Did it come as any surprise to you in the more recent past that he was accused of having been in league with a Soviet espionage ring?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It came to me as a complete surprise, a shocking surprise. I don't believe it. I can't believe it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Sourwine has a question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, if we might revert to the letter under date of October 3, written to you by Mr. Frederick V. Field, which referred to your piece called Third Alternative.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes?

Mr. SOURWINE. On the current policies of the Soviet Union. That would be the then current policies, wouldn't it, as of 1939?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall anything about that piece, "Third Alternative"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't recall at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether it was ever published in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't know. I might be able to look it up. Just a minute. I have a list here of my own contributions.

I don't see it here; no. I must say I don't remember writing such a piece.

Mr. SOURWINE. Undoubtedly you had written something or Mr. Field wouldn't have been criticizing it, is that not true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Undoubtedly I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are not suggesting you didn't write the piece? You are stating now that you simply don't remember writing it or what was in it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were editor of Pacific Affairs at this time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why was it that Mr. Field was telling you that if you and he kept your thoughts to the level of discussion and letter writing for a few weeks there will emerge something sufficiently well thought out to warrant publication in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can only infer from that wording—I don't remember the circumstances at all—that the question was putting in some kind of article in Pacific Affairs at the beginning of the war in Europe.

Mr. SOURWINE. I mean, sir, did Mr. Field have a veto power over what went into Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; he didn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why did you submit material to him before deciding whether it would go in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Field was at that time secretary of the American IPR. Since it was our general practice to circulate things that appeared in Pacific Affairs to various people for criticism and comment before publication, I, as editor, thought that I should receive the same treatment. So when I wrote an article I sent it in to the assistant editor in New York, and she was free to circulate it to all and sundry.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean that this article was not sent by you to Mr. Field—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I doubt it very much.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see. Would you say that Mr. Field had no responsibility for the editorial content of Pacific Affairs and had no authority with regard to what went into the magazine?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say the answer to that would be different in different years.

Mr. SOURWINE. Let's talk about this year, 1939.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would have to look it up, because at different times various people were listed as consultant-editors of Pacific Affairs representing the various national councils. Sometimes that would be for the American, and sometimes that would be the Secretary of the American council, and sometimes I believe it would be somebody else.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is the year in which you have testified Mr. Field was secretary of the American council?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; but I think we could settle that very quickly by looking at the masthead for 1939 and seeing who is listed, if anybody. In fact, I am not sure that all the time we edited Pacific Affairs we had that system. We may have started out with that system and then discarded it, and my memory is not clear on it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you think this letter indicates that Mr. Field both has and is exercising a certain measure of editorial authority?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't. I think Mr. Field is expressing his personal opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked that a copy of Pacific Affairs for some month in 1939 be sent for, and when we get it I would like permission to revert and get an answer to that one question. Otherwise, that concludes my line of questioning on that point.

Mr. MORRIS. May we have another letter introduced into the record, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Mandel, will you identify that letter, please.

Mr. MANDEL. There is a photostatic copy of a handwritten letter on the letterhead of Pacific Affairs, addressed to Frederick V. Field and signed with the same initials with which the previous letter has been signed and identified by Mr. Lattimore. It is dated September 27, 1935 sent from 33 Ta Yuan Fu Hu Tung, Peiping, and is taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can it be handed to Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. MORRIS. That is a photostat of the original?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; this is obviously mine.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may it be received in the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. When the witness said it is obviously mine, do you mean it is a letter which you wrote and in your handwriting?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is dated at Peiping, September 27, 1935.

DEAR FRED: After getting back here—

The CHAIRMAN. Who is referred to by "Dear Fred"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The letter is to F. V. Field, New York office.

EXHIBIT 492

DEAR FRED: After getting back here I read your summary of the movements of the Communist armies in China, which I read with very great interest. I am sorry that I cannot offer very much in the way of comment you request. Particular comment is ruled out because I have not read more than a fraction of the newspaper reports you have gone through. All I can say is that if I had gone through all the reports, I am sure I could not have reduced them to so clear a summary statement..

As for general comment, probably all that I could offer is already contained in the editorial article I had already sent forward for Pacific Affairs, which you have probably read by now.

Half an hour ago I received your letter of 4th September (which made pretty good time) and I have already gone over the enclosures. I found Hansu Chan's retort to Isaacs very interesting—

Mr. MORRIS. Is that Hansu Chan, Dr. Chi?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It has been so stated before this committee, I believe. I don't know [reading]:

but here again I should not like to venture a detailed comment, or even a summary for print. For this also, anything that I could commit myself to signing is in the editorial already sent.

I am certainly not the man to risk summarizing so closely worded an argument, because my knowledge of Communist controversy is so limited that I should be quite capable of giving a Trotskyist summary of a Stalinist plenic. I could probably do it the other way round just as easily. Moreover I have just been traveling with Wittfogel who, as you probably know and I dimly suspect, is a bit of a heretic from either the Stalinist or the Trotskyist point of view when it comes to the bourgeois feudal controversy over the nature of Chinese society, so I am in a complete fog.

In the editorial referred to I did try to take into consideration some of the points raised by Isaacs, but I did not refer directly to his article because, once more, of lack of confidence in my own understanding of the controversial issues. Anyhow that article is as far as I should care to go for the present.

What I should like to suggest is that you yourself summarize the Hansu Chan article, in the manner you suggested for me. You are far more competent than I, and since the reply appeared in America and you are the American corresponding editor, your position entitles you to sign the notice. You could do it in such a manner as not to draw any accusation of official American IPR approval of the Stalinist view. (Your Survey article was a masterpiece of detached statement.)

There is an appalling accumulation of work here, but I'll be writing again when I have thrown some of it over my shoulder.

Yours,

O. L.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I put that in the record in connection with the series of questions on whether or not Mr. Lattimore knew that Mr. Field was a Communist while he was editor of Pacific Affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has it been received?

The CHAIRMAN. It is received and inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 492" and was read in full.)

Mr. SOURWINE. To clear this up, here is the June 1939 copy of Pacific Affairs. Can you say now the extent of the editorial authority or responsibility that Mr. Field had at that time in that year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. We got the wrong issue. It is torn here.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am sorry. Try this one.

Mr. LATTIMORE. This seems to confirm my memory that in the latter years of my editorship of Pacific Affairs there were no national editorial—what would you call them—correspondents or something of that kind as such. All that is listed here is the national secretary, and I am simply listed as editor. I believe that in the earlier years we did have national corresponding editors.

Mr. SOURWINE. What issue is that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is September 1939.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are talking about the year 1939, aren't we?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. In that year 1939 you are saying now in that year 1939 there were no corresponding editors.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Apparently not.

Mr. SOURWINE. And therefore Mr. Field had what degree of editorial responsibility and authority?

Mr. LATTIMORE. None.

Mr. SOURWINE. In this letter which you have just read, of 1935, you did refer to Mr. Field as the American corresponding editor or words to that effect, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did. I believe in earlier years we had such a system.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Mr. Field in 1935 secretary of the American IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was in 1939?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think so. We can confirm that in a moment. I am not sure of the year when he resigned.

Mr. SOURWINE. I hope I haven't handed you the one with the torn page.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; you have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Sorry.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Of the United States, yes, Field was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was secretary of the American IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 1939.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are saying, however, that notwithstanding that fact, Mr. Field did not in 1939 have any editorial responsibility or authority with regard to Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you are stating in this letter of October 3 to you which has been read and discussed, which starts out with a reference to your piece called Third Alternative, that in your opinion Mr. Field was not attempting to exert or express any editorial authority or responsibility?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In my opinion, he was probably one of several people to whom an article had been sent for prepublication criticism.

Mr. FORTAS. Is this a good time for a recess?

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder. Senator Smith, do you have to go away tonight?

Senator SMITH. Not right away.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ferguson is not here. I would like to have more in attendance, if it was possible.

Mr. SOURWINE. Could you recess for 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. I was thinking of recessing for the day. Would that be satisfactory?

Senator SMITH. Yes. It suits me.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator O'Connor.

Senator O'CONNOR. Whatever you say, Mr. Chairman. I would be glad to stay.

Mr. FORTAS. Before you recess for today, may I note the appearance here of my partner, Thurman Arnold, as counsel for Mr. Lattimore, since I may have to be absent from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. We will reconvene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and continue.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m. Saturday, March 1, 1952.)

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 10:15 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 424, Senate Office Building, Hon. Pat McCarran (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran, O'Connor, Smith, Ferguson, and Watkins.

Also present: Senators McCarthy and Mundt.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE, ACCOMPANIED BY THURMAN ARNOLD, COUNSEL—Resumed

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to request the introduction into evidence of Mr. Lattimore's testimony at executive session, about which he was questioned yesterday, the entire testimony, that is.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be dealt with at a later time.

You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, was John K. Fairbank a subordinate of yours in the Office of War Information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Was he what?

Mr. MORRIS. A subordinate of yours while you were director of Pacific Affairs in the Office of War Information.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe he was. The records would show.

Mr. MORRIS. What was his position in the Office of War Information?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am rather vague what his position was. He was never as I recall a direct subordinate of mine.

Mr. MORRIS. He was not head of the China Division?

Mr. LATTIMORE. If he was, I think it must have been after I ceased to be Deputy Director of Pacific Operations.

Senator FERGUSON. What was the date of that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that was in 1944. I don't recall exactly when I ceased to be Deputy Director, but remained in contact with the OWI as a consultant.

Senator FERGUSON. How long were you a consultant, up to what time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Into 1945, I think.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know the time in 1945?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't recall exactly. I am sure the records will show.

Senator FERGUSON. Speaking of subordinates, could I inquire into another matter, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Who was the subordinate, you or Mr. Field, in the IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Neither.

Senator FERGUSON. On a equal basis?

Mr. LATTIMORE. On a totally different basis. I was an employee of the Pacific Council, and he was an employee of the American Council.

Senator FERGUSON. I notice in some of these letters that you were exchanging opinions, that is, as to criticism of articles, whether they went in a certain way.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; those were purely on an individual basis.

Senator FERGUSON. Rather than as employees or supervisors?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know that John K. Fairbank used the White House as his mailing address?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't know that, unless I read it in the press since these hearings began, but I don't recall it.

Mr. MORRIS. So you would not know then that he used as his return address, care of Mr. Lauchlin Currie, care of the White House, Washington, D. C.?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't think I ever knew that.

Mr. MORRIS. At this time, Mr. Chairman, may I make reference at this part of the record to exhibit 129 introduced in our open hearings of August 16, 1951, which shows a letter by John K. Fairbank, return address care of Mr. Lauchlin Currie, the White House, Washington, D. C. That is in the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Michael Greenberg your successor at Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe he was. When I resigned as editor—and my recollection is I didn't have anything to do with it—but my recollection since looking up old issues of Pacific Affairs is that he became managing editor or something of that kind I think Mr. Holland became the actual editor.

Mr. MORRIS. I have the first volume after your retirement, Mr. Lattimore, which is the September 1941 volume and that lists "editor, Edward C. Carter, managing editor, Michael Greenberg."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, that would be correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with the testimony before this committee by several witnesses that Michael Greenberg was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I have seen that in the transcript.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Michael Greenberg working for Mr. Currie at the White House at the time you were there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not at the time I was there, I don't think.

Mr. MORRIS. He came along later, is that it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe so; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have in the record at this time the executive session testimony of Mr. Stanley Hornbeck on the question of Mr. Currie and Mr. Lattimore.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; produce it.

Mr. MORRIS. It is two pages, and I would like to read it into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. This is the testimony of Stanley K. Hornbeck, taken February 15, 1952. It reads:

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Hornbeck, have you ever been sworn in this hearing?

Mr. HORNBECK. No.

Senator FERGUSON. All right. Do you solemnly swear that in the matter now pending before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HORNBECK. I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Dr. Hornbeck, will you state your full name?

Mr. HORNBECK. Stanley K. Hornbeck.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Hornbeck, what is your present address?

Mr. HORNBECK. 2139 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Senator FERGUSON. Dr. Hornbeck, have you been subpoenaed to come here this morning?

Mr. HORNBECK. I have.

Senator FERGUSON. By the committee?

Mr. HORNBECK. Yes; by the committee.

Senator FERGUSON. And you are here in response to that subpoena?

Mr. HORNBECK. I am.

Senator FERGUSON. And therefore you have been sworn as a witness in this hearing?

Mr. HORNBECK. That is right, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. You may proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Hornbeck, how long were you associated with the United States Department of State?

Mr. HORNBECK. My service in the United States Department of State was in two periods: First, in the Office of Economic Adviser from 1921 to 1924; second, from 1928 continuously to 1944. In the second period I was from 1928 to 1937 Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs; from 1937 to January 15, 1944, adviser on political relations; from then until May 1, 1944, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs; and from then until September 21, 1944, special assistant to the Secretary of State.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recall a conversation in 1941 that you had with Mr. Lauchlin Currie in connection with the appointment which was about to be made of Owen Lattimore as special adviser to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. HORNBECK. I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us about it?

Mr. HORNBECK. In 1941, shortly before Mr. Owen Lattimore went to China as adviser to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Mr. Lauchlin Currie came, on his initiative, to me in my office in the old State, War, and Navy Building. Mr. Currie was at that time one of the several anonymous assistants to the President, Mr. Roosevelt, and in that capacity he had concern, interalia, with questions of United States relations with and regarding China.

On the occasion of this call, Mr. Currie said that he wished to inform me that Chiang Kai-shek had asked President Roosevelt to nominate an American national to be an adviser to him, Chiang, and that President Roosevelt was nominating Mr. Owen Lattimore.

I inquired whether President Roosevelt had consulted the Secretary of State. Mr. Currie replied in the negative.

I expressed doubt whether an assumption by the President of responsibility for such a nomination was a wise procedure and whether the nomination of Mr. Lattimore was a suitable nomination.

I made reference to a procedure which has been followed over a period of many years in the nominating of a series of very able American advisers to the Government of Siam (Thailand), and I asked who had suggested to President Roosevelt the nomination of Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. Currie replied that he, Currie, had. I said that in that case it should be an easy matter to effect a reconsideration. Mr. Currie said that he was sure that President Roosevelt's action had been appropriate, that he was confident that the nomination was a suitable nomination, and that, in any event, there could be no reconsideration inasmuch as the nomination had already been sent to Chiang Kai-shek * * *.

To that extent I would like to have the executive session minutes of Mr. Hornbeck introduced into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone want anything further in this record introduced?

Mr. ARNOLD. May I look at it?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. There is something on another page if you like you may put in the record.

Mr. ARNOLD. I will read it over first.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, on yesterday, I inquired as to whether or not you knew who had proposed your name to President Roosevelt for appointment as adviser to the Generalissimo, and a question or two was asked with respect to Mr. Lauchlin Currie.

Did you know of any consultation had by the President with the Department of State prior to your designation as adviser?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I ever heard of anything of the kind.

Senator O'CONNOR. Did it occur to you it was important to know whether or not the recommendation was or was not approved by the Secretary of State?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. At that time I was so unfamiliar with the workings of the Government that I would not have known anything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, do you say that on yesterday you asked him who had recommended him, and that he said he did not know?

Senator O'CONNOR. No, I did not give the answer. I said I asked him certain questions with respect to who had recommended him to the President for appointment as adviser to the Generalissimo. I did not state what his answer was.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he say then Lauchlin Currie? You said so this morning; that is the reason I am asking you.

Senator O'CONNOR. No; I did not so intend to say.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to clear up.

Senator O'CONNOR. I am obliged to you for clearing the record, Mr. Chairman. I do not think you said that. Your response did not indicate that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I did not.

Senator O'CONNOR. I said there had been a series of questions asked after with respect to Lauchlin Currie, but I did not mean to say you had made any response, and your answer indicated you had not.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator O'CONNOR. Was there any discussion whatsoever as to the participation of the Secretary of State in the designation or in the recommendation for your appointment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Between me and somebody else?

Senator O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, who first notified you or contacted you in relation to this appointment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection on that is very clear, Senator. I came to my office at the Johns Hopkins one morning and was told that there was a White House call for me. So, I answered that call, put it back through the operator, and the man at the other end said, "This is Lauchlin Currie, Assistant to the President. Could you come over and see me?" And he made an appointment, and I went over to see him.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the first that you knew of Lauchlin Currie?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not believe I had ever heard of him before.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, being a White House call, you remembered who called you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was also the first time I ever had a message to call the White House.

Senator FERGUSON. I can see the reason for your remembering. Did Mr. Currie ask you what your experience was or anything?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think he did in a general way; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Did he indicate that it was all accomplished; that you were really being asked, or was he just asking you, if they asked you, would you consider it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was the nature of the interview; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. That if they asked you—

Mr. LATTIMORE. If I were asked, would I be available.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk to the President at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that I did not talk to the President until after one or two more interviews with Mr. Currie. I didn't talk to the President until my name had gone in and the President was prepared to accept it.

Senator FERGUSON. So, your conversations with Mr. Currie, I assume, were along the line of what your experience had been, and so forth?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume that was what it was. I haven't any notice of those conversations.

Senator FERGUSON. So, you have every reason to believe that Mr. Currie did recommend your appointment, because you had not talked to the President before it was actually sent in, as you say, accomplished.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether that would constitute a recommendation. I don't even know whether Mr. Currie sent in more than one name.

Senator FERGUSON. I did not ask that.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this committee has been unable to subpoena Mr. Currie. Is that correct, counsel?

Mr. MORRIS. Pardon?

Senator FERGUSON. It has been impossible for the committee to subpoena Mr. Currie?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Currie is in South America, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. That is the reason I would like to ask the Chair this morning to write or wire Mr. Currie; and I know he is not subject to the subpoena, being out of the country, but to request his appearance before this committee. He is named so many times

in relation to this IPR that I just feel to complete the testimony we ought to do everything we can to have Mr. Currie come back.

The CHAIRMAN. We will see that that is done right away. That will be the order.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, do you recall the date of the call from the White House?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't recall the exact date.

Senator SMITH. Do you have a record, or do you recall the date that you came over to see Mr. Currie? Was it that day or the following day?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no record of it, and no exact recollection. I do not know whether it was the next day or the day after. It was very soon.

Senator SMITH. Do you recall the month? What is the nearest date that you can pin it down to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think it was probably June 1941.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, may I read into the record the next sentence which follows [referring to executive session testimony of Stanley K. Hornbeck].

The CHAIRMAN. That which was read by counsel?

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. ARNOLD (reading):

It may be noted in the sketch of Mr. Lattimore which appears in Who's Who in America that Mr. Lattimore is stated to have been political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, 1941-42.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, would this be a good place to clear up a point that is a little bit uncertain in earlier questioning this morning?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that is the position held by Mr. John K. Fairbank with the United States Information Service in China. I hold in my hand a bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air, the December 6, 1949, broadcast, being the five hundred and eighty-ninth broadcast. This appears to be a transcript of the broadcast and is published as such by Town Hall, Inc., and it indicates on page 8 at the bottom of the page and running to the top of the next page that Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., who was moderator, introduced Dr. John K. Fairbank as—

Professor of history at Harvard University, who served as special assistant to the American Ambassador in China in 1942 and 1943, who as Director of the United States Information Service in China in 1945 and 1946, and is the author of many books, among them The United States and China. We take pleasure in welcoming back to Town Hall Dr. John K. Fairbank.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that that paragraph of introduction may be placed in the record at this point, and then I would like to ask Mr. Lattimore does that refresh your memory at all with regard to the post that Dr. Fairbank held?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It doesn't exactly refresh my memory. It takes the place of my memory. I might say that the United States Information Service in Chungking was, to the best of my recollection, under the Embassy, although it used and distributed materials from the

Office of War Information. It was a complicated bureaucratic set-up there in which Office of War Information operated in the United States, but by this time, I think, American personnel, all American nonmilitary personnel of various kinds, were coordinated under the Embassy, and under the authority of the Embassy.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you with OWI in 1945 and 1946?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1945-46, a part of 1945 I may have still been with them as a consultant.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say that this does not indicate in any way that Mr. Fairbank was ever your subordinate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Say "Yes." Let us clear that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would say it does not indicate that he was my subordinate.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter will be inserted in the record. I think, if I were to be technical about it, it does not have a place in the record. It goes to the weight rather than the admissibility of it. But it will go into the record. The question is whether the party who made the statement knew what he was talking about at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, so the record may show, this was offered to refresh the witness' memory, not as evidence.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, were you and John K. Fairbank and Alger Hiss frequent associates?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you, Mr. Fairbank, and Mr. Hiss together at any time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever invite Alger Hiss to your home?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have that last question read again, to the witness.

(The question was read by the reporter as follows:)

Were you, Mr. Fairbank, and Mr. Hiss together at any time?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want the answer to stand to that as "No"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That Mr. Hiss, Mr. Fairbank, and I were ever together?

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question again to the witness.

(The question was reread by the reporter.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever invite Alger Hiss to your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did. At the time that is was reported in the press that Mr. Hiss was coming to Baltimore to initiate a libel action, I wrote to him and asked him to stay with us if he so desired.

I might add that, just a few months before that, Mr. Hiss had been given an honorary degree at my university, and I thought it was an ordinary courtesy to offer.

Senator FERGUSON. What was the day or the year that this happened, that you invited him to come to your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall the year. It could be verified from the press, of course.

Senator FERGUSON. The libel action was against Chambers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe so; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. At that particular time, there had been quite a bit of newspaper publicity of Chambers' testimony against Hiss: that he was a Communist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall in detail. I suppose that is true.

Senator FERGUSON. Wait a minute. You just suppose that is true. Let us get a little more definite. Did you not know it was true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't recall exactly how much I had read in the press at that time. I can't recall the date exactly. I could look it up or anybody could look it up. It would be in the press at the time.

Senator FERGUSON. I am not talking about looking it up. What I want to know is what you knew. You say that you saw in the press that he was starting an action in the Federal court, and who was the action against?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The action was against Whittaker Chambers.

Senator FERGUSON. And it would be assumed by you—would it not—that the action was by Hiss against Chambers in relation to Chambers' testimony, and his statement on the radio backing up his testimony?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't remember that much in detail. My present recollection, Senator, is that the Chambers charges against Hiss came out, so to speak, in progressive steps, and I can't remember how much had come out at that time.

Senator FERGUSON. Was there any doubt in your mind, when you invited Mr. Hiss to your home to stay, that he had been accused as a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He had been accused of something serious—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, "Was there any doubt in your mind?"

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can't remember what was in my mind at the time, Senator. My present recollection is that he had by then been accused of something serious enough to make him initiate a libel action. But exactly what the accusation was at that stage, I don't remember now.

Senator FERGUSON. Had he not been also accused by sworn testimony that he had removed papers from the files of the State Department and given them to unauthorized Communist sources.

Mr. LATTIMORE. My present recollection, Senator, doesn't carry that much detail.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not getting answers to questions on matters that I think a man ought to remember.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not getting the answers.

Senator FERGUSON. Personally, I think a man ought to remember some of the things I am asking. When a man comes to a city, having started an action against another man for libel, and a man invites him to his home to stay with him in his home, he ought to know something about these things.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am sorry, Senator; my memory simply does not measure up to your specifications.

Senator FERGUSON. Is it a blank on this matter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; it is not a blank. I remember that I asked him. I remember that he had been accused of something serious enough to make him initiate a libel action; but, as I say, my present general recollection is that the charges against Hiss came out in successive stages; and, without looking up the newspaper record of the time, I wouldn't be able to say even what I ought to remember as of a particular date.

Senator FERGUSON. How long did he remain at your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He didn't come. He didn't accept the invitation.

Senator FERGUSON. Had you called him on the phone or how did you contact him to come to your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I wrote him a letter, I think. I don't believe I called him on the phone.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you have a copy of that letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I do.

Senator FERGUSON. Will you have your files searched and ascertain if you do have?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely. I have gone through my files, of course, during the past couple of years or so, and I have never seen a letter to that effect, or a carbon of a letter to that effect. I may say that my files are not kept very meticulously.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you write him a letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection is that I wrote him a letter.

Senator FERGUSON. To what address, do you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know. My presumption would be that I wrote to the Department of State. It might be in their files.

Senator FERGUSON. Did the newspaper article say what day he would be at Baltimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't even recall that. I don't recall whether the newspaper said that he would be coming or would be coming on a particular date, or would be coming in the near future.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you talk to him after the day you wrote him the letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. You have never seen him since then?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have never seen him since then.

Senator FERGUSON. And you have not talked to him on the telephone?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I ever did. In fact, I don't believe I ever talked to him on the telephone.

Senator FERGUSON. Even before that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Before or after.

Senator FERGUSON. But you had seen him before that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had seen him occasionally when he was in Mr. Hornbeck's office. He sat in Mr. Hornbeck's outer office, and I would stop and chat with him while waiting for an appointment with Mr. Hornbeck, and then I saw him on the occasion when he received an honorary degree at the Johns Hopkins.

Senator FERGUSON. Did he stay at your home when he received the degree?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; he never stayed at my home.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you class him as a close personal friend prior to that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Can you give a reason why you requested him to come and stay at your home? Was there anything you wanted to talk over with him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; there was nothing particularly I wanted to talk over with him. It was just a general gesture of courtesy.

Senator FERGUSON. How long after you wrote the letter would you say the pumpkin papers appeared in the press?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no recollection.

Senator FERGUSON. You do remember that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I remember they appeared, but the date sequence is beyond me.

Senator WATKINS. I understood the witness to say that he addressed the letter to Mr. Hiss at the Department of State.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think I probably would have.

Senator WATKINS. Was he in the Department of State at that time?

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have a copy of the letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator WATKINS. Just a moment. May I get an answer to that? Do you still say you sent it to him to the Department of State?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I probably sent it to the Department of State. I have just turned to my wife and asked her if she had any supplementary memory, and she says that she thinks at that time Mr. Hiss was no longer with the Department of State, but with the Carnegie Endowment for Peace.

Senator WATKINS. You knew that as a matter of fact he was with the Carnegie Endowment at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It had slipped my memory in answering this question. As I say, my memory of the sequence of dates is very vague. But I should have remembered it, because now that the point has been brought up, I remember that his being given an honorary degree at the Hopkins was more or less on the occasion of his leaving the State Department and taking up the directorship, or whatever it is, of the Carnegie Endowment.

Senator WATKINS. When did that happen? When was this honor conferred on him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think probably about 1946.

Senator WATKINS. That was a long time before the Chambers exposures.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was before the Chambers charges, before any question of libel action, as I recall.

Senator WATKINS. Is this the only occasion that you have ever written to Mr. Hiss?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe it is.

Senator WATKINS. Do you not know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the only one I can recall. I doubt very much if I ever wrote to him on any other occasion. I would not have any reason to write to him.

Senator WATKINS. Are you confused in your mind on that question whether you did or did not write to him other times?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. But I am trying to carry my memory back a rather long way. My general recollection is that I would never have had anything to write to Mr. Hiss about, and therefore I don't suppose I did, but there may have been some bureaucratic matter in the Government during previous years which had involved my writing to him so I don't want to say flatly that I didn't. I just can't remember anything that I did write to him about or would have written to him about.

Senator WATKINS. This may have been covered by other questions; I came in late—if it has, you can so indicate—how long did you know Mr. Hiss at the time you wrote him this letter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had known him casually—I doubt if it could have been before 1938.

Senator WATKINS. At least from 1938 on.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I put 1938 as the earliest possible date because that was when I came to live in Baltimore after returning from China. But I may not actually have met him until 1939 or 1940.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "casually" in that respect, as you put it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like to have my words read back. I forget how I used it.

(The answer was read by the reporter as follows:)

I had known him casually—I doubt if it could have been before 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the word "casually," as you use it there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I used it there, it might be something like dropping him a note saying "I am coming over to Washington and would like to see Mr. Hornbeck. Can you make an appointment?" Or something of that sort.

Senator WATKINS. Did you occasionally drop over to see Mr. Hornbeck in the State Department?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did; yes.

Senator WATKINS. Were you in the habit of asking Mr. Hiss to make the appointment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Hiss was——

The CHAIRMAN. The question was, "Were you in the habit"—and that can be answered "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I was in the habit.

Senator WATKINS. What recalled to your mind that you might have sent a note to him asking him to make an appointment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think this came up before you came in.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it did not.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That Mr. Hiss sat in the outer office of Mr. Hornbeck. He was sort of an assistant to Mr. Hornbeck and was therefore the man I saw when I was waiting for an appointment with Mr. Hornbeck.

Senator WATKINS. Over what period of time had your visits to see Mr. Hornbeck occurred?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I saw Mr. Hornbeck occasionally—I can't recall how frequently—from 1938; that is, from the time I came home to settle down permanently here, until, well, until his retirement from the State Department. But I wouldn't see him very frequently, and I certainly wouldn't see him on any regular schedule.

Senator WATKINS. What were the purposes of your conferences with Mr. Hornbeck?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Hornbeck was one of the top men for the Far East in the Department of State, and at that time from 1938 on up to Pearl Harbor, there were many questions of American policy relating to Japan, on the one hand, and China on the other. Those were the years of very lively discussion of the desirability or possibility of an embargo of war materials to Japan, and my present recollection is that I principally went in to see Mr. Hornbeck from time to time to get from him a statement on where policy stood at the moment, just as newspapermen and academic men would do at that time.

Senator WATKINS. Did you ever go at his instance?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At Mr. Hornbeck's instance?

Senator WATKINS. Yes, or his invitation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so.

Senator WATKINS. Did you visit anyone else at the State Department on any of these occasions that you visited Mr. Hornbeck?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I remember visiting Mr. Hull once.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Let us proceed.

Senator FERGUSON. One more question, if I might.

Mr. Lattimore, when was the first that anyone testified before a congressional hearing that came to your knowledge or to the public that you were pro-Communist, if they did so testify?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Have you not any recollection at all of when it became public from some committee that someone had testified that you might even be pro-Communist or connected with the Communists?

Mr. ARNOLD. May I consult with him?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

(Mr. Lattimore consulted with Mr. Arnold.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe that the first case of that was when I was in Afghanistan, and received wires from press representatives saying that Senator McCarthy had made charges against me.

Senator FERGUSON. Was that before or after you invited Mr. Hiss to your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Long after, I suppose.

Senator FERGUSON. It was long after?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. So no one had mentioned you in relation to communism so far as committees were concerned at the time you invited Mr. Hiss?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe so.

Senator FERGUSON. And did you get a letter from Mr. Hiss declining your invitation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I did; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know what he said, or do you have a copy of that letter? Will you try to produce that letter for us?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't have a copy, but I remember fairly clearly that I received just a brief courteous note from him, saying that he had relatives in Baltimore and would stay with them, or something of that sort.

Senator FERGUSON. At the time you invited him to your home, you were professor at Johns Hopkins?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. And you did not know the merits of the case for the libel?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. You did not know, then, whether or not it was an actual fact that Mr. Hiss had delivered papers to the Communist Party?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I thought——

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, You did not know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not know for a fact and I thought that when charges are made against a man, when he has denied those charges, and has said he is going to take legal action, it is a courteous thing for

his friends to make some little gesture that shows that they do not believe that mere accusation is equivalent to conviction.

Senator FERGUSON. You were one of his friends, then?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. Well, I was an acquaintance, rather than a friend.

Senator FERGUSON. You thought that was the duty of an acquaintance; that if a man was being accused of delivering secret papers from the State Department to the Communists, and accused of being a Communist, that it would be the duty of an acquaintance who was a professor at a school to invite the man to his home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was an acquaintance who had been present when he received an honorary degree at my university. I knew that the president of my university, the late Isaiah Bowman, had an extremely high opinion of Mr. Hiss, and the general atmosphere in which I had some acquaintance with Mr. Hiss was that this whole business was an incredible charge.

Senator FERGUSON. How long after the degree did you hear that he was accused of the accusations that were being made?

Mr. LATTIMORE. At present I can't recall the time interval, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. He got his degree before the accusations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, precisely.

Senator FERGUSON. And the accusations, sworn testimony, did not make any difference to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My attitude was that—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. You can answer that "Yes" or "No." Sworn testimony did not make any difference to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Sworn testimony did not make enough difference to me to make me believe that a man's friends and acquaintances should begin to treat him as guilty merely on a charge and before both sides of the case had been heard.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, where did you say you were when you first heard the news that Senator McCarthy had charged—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was in Afghanistan.

Senator SMITH. How long did you stay there after that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It may have been 5 or 6 days; it may have been a week.

Senator SMITH. Then where did you go?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Then I returned to this country.

Senator SMITH. Did you stop en route between Afghanistan and America any day or 2 or 3 days, any length of time at all?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No. I stayed between planes, while making connections. I think I stayed, oh, for one night at Karachi, Pakistan.

Senator SMITH. That is the only place you spent as much as a day or night?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, and may I say, as an example of the way that people react to unproven charges, that during my stay overnight and into the next day before catching my plane in Karachi, the American Ambassador in Karachi, a very fine gentleman from my own State of Maryland, invited me to lunch.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator.

Senator SMITH. That is all.

Senator O'CONNOR. At whose instance did you go to Afghanistan?

Mr. LATTIMORE. United Nations.

Senator O'CONNOR. And specifically upon whose invitation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Specifically on the invitation—I think I would have to say specifically on the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan. Would you like for me to elaborate on how that appointment came about?

Senator O'CONNOR. It might be of interest, yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was called on the telephone from United Nations and told that the United Nations had a program of technical assistance to unindustrialized countries, that is the United Nations equivalent of point 4. That in that connection they had compiled lists of people who might be regarded as useful for technical assistance missions in different parts of the world, that a number of Americans who knew anything about Afghanistan and were not already engaged in Afghanistan was infinitesimal, but that they had my name as a general expert on the inter-Asian or central Asian area, and would I be interested in considering taking part in a mission of that kind which was then being discussed with the Afghan Government.

Senator O'CONNOR. Did you speak the language?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator O'CONNOR. Had you ever been there before?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had never been there before.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may proceed, Senator.

Senator SMITH. One other question following that. Dr. Lattimore, did you have any conference or conferences with any newspapermen after you left Afghanistan before you got to America?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was interviewed, I think, by a United Press man at Karachi, and afterward when the plane landed at Rome, and again at London, pressmen came up and asked me question. I wouldn't be able now to identify which services they represented. At Karachi it may have been United Press or Associated Press, or it might have been both.

Senator SMITH. Do you recall any particular newspaperman that interviewed you at any of those places?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't recall any one by name. There was nobody that I had previously known.

Senator SMITH. No one you had previously known at all?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you receive a telegram from Edward Carter on the day that the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact was announced to the world?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Morris, I believe that was the date.

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer that, if you know.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think that was the date. That is not of my own knowledge. That is as of Mr. Morris' statement in executive session.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you receive on that day, Mr. Lattimore, from Mr. Carter an invitation to fly to Moscow at IPR expense for 3 to 5 days' visit.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I do not believe it was an invitation, Mr. Morris. I believe it was a statement of possibility.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive any request?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was certainly not a request, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. What was it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As I remember, it was a suggestion that if I wanted to do that, the IPR would be willing to bear my expenses or part of my expenses.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you go to Moscow, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Why not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Because my summer vacation was coming to an end. I wanted to spend a little time in Norway on the way home, and that is what I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recall whether or not you actually received that telegram from Mr. Carter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would not have recalled it if I had not been shown it in executive session.

Mr. MORRIS. But you have recalled it now.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have recalled it now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you turn it down?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was not a telegram I took seriously at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you indicate your refusal? Did you send anything in the way of a communication to Mr. Carter to tell him you were not going to Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't believe I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Mandel to identify this, please.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a telegram from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, marked "Stockholm, August 24, 1939." addressed to "Lattimore, Cooks, STKM", and signed "Carter."

The CHAIRMAN. That is a photostat of a document taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations; is that correct?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, would you look at that document and see if you can recall having received that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I received it. May I read it?

Mr. MORRIS. You may, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

Cable if Motylev free see you. Would you care make 3- or 5-day visit Moscow? Can pay air passage and Intourist Hotel second category.

CARTER.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say you did receive that, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I obviously must have received it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know when and where you received it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he received it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't. Until I was shown this telegram in executive session I had forgotten the whole incident.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will that be received into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been received in the record.

(The telegram referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 494" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 494

Telegram Kungl. Telegrafverket

STOCKHOLM, 24 August 1939.

alp-wqb

—ppsbron 2

sw64 1 lee mass 30w 24/8 0935
nlt—lattimore cooks stkm

VIA GÖTEBORG-RADIO

Cable if Motylev free see you. Would you care make 3- or 5-day visit Moscow? Can pay air passages and Intourist Hotel second category.

CARTER.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you go from Sweden to Norway at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Just about that time; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, in view of the fact that you have just now read that telegram, could you now answer the question that you received an invitation from Mr. Carter to go to Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I would not call it an invitation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have introduced into the record at this time the front page of the New York Times of Thursday, August 24, 1939, which carries the announcement that that morning the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact had been announced to the world.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. MORRIS. August 24, 1939.

And this telegram, sir, was sent by Mr. Carter from Lee, Mass., apparently, at 9:35 in the morning, according to the date at the top of the telegram.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I ask if there is a time difference between Europe and the United States taken into account there?

Mr. MORRIS. It is 7 hours earlier, Moscow, or 8 hours.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Senator FERGUSON. Seven or eight.

Mr. MORRIS. About 7 or 8 hours. So you see that would have been announced 7 or 8 hours earlier in Moscow than Lee, Mass.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is there anything to show that anyone living in Lee, Mass., would have known that earlier than the New York Times?

Mr. MORRIS. We will have to ask Mr. Carter about that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Mandel to introduce the next document.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to act on this other offer as soon as Senator Ferguson is through.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, would you care to look at the New York Times of that date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 495" and is as follows:)

THE NEW YORK TIMES

Copyright, 1939, by The New York Times Company

Late City Edition: Partly cloudy and warm with scattered showers today and tomorrow. Temperatures Yesterday—Max., 88; Min., 70

[Vol. LXXXVIII, No. 29,797. Entered as Second-Class Matter, Postoffice, New York, N. Y. New York, Thursday, August 24, 1939]

GERMANY AND RUSSIA SIGN 10-YEAR NONAGGRESSION PACT; BIND EACH OTHER NOT TO AID OPPONENTS IN WAR ACTS; HITLER REBUFFS LONDON; BRITAIN AND FRANCE MOBILIZE

[Column 5]

QUICK ACTION SEEN—BERLIN TALKS OF 6 P. M DEADLINE FOR MOVE AGAINST POLAND—DICTATOR WARNS BRITISH—HENDERSON SO WROUGHT UP ON LEAVING PARLEY WITH HITLER THAT HE IS SPEECHLESS

(By Otto D. Tolischus)

Wireless to THE NEW YORK TIMES

BERLIN, Thursday, Aug. 24.—While Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop was in Moscow discussing, in the view of some German quarters, not so much a new nonaggression pact as "Poland's fourth and final partition," Chancellor Hitler yesterday received Sir Neville Henderson, the British Ambassador, for a fifteen-minute conference.

According to reliable information, the conference ended on a rather blunt note that is interpreted in diplomatic quarters as possibly Herr Hitler's last word. The communiqué, issued last night, reads:

"Complying with the wish of the British Government, the Fuehrer received Sir Neville Henderson at the Berghof today. The Ambassador delivered a letter from the British Prime Minister addressed to the Fuehrer, which was drawn up in the same sense as yesterday's British communication regarding the Cabinet session.

"The Fuehrer left no doubt in the mind of the British Ambassador that the obligations assumed by the British Government could not induce Germany to renounce the defense of her vital national interest."

HITLER'S TONE REPORTED BLUNT

Actually Herr Hitler's tone to Sir Neville was reported to have been even more blunt than the communiqué indicates. In effect, Herr Hitler told the Ambassador that Britain had no business in Eastern Europe and that her guarantee of Poland merely encouraged Polish resistance to German demands, therefore it was up to Britain to persuade the Poles to yield or face the consequences.

Sir Neville left the conference so wrought up he was speechless. Not trusting his memory to repeat the exact shadings of Herr Hitler's answer, he asked that it be put in writing and he returned for it a half hour later. He got it couched in the same strong terms that Herr Hitler used to him before.

At the same time there are also well-authenticated reports that, in addition to Prime Minister Chamberlain's letter, Sir Neville also delivered to Herr Hitler an oral message that if Herr Hitler would give the Poles time Britain would try to induce Poland to come forth with new proposals. In that connection some circles launched—perhaps not unintentionally—the suggestion that Foreign Minister Josef Beck of Poland might after all ask to see Herr von Ribbentrop and even Herr Hitler. A preliminary meeting with the former might be arranged at Riga, Latvia, on Herr von Ribbentrop's return from Moscow. But Polish circles declare the suggestion was "extremely unlikely" because it spelled surrender.

As during the last few days the word in Berlin is that the zero hour, which will set the German Army on the march, will come today, and these rumors are supplemented with the additional detail that the exact hour is 6 P. M. [noon, New York time], which might mean "contact with the enemy" some time tomorrow. Furthermore, orders to postpone action, issued after Herr von Ribbentrop's departure for Moscow, have been canceled again.

GERMANS ELATED BY NEWS

How much all that is merely a part of the "war of nerves" and how much is bitter reality remains to be seen. In fact the tension developing in Germany, at least in an atmosphere of fantastic unreality, is made no more real by the delayed Summer heat that lures the populace to the woods and beaches, and, together with the elation over the Russian pact and renewed confidence in Herr Hitler's diplomatic superiority over the democratic statesmen, helps to hide the war clouds.

However, the rebuff to Britain yesterday, which in some quarters is compared with the rebuff administered to the French Ambassador by King William of Prussia just preceding the Franco-Prussian War

[Continued on Page Two]

* * * * *

[Column 8]

BARB HOSTILE UNION—TREATY FORBIDS EITHER TO JOIN ANY GROUP AIMED AT OTHER—ESCAPE CLAUSE OMITTED—VON RIBBENTROP'S CAR, FLYING SWASTIKA, PASSES BENEATH RED FLAG AT KREMLIN

(By The Associated Press)

Moscow, Thursday, Aug. 24.—Germany and Soviet Russia early today signed a nonaggression pact binding each other for ten years not to "associate itself with any other grouping of powers which directly or indirectly is aimed at the other party."

By the pact they also agreed to "constantly remain in consultation with one another" on their common interests and to adjust differences by arbitration.

The nonaggression clauses bound each power to refrain from any act of force against the other and if either party is "the object of warlike acts by a third power" to refrain from supporting that third power.

The pact did not include the usual escape clause providing for its denunciation in case one of the contracting parties attacked a third power. This provision has been written into most nonaggression agreements signed in the past by Moscow.

ARRIVES BY PLANE

(By G. E. R. Gedye)

Special Cable to The New York Times

Moscow, Thursday, Aug. 24.—With the meticulous punctuality of a perfectly staged arrival, two huge Focke-Wulf Condor planes conveying Joachim von Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister, and his thirty-two assistants, landed at the Moscow airdrome on the stroke of 1 P. M. yesterday.

Adequate but not excessive police precautions were taken at the airdrome. For the first time the Soviet authorities displayed the swastika banner, five of which flew from the front of the airdrome building, but were placed so as not to be visible from the outside.

Vyacheslaff M. Molotoff was not present to welcome Herr von Ribbentrop, probably because he is not only Commissar of Foreign Affairs but also Premier, and therefore higher in rank than Herr von Ribbentrop. Instead the visitor was received by Vladimir P. Potemkin, Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Barkoff, protocol chief; Mr. Merkuloff, Vice Commissar of Internal Affairs, under whom falls the NKVD, formerly the GPU; Mr. Alexandroff, chief of the Central European Department of the Foreign Office, and General Suvoroff, commander of the Moscow garrison.

Almost the entire staff of the huge German Embassy, headed by the Ambassador, Count Friedrich Werner von der Schulenburg, with the military, naval and air attachés in uniform, was present. The German civilians mostly wore top hats and cutaway coats.

The Italian Ambassador, Augusto Russo, with his military attaché in uniform, also was present. The feature of the reception most commented upon was the absence of any Japanese representative.

The German Embassy staff stood lined up like troops on parade. As each was presented to Herr von Ribbentrop he sprang to attention, clicked his heels, gave the Hitler salute and shook hands, again saluting and heel-clicking.

IN OLD AUSTRIAN EMBASSY

From the airdrome the party drove to the city through streets where police in their white Summer jackets stood every ten paces. For Herr von Ribbentrop the Soviet Government provided a large American car from the Kremlin car park, flying the swastika flag.

The party drove directly to the former Austrian Embassy, where they are being housed. Subsequently Herr von Ribbentrop and leading members of his mission had luncheon at the embassy with Count von der Schulenburg.

At about 3:30 P. M. Herr von Ribbentrop, accompanied by Count von der Schulenburg and an expert translator whom the Germans brought from Berlin, drove through the gates of the Kremlin with its

[Continued on Page Six]

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations dated February 5, 1940, addressed to Harrison Forman, Port Washington, N. Y., with the typed signature of Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that letter taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MANDEL. This is the carbon copy taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I offer you that carbon and ask you if you can recall having sent that letter to Mr. Forman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that, please?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The date is February 5, 1940. May I read it?

Mr. MORRIS. By all means, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

EXHIBIT 496

DEAR FORMAN: Last summer while in Sweden I got a post card you had sent from Moscow. After that I saw a report in a paper about your being heckled at a Canadian meeting. Then came your startling Christmas card, and that had an address on it, so I can write to make acknowledgment.

It was interesting enough being in Sweden on the eve of war; it must have been even more interesting to be in Moscow when the dam was beginning to crack. As a matter of fact, I'd have been in Moscow myself when the Germans marched into Poland, if it hadn't been that a cable from my New York office was not delivered until we reached our boat in Norway.

You must have had an extraordinarily interesting time, and I'd like to hear more about it. Do you ever pass this way on your lecturing peregrinations? If you do, I wish you'd put up with us over night. Or is there a chance of our crossing anywhere else? I shall be away from here during most of the month of March, going out through western Canada and coming back via the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be inserted in the record.

(The letter which was read in full was marked "Exhibit No. 496.")

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I add some comments, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that a letter you wrote, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is quite obviously a letter I wrote. One I totally forgot until I saw it just now.

Mr. MORRIS. In there, Mr. Lattimore, do you not state that you would have been in Moscow if you had received the telegram we have been discussing?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I state that.

Mr. MORRIS. And is it not a fact that at that time, August 24, 1939, and for a period of approximately 18 months, Moscow joined Berlin as the headquarters of the enemy of the democratic world?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your statement on that.

Senator FERGUSON. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. What had Mr. Forman been heckled for?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Senator FERGUSON. It must have struck you as important. You wrote him about it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It evidently was something that struck me as interesting at the time, but I don't recall.

Senator FERGUSON. Was it that he was pro-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you the other way. Was it that he was anti-Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea.

Senator FERGUSON. You have not any idea of what you wrote him about being heckled?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. You apparently were on his side.

Mr. LATTIMORE. The press might show.

Senator FERGUSON. You thought it was——

Mr. LATTIMORE. As of 1940, I would have been extremely interested to talk to anybody who had been in Moscow at the time the dam was beginning to crack, as I said. That whole business of the Nazi-Stalin pact had everybody speculating, everybody was interested in talking about it. At that time, and since, I had an extremely slight acquaintance with Mr. Forman, but I certainly did not consider him a Communist or a pro-Communist. Now, I should like to say——

The CHAIRMAN. You started to say "extremely." Did you mean "extremely"? Then you said "slight." Straighten the sentence out.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That would be extremely slight.

Senator FERGUSON. And you thought, then, as you say here, that it must have been even more interesting to be in Moscow when the dam was beginning to crack.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Quite so; yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Even though the Russians were against the free world at that time with Germany.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I tell you why I thought it was interesting?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; I wish you would.

Mr. LATTIMORE. When I was in Sweden, the person whom my wife and I knew best was Dr. Sven Hedin, the celebrated explorer. Dr. Hedin for many years had been extremely pro-German and was, in fact, I believe, an honorary member of the Nazi Party. Just a short time—I forget whether it was 2 or 3 days—before the Nazi-Stalin pact was announced, we had dinner with him, and he told us that he thought that the British-French negotiations with the Russians were going to break down, and the Russians were going to come to

terms with the Germans. My knowledge as an expert on European politics was so slight that I pooh-pooed the idea. My idea was that the Germans and the Russians were such enemies that they could not possibly get together. I was astounded when the pact came out and with that background I would naturally have been even more interested in talking to anybody who had been in Moscow at the time that I had heard a conversation of this kind in Sweden.

Senator FERGUSON. But this indicated that it would have been interesting for you to be in Moscow.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It would be interesting for anybody to be in Moscow. I don't think it says me, personally. I said I was in Sweden. That was very interesting. You were in Moscow. That would have been even more interesting.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I have put into the record the executive session interrogation on this particular subject? This is page 57 from the executive session testimony of Mr. Lattimore.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have copies of that to follow? Counsel, do you have copies of that to follow?

Mr. ARNOLD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. We did have it yesterday.

Mr. MORRIS. Here is a copy.

Beginning at page 57, the question is:

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony that that cable from Mr. Carter to yourself had no relation to the pact that had been announced the previous day?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I certainly would say not. It is a telegram that I received on the 24th or 25th, whenever it came into Sweden. But as far as my mind is concerned, it has no connection with the date.

Senator EASTAND. Did you go to Moscow?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. MORRIS. How did you reply to that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What?

Mr. MORRIS. How did you reply to that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I doubt if I replied at all.

Mr. MORRIS. Wasn't that unusual?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; my assumption would be—I may have replied—but my assumption would be that receiving it at that time with the excitement caused by the Hitler-Stalin pact, my assumption would be, this is an idea that Mr. Carter was thinking of before the pact, but with that pact it is quite obvious that any such arrangements would be impractical.

Senator SMITH. May I ask him a question?

Mr. MORRIS. By all means, Senator.

Senator SMITH. At that time you say you were on a vacation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Then on page 59:

Senator SMITH. And do you recall what sort of an answer you gave to that, if you gave any answer?—

That is the second line, page 59—

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall what answer I gave. If I had given any answer it would have been negative.

Mr. ARNOLD. May I again request that the entire testimony be introduced in evidence?

The CHAIRMAN. That request will not be granted. It deals with different subjects.

Mr. ARNOLD. I haven't had time to read it; in order to protect my record, Senator, may I request that all the testimony on that subject be put in evidence?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter we will take up later.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that we have here a letter written—when, in 1950?

Senator FERGUSON. February 5.

Mr. LATTIMORE. February 5, 1940. When I quite obviously from the letter had no exact recollection of the date of the relationship between the telegram and the Nazi-German pact that I mentioned that I received the telegram when I got on the boat in Norway, and it was obviously not in my mind that I would have received it in Sweden on the Nazi-German pact if I had been in Sweden at the time. I should like to add a word or two of amplification there, of why there should have been such a telegram at all.

Mr. Carter knew at that time that I had long been trying to get into Outer Mongolia.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you trying to testify to this committee as to what Mr. Carter thought or knew at that time? If you are, I do not think we would care to go into it. I do not think the committee would care to hear it. We would rather hear it from Mr. Carter.

As regards you, or yours, all right, but what Mr. Carter was thinking at the time or what he did at the time or how he considered at the time, I do not think you are capable of testifying.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept that, Mr. Chairman. I had previously told Mr. Carter that I wanted to get into Outer Mongolia, because as a specialist on Inner Mongolian habited regions of western Manchuria, by then occupied by Japanese, and in southern Inner Mongolia, under Chinese rule, I wanted to get into Outer Mongolia, which even then was a Russian satellite, and it would be impossible to arrange such a visit unless I were able to get to Moscow and see the Outer Mongolian representatives in Moscow, because there were not any Outer Mongolian representatives anywhere else.

Senator O'CONNOR. May I ask a question there? Can you reconcile any better than you have the two apparently conflicting statements regarding the receipt of the telegram and your attitude? In the executive session, the impression was left, at least upon me, that you had received Mr. Carter's cablegram, and declined it. It now appears from the correspondence that you did not receive it until a subsequent time. Had you received it, you would have received it—

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the impression the Chair gets from the testimony this morning. The testimony this morning, as I get it, is that he did receive the telegram. He doesn't deny receiving the telegram.

Senator O'CONNOR. He received it according to this letter at a later date. I read from the letter—

The CHAIRMAN. He says in that letter that he received it.

Senator O'CONNOR. That is right [reading]:

if it hadn't been that a cable from my New York office was not delivered until we reached our boat in Norway.

That seems to conflict with your statement in the executive session that you had received it and had declined it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Of course—

Mr. ARNOLD. Just a second. I am a little—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, Mr. Counsel. When you are called upon for advice from the witness, you may give it, but otherwise not.

Senator FERGUSON. I would like to show you that he said in this letter he would have been there if he had not received the wire.

Senator O'CONNOR. Do I make myself clear, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. May I first look at my testimony in executive session, or do you want me to answer cold?

Senator O'CONNOR. You are perfectly free to refer to it. I was referring to the statement that Mr. Morris had read.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I notice that I stated—I think this is pertinent to your question of dates, Senator O'CONNOR, and I would like to bring it out first and then refer to the question of dates—this is my statement in executive session. No, first, a question from Mr. Sourwine:

Was Mr. Motylev the person who because of his official position in the Soviet Union might have been able to assist in getting you access to Mongolia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Motylev was head of the Russian Institute which was at that time a member of the international group of the Institute of Pacific Relations. At the Yosemite conference of the institute—

That was, I might interpolate, in the summer of 1936—

I had put up to Mr. Motylev the suggestion that I might be able to make a visit to Outer Mongolia via Russia. Mr. Motylev, like all Russians, was extremely cagey on the subject, because it was my experience, a very baffling experience on that in trying to get into Outer Mongolia, that is, that the Russians would never have anything on the record to prove that they controlled who permitted people into or out of Outer Mongolia. Everybody knows that it depended on them, but—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You are reading from the record?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. What page, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 59 and 60 [reading]:

but they would never let anything get on the record to prove it.

On this question of the date in executive session I was shown by Mr. Morris this copy of the telegram. I was not shown by him this letter to Harrison Forman about the fact that I had received the telegram only in Norway. I was shown a telegram to me, addressed to Stockholm, with no indication that it had been received in Norway, and I think I quite naturally allowed my memory to be refreshed to the extent of saying that I received it there. I simply assumed it. It was an unwarrantable assumption.

Then at a later hearing a letter was brought out which proves that I did not receive it in Sweden, as I had been led to assume by the manner of questioning in the executive session, but that I had received it some time later, 2 weeks or so later, in Norway, which I had totally forgotten.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, would that explain why at the time of the executive session you indicated that, having been shown it, you assumed that you received it and you volunteered the information that you declined it and that you did not wish to go to Russia, whereas—

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't volunteer that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the question be asked.

Senator O'CONNOR. That was my understanding. Of course the record will speak for itself on it. But now, upon being shown the letter from you to Mr. Forman, it is clearly indicated that you had not received it, and had you received it you would have accepted it and gone to Moscow.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Here again, Senator O'Connor, I wrote this letter without looking up the date of the telegram or the date—

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the question, Mr. Lattimore. Just a moment. That is not the question. Read the question of the Senator from Maryland.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I first look up the executive record to see if I did in fact say that I declined?

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the executive session?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The executive session here.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator FERGUSON. Didn't you say this morning that you wanted to complete your vacation, that you mentally declined because you wanted to finish your vacation?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, no; I think that is an unjustifiable inference.

Senator FERGUSON. Then go back and read the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. He is trying to read one phase of the testimony now. One at a time. He wants to read the executive session testimony.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have it on that point, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. "Mr. Morris"—

Mr. MORRIS. What page is that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The top of page 57.

Mr. MORRIS. Is it your testimony that that cable from Mr. Carter to yourself had no relation to the pact that had been announced the previous day?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I certainly would say not. It is a telegram that I received on the 24th or 25th—

I had been led to say that by the manner in which the telegram had been presented.

Mr. MORRIS. What do you mean, you had been led to say that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had been led to say that by the presentation of a telegram, the dates of which indicated that it must have been delivered in Sweden on those dates, and without my memory being refreshed by the knowledge which you had that I actually received it in Norway several weeks later.

Mr. MORRIS. Then you mean you had been led by reading the telegram into that statement?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had been led by having the telegram presented to me, and not the letter.

Mr. MORRIS. But you had been led by reading the telegram, and not the presentation of it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had been led by the fact that the telegram had been presented to me. If the telegram had not been presented to me I wouldn't have read it—

on the 24th or 25th, whenever it came into Sweden. But as far as my mind is concerned, it has no connection with the date.

If I may go on, Senator O'Connor, I think it is obvious from my letter to Mr. Forman that I had quite forgotten the dates on the telegram and that I was assuming many months later that if the telegram had not been delivered to me in Norway, I would have received it before the Nazi-German Pact and would in that case have tried to complete the arrangements and go to Moscow. In that case I might have been in Moscow when, as I put it, the dam began to crack, which would have been extremely interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Mr. MORRIS? Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. I would like to go back and ask a question. Dr. Lattimore, just now I asked you about whether when you left Afghanistan you had any interviews with any one, newsmen, that you recalled, and you told us that you had a lunch at Karachi, I believe it was, and then you changed planes, but that was all, except that newspapermen met you at some of these places and interviewed you and none of them you knew.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right, I don't believe I saw anyone I knew.

Senator SMITH. I believe you wrote a book, did you not, "Ordeal by Slander."

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. Will you tell us now that you did not meet any newspaperman en route home from Afghanistan? Do you still say that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, I remember now. Yes, you are quite right. My recollection completely slipped. Mr. Hamilton Owens, of the Baltimore Sun, came to London and traveled back on the same plane with me.

Senator SMITH. Let me see if you recall that you wrote this in your book. On page 18:

Then I went to face the flashbulbs, and talked to the reporters.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH (reading):

One thing I noticed right away. Not only the English reporters, but also Americans were quite obviously assuming that I was innocent until proved guilty. Among the newspapermen in the group at London Airport was Hamilton Owens, editor of the Baltimore Sun. The fact that he had come all the way to London to meet me was like getting a signal in code to which I had the key. I knew that the Baltimore Sun, as my home-town paper, would be exposed to the full pressure of unreasoning emotion as soon as the McCarthy charges came out. I also knew that the editorial page of the paper had a tendency to be flabby. I had therefore guessed that as soon as the sensational McCarthy charges come into the open, the Sun had played the news on its front page with the biggest headlines that the printing room could provide while hesitating, on its editorial page, to point out that in my university and my own community my loyalty has never been doubted. (They later sent a man up to Wisconsin who wrote some good stories on McCarthy).

I could therefore see right away that at least one of the reasons why Hamilton Owens had come all the way to London was that he was looking for a safe way to write a friendly story about me. This he did, and I was very grateful to him for it.

Here is the book. That is what you wrote in your book, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is quite right.

Senator SMITH. So Mr. Owens was a friend of yours, was he not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. And still is, is he not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He still is.

Senator SMITH. And he flew all the way to London to meet you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you acquiesce in any suggestion by Soviet officials in Moscow in 1936 that you would endeavor to express a definite line in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't believe I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I ask you you to look at this document. This was introduced in open session yesterday. I ask you to read a paragraph with the number IV.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of clarifying the record, what is the number of that exhibit?

Mr. ARNOLD. May I have one?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a number of identification on the exhibit?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Exhibit No. 485.

The CHAIRMAN. He was asked to read something.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the paragraph marked IV on the first page.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

OL said that he would like to meet the Soviet suggestion as far as possible, in re having a more definite line expressed in PA. He has not been able to do this before, because he has not had close cooperation from the the various councils. He said that if the Soviet group would start on such a line, he would be able to make the others cooperate more fully. Voitinsky said that the main trouble was that the articles in PA did not come out against the aggressor, and the aggressor was not analyzed from within, therefore there were no indications of the internal weakness of the aggressor—

May I—

Senator FERGUSON. What is the date of that, April? What year?

Mr. MORRIS. 1936.

Mr. ARNOLD. You want the whole thing read, do you not?

Mr. MORRIS. No.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I add something at this point, Mr. Morris?

Senator FERGUSON. Before that, could I ask you one question? What was the definite line? Was that the Communist Party line? You say there—

the Soviet suggestion as far as possible, in re having a more definite line expressed in PA. He has not been able to do this before, because he has not had close cooperation from the various councils.

Then, "He said if the Soviet group would start on such a line." That was the Communist Party line, was it not? Why do you have to confer with your counsel to answer that question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson—

Senator FERGUSON. It is not a legal point. You can answer that. You wrote it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator Ferguson, I see nothing here to suggest that this was the party line.

Senator FERGUSON. What line was it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was just going to ask permission to say something about this point which was a subject of discussion and differing points of view throughout my period as editor of Pacific Affairs.

Mr. ARNOLD. Would it be out of order to make—

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let him answer.

Mr. ARNOLD. I had a question about that question, that is all.

Senator FERGUSON. I am asking now, when you were talking about the Soviet definite line, as to whether or not that was not the Communist Party line.

Wait, Judge, that is not a legal matter.

Mr. ARNOLD. There is something about the question—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment.

Senator FERGUSON. The witness will say there is something wrong with the question if there is.

Mr. ARNOLD. May we have the entire question read back?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. That can be answered "Yes" or "No" and then explain.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In my opinion, no.

Senator FERGUSON. What line was it? What was the definite Soviet line, if it wasn't the Communist Party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This was the line of the Soviet Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations in connection with a particular subject of differing points of view between various national councils in IPR at that time. If it was the Communist line, when the Japanese Council must have been Communist because the line that the Russians were taking at that moment was exactly the line that the Japanese were taking in the IPR.

Senator FERGUSON. All right. Let me read you this line and see whether or not you are entirely right in your answer. "He said"—is it you they are talking about? Is that you or is that the Russians? "He said that the Soviet group"—that would be you—"would start on such a line." What line were the Russians to start on, a non-Communist line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. They were to start on the line that articles in Pacific Affairs should be presented by the various councils as groups and not by individuals as individuals. This was a line that had nothing Communist about it. It was the line that was shared by the Japanese Council at the same time. The British, Chinese and American councils did not agree. They all thought that people should write as individuals and not as representatives of councils.

Senator FERGUSON. Were the Soviets going to follow a party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I have no way of knowing whether that was a party line or not. All I know is that it was the same line that was being followed by the Japanese Council at the same time.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you ever know the Soviets to follow any other line than the Communist line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Senator, I am not enough of an expert—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Did you know? Answer it "Yes" or "No," no matter whether you are an expert or not.

Senator FERGUSON. You say you don't know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as my knowledge goes, Senator, I believe that the Russians have at various times followed lines, if you want to use that word, temporarily for particular purposes that had nothing Communist about them as such. In the larger sense, if you want to say that it is Communist policy to do that kind of thing, of course I would agree.

Senator FERGUSON. You would agree that they do it in that way?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the answer?

Senator FERGUSON. Have you ever known the Soviets not to follow a party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as my knowledge goes, no.

Senator FERGUSON. Therefore, as far as they are concerned in writing in this magazine it was perfectly proper for them to follow the party line, and you were going to see that that was done.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that not what you say?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In the first place, I would remind you that this is not a stenographic record. This is a condensed memorandum written by somebody afterward, not shown to me for my approval—

The CHAIRMAN. That will be stricken from the record. Answer the question, Mr. Lattimore. Read the question back to the witness and have him answer the question.

(The question was read by the reporter as follows:)

Senator FERGUSON. Therefore, as far as they are concerned in writing in this magazine it was perfectly proper for them to follow the party line, and you were going to see that that was done.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that not what you say?

Senator FERGUSON. Is that not what was said? I will put it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Read what he said.

Senator FERGUSON. He said this: "He said that if the Soviet group would start on such a line, he would be able to make the others cooperate fully." That was a definite line the Soviets suggested.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I don't know—maybe I missed it—whether or not this was identified and how it was identified. In view of the suggestion which Mr. Lattimore has just raised that this doesn't purport to quote him verbatim but rather is a summary, who made this? Do we have any evidence on that?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator Smith, this was identified by Mr. Mandel yesterday as a copy of a document found in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations and it purports only to be the minutes of a meeting at which those people attended and Mr. Lattimore has testified he did attend.

Senator SMITH. I just wanted to get it identified.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like the record to show also that this is not a verbatim record of what I said.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, who, outside of you, was present at this meeting from America?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The notation at the top shows Mr. Carter, myself, and Harriet Moore.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think at this time it would be appropriate if we incorporate into this part of the record the testimony about the Communist affiliations of Voitinsky and Motylev, who were two of the gentlemen at this meeting and the next meeting which will be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. If you have it, let's have it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Barmine, testifying before this committee in open session—

The CHAIRMAN. Give the page.

Mr. MORRIS. At page 188 in the published reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's see that counsel has a copy of it.

Mr. MORRIS. Part I, page 188.

Mr. ARNOLD. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Barmine testifying, the last sentence of that first paragraph. This is in the fall of 1921 he is talking about:

Among them was Voitinski who at this time was in charge of the far-eastern section of the Foreign Office.

Mr. MORRIS. You say you know Voitinski as the man who was head of the far eastern section of the Foreign Office at that time?

Mr. BARMINE. That is right. He came back to the Foreign Office from the Comintern and when he was also in charge of far eastern affairs. He returned back from the Foreign Office a couple of years later again to the same work.

Mr. MORRIS. You, therefore, testify he had come from the Comintern to occupy that position as head of the far eastern section of the Foreign Office and after he finished that assignment he went back to the Comintern?

Mr. BARMINE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you testify also, General, in the Comintern he was in charge of far eastern affairs?

Mr. BARMINE. That is right.

We had the open testimony of Professor Poppe on February 12, 1952, on this same subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps in view of the fact that counsel here was not present and does not know who General Barmine was, if he wishes it stated we can state it.

Mr. ARNOLD. I know who he is.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Have we a copy of this open session, Mr. Poppe's testimony? I will read it with you, Mr. Arnold. We seem to have only one copy available. I will read it with you.

Mr. ARNOLD. You don't have to do that. Just give it to me when you are through. I can remember it. I have no doubt you will read it correctly.

Mr. MORRIS. This is a question addressed to Professor Poppe, of the University of Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Professor, do you know a man named Voitinsky?

Mr. POPPE. I know him very well. Voitinsky is an outstanding Communist, a member of the Comintern, a man who played an important role in Chinese affairs. He in his youth was an organizer of parties of guerrillas against the White Russian Armies in Siberia. Later on he became a member of the staff of the Soviet Foreign Office and played a very important role in the far eastern development. Then he became one of the directors of the Communist Academy which later on was merged with the Russian Academy of Scientists, and became the nucleus of the future Academy of Scientists. He was also the director of various institutes in the Academy of Sciences, chief editor of the magazine, World Policies and World Economics. He is the right-hand of Stalin's No. 1 economist, Varga.

Mr. MORRIS. Professor, would you tell us whether he was himself a Communist Party man?

Mr. POPPE. He was a party man, a member of the Comintern, and in 1936 and 1937 he conducted a purge of the Academy of Sciences, and many people worked together with me in my institute, my assistants, were purged, simply in consequence of his accusations.

Senator WATKINS. What do you mean by "purge"?

Mr. POPPE. It was in 1936 and 1937, in connection with Stalin's destruction of the Zinoviev, Borodin, and all the other well-known Communists. A great purge was started in all the agencies, and all the universities, and so on. I can only say, to give you an idea of what it was in my Institute of Oriental Study, that we had 94 scientists and 37 of them were arrested and disappeared forever; 37 out of 94.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year was that, Professor?

Mr. POPPE. 1937. Votinsky delivered a speech in our institute where he severely criticized this man and that man, and so on, and a few days later there was the elimination of all those people. So he was the one who gave the green light for those arrests.

Then in connection with Mr. Motylev, again Professor Poppe testifying on the same subject, the question was asked:

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us who Professor Motylev is?

Mr. POPPE. Professor Motylev is a party member.

Mr. MORRIS. You know that he is a Communist Party member?

Mr. POPPE. A Communist Party member, and an economist, not a physical geographer, a scientist of very little significance, but an outstanding party organizer, and a man who knows how to run an organization under Soviet conditions. He was trusted greatly and he was ordered not to compile, because he himself alone was not able to do this, but to establish a group which would compile that atlas, and to supervise the publication of that atlas. The result of that work was published in 1937. It is a big Soviet world atlas, technically done very well, but, as anything in the Soviet Union, it had also to comply with the Marxist-Leninist line of thinking.

Mr. ARNOLD. Is that part of the public record?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. You may look at that.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question pending.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May the record show at this point—

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ferguson, I think, was questioning.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, in this one dated April 12, do you have that before you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I do.

Senator FERGUSON. Yesterday, you read that you had considerable trouble with the minutes of the April 8 document:

In the next issue of PA there is to be an article by a Communist writer which is antagonistic to the Chinese Council and the British Council.

We had to spend, I would say, an hour on the question of whether or not that was Asiaticus. You had great trouble in answering the question. Now I show you the one of April 12, over on page 2, and ask you whether or not when you used this language, "in regard to the Asiaticus article"—That is the first article he wrote that was published?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON (reading):

he had to revise the vocabulary considerably or otherwise the article would have been discounted as propaganda.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator FERGUSON. Doesn't that prove to you that the man you were talking about, the Communist, when you were in Russia, writing his first article, was Asiaticus?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; it doesn't. I will remind you again this is not a verbatim record. The way in which this is condensed, written after the meeting, not at the meeting, not presented to me beforehand for—verification—

The CHAIRMAN. The answer is that it does not, and that is the answer. Just a moment.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Forthcoming article.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. You have answered the question.

Senator FERGUSON. I will ask him this question: Would not this indicate that the person who wrote the minutes—who had to be one of three—you, E. C. Carter, or Harriet Moore—because these are found in the office in New York? At least one of those three people? That is clear from the record, is it not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is not clear to me from the record, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you say a fair interpretation of the record by the person who wrote it is that that is true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; because there may have been somebody else present who was merely there for the purpose of taking notes and therefore was not recorded as a participant in the meeting.

Senator FERGUSON. At least to the writer of the note it is a fair conclusion.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I cannot answer what would be the conclusion in the minds of the person who wrote the note. The only conclusion that I can speak to is my own conclusion as a reader of these notes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Morris. All right, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. I would like to inquire if Mr. Lattimore knew that someone was taking notes, a résumé of what took place at the meeting, not only of this meeting on the 12th, but the 8th and other meetings. You knew that memoranda were being made, that summaries were being made?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't.

Senator SMITH. Was that not the custom?

Mr. LATTIMORE. What?

Senator SMITH. Was that not the custom when all of you had a meeting to have notes made as to what was said and done?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not an invariable custom; no.

Senator SMITH. Did you know it was ever done?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Surely, yes.

Senator SMITH. You and Mr. Carter went over the minutes after they were written, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I don't believe I did.

Senator SMITH. Never?

Senator LATTIMORE. When I saw these, was the first time that I could recollect ever hearing it.

Senator SMITH. So whoever took the minutes of the meeting, you had such confidence in them that you didn't think it necessary to go over the minutes yourself afterward?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't even know whether they were going to be written up as minutes.

Senator SMITH. I mean, whoever did make the minutes of the meeting was of such character that you relied upon him without checking the minutes yourself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I either didn't consider it important enough to ask about or whoever made the minutes didn't consider it important enough to submit them to me for checking. This is an extremely amateur, private organization, Senator. This is not like records of diplomatic meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in the question at all, whether it is amateur or not.

All right.

Senator WATKINS. As a matter of fact, did you not direct that these minutes be kept at these conferences?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Whose activity would it be? You did have this done.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can speak only as a very vague generalization, Senator, not from personal knowledge, but my assumption would be—and it is no more than an assumption—that if notes were made, they were made at the instance of Mr. Carter—

Senator WATKINS. He was the secretary.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Since he was the secretary-general dealing with various national councils, and since the discussion of the editing of Pacific Affairs was at that time being taken up with various national councils, I went in and talked with the Dutch after this visit in Moscow. Mr. Carter was not present. Then Mr. Carter and I talked about it with the British in London, and then this led up to a fairly thorough but inconclusive discussion of the editing of Pacific Affairs at the Yosemite conference in the summer of the same year.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you ask the Soviet officials in Moscow in 1936 to show a general line in their articles, which general line would be established in Pacific Affairs and around which all other articles would naturally gravitate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recollect it, but presumably it is in these minutes somewhere, if that is the way you have read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Did you or did you not? Do you care to answer that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recollect it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, that is the answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I refer you to the exhibit that was introduced yesterday represented as the minutes of the meeting of April 8. I ask you to turn to the paragraph beginning on the top of page 4. Will you read that paragraph beginning with "Motiliev."

Senator SMITH. Is that April 8, 1936?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Senator Smith. The first paragraph on page 4, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. [Reading:]

Motiliev said that it would be better to put as leading articles one that represented the point of view of one of the councils. O. L. said that he was prepared to consider this idea, but often before he has not had an important article which represented a council. O. L. said that if the Soviet group would show in their articles a general line, a struggle for peace, the other articles would naturally gravitate to that line. O. L. said that he had no organizational authority to tell the councils what kind of articles they should send in. He hopes that this will be settled at Yosemite.

May I add—

The CHAIRMAN. "O. L." is who?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Is myself. May I add to that? I think that is an example of very ordinary diplomatic procedure. When people are pressing for something, you say, "All right, if you want it that way, start something yourself."

The CHAIRMAN. All right. That is enough.

Proceed. Let us go ahead.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you appeal to Soviet officials for their assistance in converting Pacific Affairs from a loose and unorganized collection of articles into a journal which had a recognizable position and a general point of view?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume from the fact that you have just read it that I did so. I have no recollection of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer is that you have no recollection; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a carbon copy of a letter dated June 2, 1937, addressed to Dr. V. E. Motylev, Soviet Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, No. 20, Rozin Street, Moscow, with the typed signature of Owen Lattimore, addressed from 33, Ta Yuan Fu Hutung, Peiping, China, and the carbon copy was taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MORRIS. You knew Mr. Motylev, did you not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes. I met him first in Moscow that year.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you recall having written that letter to Mr. Motylev, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. ARNOLD. Do you have an extra copy?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I did not recall it until this was shown to me, but it is quite obviously a letter that I wrote.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a copy of a letter that you wrote; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. A carbon copy; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. There is a little delay in getting the copies.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. The document on which the witness was last examined is in the record in full, is it not?

Mr. MORRIS. The last one has already been introduced into the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your question?

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write that letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I wrote it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will that be admitted into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be admitted into the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit 497" and is read in full, beginning on p. 3240.)

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the paragraph, Mr. Lattimore, beginning "You will realize, however."

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

You will realize, however, that my abilities in this respect are not superhuman. I can write all over the world requesting articles and suggesting topics; but I can only print what I receive. If I am to convert Pacific Affairs from a loose and unorganized collection of articles into a journal which has a recognizable position and general point of view, I must rely very considerably on you. The Soviet Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations is more interested in this question of coherence than any of the others, all of which, by their composition and form of organization are more or less incoherent. If I could have from you an article in each number, and if these articles were planned to succeed each other in such a manner as to create a recognizable line of thought, it would be much easier to get other contributors to converge on this line.

May I add a comment?

Mr. ARNOLD. Just a moment. Mr. Chairman, may he read the entire letter?

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all right.

Mr. SOURWINE. The letter is being offered for the record, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter is in the record.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading) :

DEAR DR. MOTYLEV: The new number of Pacific Affairs will be reaching you at about the same time—

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Mr. Motylev?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is a letter to Dr. Motylev in Moscow from me in Peiping.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a Communist known to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Motylev was the head of the Soviet Council, and I did not know that he was a Communist, but of course I would have presumed that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading) :

DEAR DR. MOTYLEV—

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment. Did he hold any position in the Soviet Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The only position that he held that I knew of, besides his position as head of the Soviet Council, was his position as the head of this—What was it called now—Institute of Soviet World Atlas, or something like that.

Senator FERGUSON. That was part of the Soviet Government?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. You say back at that time you did not know that the officials that held positions in the Soviet Government were Communists?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I didn't and I will recall to you that Professor Poppe, who testified before this committee, said that he was never a Communist but that he held a high professorial position in the Soviet Union.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you know that at the time back in 1936?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether I knew it or not.

Senator FERGUSON. Why do you adopt his language here as testimony to prove that you didn't know it in 1936?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am simply adopting this language, Senator FERGUSON, to show that an outside academic person—I wasn't an academic person then—that an outside person visiting the Soviet Union need not necessarily have assumed as of 1936 that people who held academic positions in Russia were always chosen Communists.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the testimony of Professor Poppe that I read here this morning stated that Mr. Motylev was a Communist Party member.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, but Mr. Poppe's testimony, as I recall reading it in the transcript, was that he himself held an important and favored position in the Soviet academic structure and also stated that he had never been a Communist.

Mr. MORRIS. That he, Poppe, had never been.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That he, Poppe, had never been a Communist.

Senator FERGUSON. Go ahead with your reading.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All right.

(Exhibit No. 497 is as follows:)

DEAR DR. MOTYLEV: The new number of Pacific Affairs will be reaching you at about the same time as this letter. In it you will find an article of mine on The Lines of Cleavage in Inner Mongolia. As the printed text has been altered from what I originally wrote, I thought that you and your colleagues might be interested in seeing the original version, and accordingly I enclose a copy.

I wrote this article while traveling from England to China, at a time when I was out of touch with current news and recent developments. Partly for this reason, and partly because it seemed to me that the editor of Pacific Affairs ought himself to be subjected to editorial authority when writing articles, and should not have unlimited power to print his own opinions without revision, I asked Miss Porter in New York to have my article edited. Accordingly, Miss Moore, Miss Barnes, and Chen Han-seng very kindly undertook to make criticisms. Miss Moore has now written me that they made a number of changes. She has not sent me a copy of these changes, but I understand that it was considered that I had not been altogether fair to Voitinsky and Arens in quoting from them.

Since I have the greatest respect for the opinions of both Voitinsky and Arens, although differing from them myself in a number of details, I should be grateful, if they considered the subject important enough, to have their comments on both versions of what I have written. Perhaps they might lead eventually to a further article, either in Pacific Affairs or in the Tikhii Okean.

That is a Soviet publication, a publication of the Soviet Institute.

I also enclose an article on Tibet by Sir Charles Bell. I should be delighted if you or one of your colleagues would write something for Pacific Affairs on this subject. The present article is, I consider, not only weak in several points, but very conspicuously weak. Sir Charles Bell, however, has been an important participant in the modern history of Tibet; moreover, he makes several quotations from conversations with important personages and for these reasons, I think it is desirable to publish his article—though I think it would be still more desirable if we could have comments from another point of view, to be printed either in the same number or in a subsequent number. The article is at present planned for our December number.

I shall be interested to receive your comments on the June number of Pacific Affairs. I am afraid you may think it inferior to the December and March numbers. This is partly because while I was on my way from England to China, it was difficult to keep up a full correspondence and to secure a better grouping of articles. This was not my only difficulty however. I think we are in general agreement that the contents of Pacific Affairs ought to be planned fairly well in advance, so that the numbers will follow each other in regular sequence, developing a recognizable line of thought.

You will realize however that my abilities in this respect are not superhuman. I can write all over the world requesting articles and suggesting topics; but I can only print what I receive. If I am to convert Pacific Affairs from a loose and unorganized collection of articles into a journal which has a recognizable position and general point of view, I must rely very considerably on you. The Soviet Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations is more interested in this question of coherence than any of the others, all of which, by their composition and form of organization are more or less incoherent. If I could have from you an article in each number, and if these articles were planned to succeed each other in such a manner as to create a recognizable line of thought, it would be much easier to get other contributors to converge on this line.

I think I have said all this before, either in letters or in conversations. I repeat it now because we are now in a period, after the last conference, when there is a kind of natural lag, and people have to be reminded frequently of the plans made for Pacific Affairs, otherwise they tend to lose interest, or to become absorbed in other interests. I hope you will not mind therefore if I conclude by begging you once more to start sending me the articles which you mentioned while I was still in London.

This is the third letter I have written since getting back here; I hope the others have duly reached you.

With cordial personal regards,

Yours very sincerely,

OWEN LATTIMORE.

May I add something to that?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question pending here. There is nothing to be added. You have read the whole letter. Proceed with your questions, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you recommend during the Hitler-Stalin pact that every issue of Pacific Affairs contain some reminder

of the fact that the Soviet Union was part of the Far East and the Pacific region?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Very probably. I presume so from what you have just read. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations. At the top is "ECC" and "WLH." The document is dated March 26, 1941, 300 Gilman Hall, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. It is addressed to Miss Harriet L. Moore, the American-Russian Institute, 56 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, with typed signature of Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I ask you if you can have recall having sent that letter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall having sent this letter, but quite obviously I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you read that letter, Mr. Lattimore. Mr. Chairman, may it go into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter which the witness identified. Very well.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 498" and is read in full below.)

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

DEAR HARRIET: Thanks very much for your note of March 25. There is no terrible hurry about the review of the Taracouzio's book; but if you can get it to us within the first week of April, we can include it in our June issue. Even though it may have little direct bearing on the Far East, it might make a useful book on which to hang a mention of the place of the Far East in Soviet foreign policy as a whole. I should like to have in every issue of Pacific Affairs at least some reminder of the fact that Soviet Russia is part of the Far East and the Pacific region.

Thanks very much for the address of the book shop. I am writing to them for a catalog, if they have one.

Yours,

OWEN LATTIMORE.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. What is your question?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, do you know that Harriet L. Moore before this committee refused to state whether or not she was a member of the Communist Party on the ground that her answer might incriminate her?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I remember that, and I remember stating my shock and surprise and dismay.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not an answer to the question, about your shock and surprise and dismay. The question is, do you remember.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I stated that I remembered. I began by stating that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know that the American Russian Institute was a subsidiary of Voks?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't know that.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you read that in any memorandum of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall; no.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you ever take up with the President of the U. S. S. R. the question of what mistakes you and Mr. Carter had made between 1934 and 1936 in the management of IPR?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Presumably I did. I have no recollection of it.

Senator FERGUSON. Going back to this letter, what was the book shop that Miss Moore was talking about?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no idea. It could have been any sort of bookshop.

Senator FERGUSON. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document, please.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated February 10, 1936, addressed to Mr. V. E. Motylev, Moscow, and it has the typed signature, Edward C. Carter.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this letter is not addressed to or sent by Mr. Lattimore, and yet Mr. Lattimore is discussed in it. Would you care to see the letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. ARNOLD. Do you have copies?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, we have copies.

Mr. Lattimore, will you read the next to the last paragraph on the first page beginning with the word "second"?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Second, if it meets with your approval, I suggest that during the first 2 or 3 days of our visit, Miss Moore, Lattimore, and I review jointly with you and the Praesidium the relation between the U. S. S. R. National Council on the one hand and the International Secretariat and the other National Councils on the other, with a view to discovering wherein we have made mistakes or failed to carry out the plans which we formulated in December 1934.

This refers to plans of which I have no knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask for further identification. Mr. Mandel—

Mr. MORRIS. Has identified it as a copy of a letter taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Mandel is here, sir. He can speak for what he identified it as.

Mr. MORRIS. What is this document.

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a letter, a carbon of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. It may be received in evidence.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 499" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 499

129 EAST 52ND STREET, NEW YORK, February 10, 1936.

Mr. V. E. MOTYLEV,
Moscow, U. S. S. R.

DEAR MOTYLEV: This is to confirm our interchange of cables, as follows:

"LATTIMORE AND I PROPOSE VISIT MOSCOW MARCH TWENTY-NINE TO APRIL SEVENTEEN. PEASE CABLE WHETHER CONVENIENT FOR YOU.

"CARTER."

"WILL BE GLAD SEE YOU LATTIMORE SUGGESTED TIME.

"MOTYLEV."

It was delightful to discover that the dates which I proposed would be convenient for you. As you know, Lattimore for a long time has been anxious to meet you, to visit Moscow and to advance his knowledge of the affairs and ideas of the Soviet Union. After the Yosemite Conference he hopes to learn the Russian language with a view to a more extended visit to the U. S. S. R. in 1937. But as a preliminary to all that, the visit which I have proposed in my cable, will, I am sure, greatly facilitate all his future studies of Soviet affairs. As you know, Mongolia is one of his areas of concentration but his interests are wide.

In addition to Lattimore's visit, I myself want to carry out my promise to you on the night of December 30, 1934, that I would return to Moscow within two years. I have arranged for Miss Harriet Moore to accompany me because of her knowledge of Russian, because of her wide knowledge of the work of the IPR, and because of my desire that she renew her contacts with those in Moscow who are sources of authentic information regarding Buriat Mongolia. I hope that at the time of our visit you can get the necessary permission for her to visit Buriat Mongolia some time after the Yosemite Conference, preferably at the beginning of 1937. The objects of my visit to Moscow, among others, are as follows:

First, to renew my personal acquaintance with you and the Prassidium and the other members of the U. S. S. R. National Council of the IPR. Lattimore and Miss Moore will similarly want to make the acquaintance of as many of the Council as possible.

Second, if it meets with your approval, I suggest that during the first two or three days of our visit, Miss Moore, Lattimore, and I review jointly with you and the Prassidium the relation between the U. S. S. R. National Council on the one hand and the International Secretariat and the other National Councils on the other, with a view to discovering wherein we have made mistakes or failed to carry out the plans which we formulated in December 1934.

Third, I wish to explore with you the steps that should be taken to ensure that a Soviet group of at least eight should attend the Yosemite Conference. We hope, of course, that both you and Voitinsky will attend, and want to discuss with you ways and means of ensuring that at least six more representatives of the U. S. S. R. Council will be present, as this will permit of there being two Soviet members at each of the four simultaneous round tables. The American Council desires that I raise with you the question of arranging for the Soviet IPR representatives to meet influential groups of American citizens in New York, Washington, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco.

Fourth, we will hope to find your data paper preparation well advanced and we will want to have your criticisms of the preliminary round-table discussion outlines which I sent you in printed forms on November 15th and which were subsequently reprinted in December IPR NOTES.

Fifth, with reference to publications, there are several points, (a) what is the status of the symposium of articles on important questions pertaining to the Pacific Ocean and the Far East, which the U. S. S. R. Council was planning to publish, in English, and which you discussed with us at the time of our visit to Moscow in December 1934? (b) Has the Survey of Soviet Institutions studying the Far East been completed? (c) Is there any better method for purchasing Soviet books and subscribing to Soviet periodicals in the United States than through Bookaiga and other regular bookstores in this country? (d) what policy can we mutually adopt that will result in fuller Soviet participation in *Pacific Affairs*?

Sixth, would it be possible for the U. S. S. R. National Council to appoint a Soviet citizen to be a member of the Secretary General's staff, if not for a year, at least for a month before and a month after the Yosemite Conference?

Seventh, in addition to discussing general questions, Mr. Lattimore will, of course, wish to meet some of the leading scientific workers who are studying Mongolia.

Eighth, the American Council has asked me to discuss with you whether the present book exchange arrangement between New York and Moscow is satisfactory to the U. S. S. R. Council. The American Council would like to have, if possible, more material on the internal development of the U. S. S. R.

Ninth, both from the point of view of the American and all the other Councils, we wish to discuss in detail the bibliographical exchange, several aspects of which were discussed so helpfully by Mr. Harondar and Mr. Fisher last summer.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. CARTER.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, I do not know how long you want to run. What is your pleasure, Mr. Morris? Mr. Sourwine wants 5 minutes before we conclude. I thought we would not run this afternoon, if that is satisfactory to the members of the committee.

Senator FERGUSON. That is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sourwine, you may have your 5 minutes now. Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just two loose ends I want to clean up.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the Communist Party of China backed by Russia in 1940, do you know?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it your opinion that it was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is my opinion that it was; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has the Communist Party of China been consistently backed by Russia ever since 1940?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it your opinion that it was?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is not my personal knowledge. It is my opinion; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall whether you ever held a contrary opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Whether I ever held a contrary opinion?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever express a contrary opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you have expressed a contrary opinion, not holding one?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is impossible to answer that question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you mean that it is possible that you would have expressed an opinion you didn't hold?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Your question was, "Would you have expressed a contrary opinion, not holding one?"

Mr. SOURWINE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you have expressed an opinion that you didn't hold?

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you understand what I meant, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. How can you express an opinion you don't hold?

Mr. SOURWINE. You are quibbling. You understood what I meant, didn't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Let me restate it, then. Is it true that you have stated here that so far as you can recall it has been your opinion since 1940 that the Communist Party of China has since 1940 been backed by Russia?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; it is my opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Since that has been your opinion, do you think you would have ever expressed a contrary opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't think I would have expressed a contrary opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then I am asking you, Did you ever express a contrary opinion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think so.

The CHAIRMAN. That is clear. Let's proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. The other loose end I want to clean up, Mr. Chairman, is the matter of the lawsuit which Mr. Hiss brought and the invi-

tation by the witness to Mr. Hiss to visit his, the witness', home. Do you know, Mr. Lattimore, in general what the charges were that were brought against Mr. Hiss by Whittaker Chambers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see.

Mr. SOURWINE. No; I don't want you to repeat them. I want to know if you know in general what they were.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I can tell you what I think in general they were. I am not sure whether my knowledge is——

The CHAIRMAN. The question——

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't have an accurate knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you aware at the time of the Hiss-Chambers confrontation that anything of that nature had been going on or had gone on?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Anything of which nature?

Mr. SOURWINE. The nature of the confrontation of Hiss and Chambers. Do you know what I am referring to when I speak of that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you aware that in a very dramatic scene Mr. Hiss and Mr. Chambers were brought together by the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives to try to settle the question of identities?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, I remember reading something about that; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did read the newspapers about that time, didn't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were aware of that at or about the time it happened?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I must have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the time that you invited Mr. Hiss to stay at your home with you, were you aware that that confrontation had taken place and that he had been identified by Mr. Chambers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no present recollection of what stage this thing had reached at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think it would have made any difference in your invitation to Hiss to visit your home?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I don't think it would have made any difference. My invitation to Mr. Hiss was based simply, as I said, on the general attitude that it is the decent thing, when a man is subjected to very serious charges, to show that you do not necessarily believe that accusation is equivalent to guilt.

Mr. SOURWINE. I thought you had intended to express some question as to whether your invitation took place after the conclusion of the Chambers accusation of Hiss. Is there any doubt in your mind about that now?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Would you repeat that question?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Is there any doubt in your mind about whether your invitation to Mr. Hiss followed his accusation by Mr. Chambers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have already said, Mr. Sourwine, that I don't remember the stage reached by these charges at the time I issued that invitation.

Mr. SOURWINE. You issued your invitation after Mr. Hiss had filed his libel action against Mr. Chambers, is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. That libel action was filed in September, September 27, to be precise, in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in Baltimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your statement.

Senator O'CONNOR. What year?

Mr. SOURWINE. 1948.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I will accept your date. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have no evidence on this, but I am reliably informed that the motion for new trial filed by Mr. Hiss recites that date as the date of filing. It can be easily established from the court records.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is any question about it. I do not want any incorrect date to go in here.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was explaining the basis for my question to the witness.

Senator FERGUSON. With that explanation, Mr. Chairman, may it remain in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It may remain in the record.

Senator FERGUSON. And if the witness wishes to dispute it, he may do so later.

Mr. SOURWINE. The confrontation of Mr. Hiss by Mr. Chambers was on August 17, 1948, which was 5 or 6 weeks prior to the filing of the lawsuit. Did you know that to be true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. We have here the official record of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings, if it is desired to establish that date.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question about it. If any question is raised we can establish it by the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. The hearings before the House Un-American Activities Committee ran from July 31 through September 9, in this volume, and the testimony does show that the confrontation was on August 17, 1948.

Those were the two loose ends I wanted to cover in the record, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SMITH. I have just one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, Senator.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Lattimore, on page 4 of the minutes of the April 8, 1936, meeting, the second paragraph reads:

Motylev said it was a dangerous editorial mistake to publish the Chamberlin review.

Who was Chamberlin? Was he not an anti-Communist writer, or have you so identified him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right; yes.

Senator SMITH. And Motylev was the Russian?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. He was protesting against publication of the Chamberlin review?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. In the next paragraph it is stated, not reading the whole paragraph—

but the review must be done with due respect to a person in Stalin's position. Motylev asked why the book was given to Chamberlin who was known to be so anti-Soviet.

Then the next paragraph reads:

O. L. said that he had not realized Chamberlin's position, but as soon as he learned of the Soviet opinion about Chamberlin, he canceled an article on the Soviet press which he had asked from Chamberlin.

This is the same Chamberlin, the anti-Communist writer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right; yes.

Senator SMITH. And upon the protest of Motylev you canceled this article by Chamberlin?

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I comment on that?

Senator SMITH. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. These meetings with Motylev began in an extremely unfriendly atmosphere. The Russians had published in their own journals some reviews of my work on Mongolia in which they used extremely unpleasant personal epithets about me. This whole situation was the very reverse of the Russians trying to infiltrate the Institute of Pacific Relations. The Institute of Pacific Relations as an international body was trying to get the Russians in. We were leaning over backward to show that we would entertain any reasonable presentation of their point of view, any reasonable criticism of other people's point of view, and we never succeeded. We got, I think, maybe one or two articles from them, and then all these other articles referred to that I was trying to get from them, and so on. I was being as diplomatic, as polite as I could, but it just didn't work. They just wouldn't participate; they wouldn't cooperate, and they finally just dropped out of the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is sufficient explanation.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In regard to Mr. Chamberlin's article I was forced to concede that Mr. Chamberlin had made personal remarks about the ruler and I was forced to concede that the Soviet representatives had a right to protest about that, just as the British would have had a right to protest if an article about British policy had contained personal remarks about the King.

The CHAIRMAN. And the force was the objection on the part of the Soviets; is that right?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The force was the objection on the part of the Soviets, which would have been no different in that respect from the objection of any national council on a similar point.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MORRIS?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, in view of the fact that we are not going to have a session this afternoon, I have three questions on this general subject. May I ask them now?

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you ever make a Communist article the core around which to build a whole issue of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall. I would be interested to see what you are referring to there.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever make a straight Marxist article the core around which to build a whole issue of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever consciously take a Communist or straight Marxist article and edit it in such a way as to conceal its nature and make it palatable to Pacific Affairs readers?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations dated May 16, 1940, addressed to Mr. Owen Lattimore, with the typed signature of Frederick V. Field.

Mr. MORRIS. I offer that, Mr. Lattimore, and ask you if you recall having received that letter.

(Mr. Lattimore examining document.)

Mr. MORRIS. What is your answer?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I remember this now.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read the letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. There is a blank here that isn't in the photostat. I had better read from the photostat.

DEAR OWEN: You may recall that in the winter I asked whether you would be interested in an article on the Chinese market by a young German whom I had met, William Brandt. He failed to meet your deadline of the end of March but has now turned over to me a manuscript which is going to you under separate cover. It may be delayed a day or two because I have not yet finished going through it carefully. The first impression of the manuscript is a most alarming one for it is 61 pages long. The second impression, however, at least as far as the first 30 pages which I have carefully read are concerned, is that it wanders off into a good many theoretical considerations supplementary to but not essential to the main thesis. In my opinion it can, therefore, be very considerably reduced but this is going to be a very tough job of editing. I also have the impression that, while the analysis is a straight Marxist one and from that point of view should not be altered, there are a great many of those overused Communist words and phrases which will make most of your readers vomit and which can very easily be paraphrased to the great benefit of the article.

I am under the impression that this is a really very brilliant piece of work but at the same time it is somewhat uneven in quality. The main thing that Brandt is trying to say is a very important point which should be given serious consideration and should therefore not be confused by an overdifficult article or by too many excursions into peripheral questions.

At this point I don't think it is necessary for me to give any more of my own opinion. I hope that you will be able to let me know what you think of it and whether or not you see any possibility of its being made into a Pacific Affairs article. You would, I think, be the best possible editor of it but if you don't want to undertake the job it might be interesting to ask Rosinger to take a crack at it. On the other hand, you may feel (a) that the article cannot be sufficiently condensed and/or (b) that on the whole it is somewhat too theoretical for your purposes. I am assuming, of course, that you are not going to be disturbed by the ridicule with which some of the pillars, not only of our society but of the IPR, like Sir Arthur Salter, are treated. (Footnote: why in Heaven's name has Sir Arthur been made Parliamentary Under Secretary of the Ministry of Health in the new British Cabinet?)

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK V. FIELD.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will that letter be received?

The CHAIRMAN. It is received.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit 500" and was read in full.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this letter?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 6, 1940, addressed to Mr. Frederick V. Field, Institute of Pacific Relations, 129 East Fifty-second Street, with the typed signature of Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I ask you if you recall having sent that letter to Mr. Field.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read it, please, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. LATTIMORE (reading):

DEAR FRED: Your letter of June 5 came in just when I was going to write you a note about the Brandt article. By the way, the name is on the article; but at the end of the paper, which was such a long way off that I had not yet got within sight of it.

I wanted to let you know that I am working on the paper. The first problem has been to get an original manuscript of 60 pages down to manageable proportion for Pacific Affairs. I hope you have warned the author of my Terrible Turk methods of editing, so that the shock won't be so great when he sees my draft edited version. This, of course, he will in turn be perfectly free to criticize.

The ideas he works in are absorbingly interesting, to me at least. I may have misinterpreted some of them in my attempt to abbreviate, but I am quite sure that I have learned a lot. It has been slow work. In fact, if the editing I have done were reduced to terms of 8-hour working days, it would already amount to several days, and I am not through yet.

Enclosed are a couple of enlargements that may interest you. I like the one at the water side of a little lake-island port in Sweden for its lighting effects, though the composition is disappointingly postcardy.

Yours,

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will you accept that into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been identified.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I make a reference to the article in question.

Mr. MORRIS. We have one more letter on it, Mr. Lattimore. We will introduce that first.

The CHAIRMAN. Insert it in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 501" and was read in full.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this letter?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostate of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 11, 1940, addressed to Mr. F. V. Field, with the typed signature of Owen Lattimore. Addressed from 300 Gilman Hall, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I ask you if you can recall having sent that letter.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I recall now that I see the letter; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will you receive it into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 502" and is read in full below.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you read that into the record, please?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This is June 11, 1940:

DEAR FRED: Herewith I am sending back to you the original manuscript of the Brandt article, together with the original copy of my edited version, and an extra carbon copy for you and Carter to consult at your leisure while Mr. Brandt compares his original with my original.

I do hope that Mr. Brandt will go easy on me for not going easy on him. I hated to shorten the article at all, but the present length is all that we could manage. I particularly hated to cut out things like his amusing citation from Mark Twain.

This article is a good stout core around which to build the whole of the September issue of Pacific Affairs. It does not merely juxtapose, but really integrates, questions affecting Europe, America, and Asia. I don't know when I have so much enjoyed studying and editing an article for Pacific Affairs.

Yours.

This article was one that I always considered one of the most interesting I received for Pacific Affairs. It was written in 1940 while the war with Asia was going on, and I must say that I didn't take seriously

Field's characterization of it as Marxist, because to my untutored mind of those days it was a most un-Marxist article. It was an article which described the possibilities of a peaceful evolutionary change in the status of colonial countries from Asia after the war, with development to be done by capitalistic investment and a combination of political independence and economic support. It was a sort of forerunner of what we now call 4 thinking.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, what question were you answering by the last remark? What question were you answering?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was making a comment on the correspondence about an article which interested me at the time and which I still think is an interesting article to read.

Senator FERGUSON. When did you read it last?

Mr. LATTIMORE. When did I read what last?

Senator FERGUSON. The article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The article? It is an article—

The CHAIRMAN. When did you read it last?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see. Within the last year or two, I am sure.

Senator FERGUSON. When?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure. Oh, yes, I know. I read it at the time of the Tydings hearings when I was reviewing the editorial record of Pacific Affairs.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you asked about it at the Tydings hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I was.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you asked about these letters and these minutes of meetings at the Tydings hearings?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. You say that when you took this Marxist article as described by Field—

Mr. LATTIMORE. As described by Field, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. I said, "As described by Field." He made quite a description of it, didn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. And I—

Senator FERGUSON. And even said that your readers would vomit?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't agree.

Senator FERGUSON. I don't care whether you agreed. He said that, didn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He said it, yes.

Senator FERGUSON. At that time, you said in an answer this morning, Russia was out of the Pacific Affairs.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1940, you mean?

Senator FERGUSON. When did they get out?

The CHAIRMAN. If at all.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think they just sort of tapered off. My recollection is not clear on that. I don't think there was any formal resignation. I think they just stopped subscribing or taking part.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Lattimore, isn't it true that at the meeting in Moscow in 1936 the party line was established by the Pacific Affairs and the Institute and that after that day they remained in and finally did taper off because the party line was being carried on and it could be carried on much better if they didn't appear in the organization? Isn't that a fair conclusion from these documents here today?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, that is a totally unwarrantable conclusion.

Senator FERGUSON. I don't see, Mr. Lattimore, how you can draw any other conclusion than that conclusion from these documents and these letters and these articles.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I draw a totally different conclusion and so did readers of the Pacific Affairs through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not make any difference what somebody else did.

Senator O'CONNOR. May I ask a question there, Mr. Lattimore. At the time you received this from Mr. Field did you know him to be a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir.

Senator O'CONNOR. I thought you told us yesterday that you knew that in 1939.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir. I said that reading now a letter that Field had written in 1939 I would consider that my memory of him as a close fellow traveler had been wrong by 2 years. Reflecting on that overnight, I came to the conclusion that perhaps I had committed the same error that so many other people commit, namely, thinking back to the 1930's with the knowledge and the point of view that we have in the 1950's. I do not believe that, speaking as of 1952, with all the intervening years, I would today be entitled to say that in 1939 I was sophisticated enough to classify people in that manner.

Senator O'CONNOR. But the fact is, is it not, Mr. Lattimore, that yesterday you did give us to understand that you believed that Field in 1939 was known to you to be a Communist.

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir, I don't think the record will show that.

Senator O'CONNOR. You now say that you have always believed that he was a Communist only as of 1941 or thereabouts?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My recollection has always been that I began to think of him as a close fellow traveler of the Russians in the—I think it was the winter of 1940–41 when the American peace mobilization was on, and even then I thought of him as a fellow traveler of Russia and a justifier of Russian policy rather than a Communist.

Senator O'CONNOR. Even though he described the analysis as a straight Marxist one and including Communist words? Did that not leave an impression on you that the article was definitely following the party line?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not as of that time, Senator. America at that time was—

The CHAIRMAN. "Not as of that time" is your answer. The rest will go out. Any further question?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes; I have a question.

Mr. Lattimore, would you say that any reasonable and prudent editor could come to any other conclusion after reading this May 16, 1940, letter to you, than that Mr. Field was a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I think that many reasonable and prudent editors as of that date would have acted the same way I did, because there was the article—

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, and here were his words:

I also have the impression that, while the analysis is a straight Marxist one and from that point of view should not be altered, there are a great many of those overused Communist words and phrases which will make most of your readers vomit and which can easily be paraphrased to the great benefit of the article.

In other words, "Let's go back," he says, "to the Communist propaganda line and conceal this thing, but let's make it palatable for the people who are reading it and carry out the Marxist Communist line." Wouldn't any reasonable editor draw that conclusion?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, sir; I do not agree with you.

Senator FERGUSON. I can't agree with your answer, either.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like to give you my reasons for not agreeing.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have to give the reasons. You do not agree with him, and that settles it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like the record to show that I have tried to give my reason.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, one word. In that letter of May 16, Mr. Lattimore, Mr. Field suggested that you also pass it on to Mr. Rosinger. Was that Mr. Lawrence K. Rosinger that he was referring to or did you know who he was referring to?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Oh, yes; I must have known. 1940. I think Rosinger was working for—I don't know whether he was working for the IPR then or was working for the Foreign Policy Association.

Senator SMITH. You know he has been identified, has he not, by some witnesses as a Communist?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know that now; yes.

Senator SMITH. You did not know that in 1940?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I had no reason whatever to suppose that.

Mr. MORRIS. You know, Mr. Lattimore, when we had Mr. Rosinger in here to testify, he declined to answer whether or not he was a Communist on the grounds that the answer would incriminate him?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I know that, and I was profoundly shocked to hear it.

Senator O'CONNOR. Mr. Lattimore, in editing the article did you omit the obvious Communist words and phrases to which Mr. Frederick Vanderbilt Field referred?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Thank you for asking that question, Senator. I eliminated what I considered to be a lot of European economic jargon used by a man who did not write English well. I did not consider myself an expert on Marxism, and perhaps for that very reason when I saw an article that did not have all the simple stereotyped, violent revolution, class warfare, and all the rest of it that I as a nonexpert on Marxism would have expected at that time, I went on my own judgment of the manuscript and not on Mr. Field's characterization of it.

Senator O'CONNOR. The reason for asking that was that you previously stated you were not conversant with the Communist line or Communist readings and writings, and I wondered why, if you were not so well versed, you didn't ask Mr. Field to what he referred when he said that obviously there were Communist phrases and words.

Mr. LATTIMORE. All I can answer, Senator, is that in the atmosphere of that type, in discussions of international relations, economic and political problems, and so on, that just wasn't customary in the circles in which I moved.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator SMITH. Did you publish the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I published the article; yes.

Senator SMITH. In Pacific Affairs?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes. I thought it was a very good article.

MR. MORRIS. What was the name of it, Mr. Lattimore?

MR. LATTIMORE. I have forgotten the name of it.

MR. MORRIS. When did it appear?

MR. LATTIMORE. Presumably September. I think it is mentioned in this letter. We could look it up.

MR. MORRIS. Were there two articles by Mr. Brandt in Pacific Affairs?

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes; there was another one by him, too.

SENATOR O'CONNOR. Is the original manuscript in existence?

MR. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

SENATOR O'CONNOR. There would be no way to show just what was submitted. If it is in existence, this committee must have it.

MR. SOURWINE. Might I follow a short line of inquiry here, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LATTIMORE—

THE CHAIRMAN. Any levity in the rear of the room or any demonstration will have to be dealt with, because we are crowded in here. I hope people will observe the decorum and not engage in that.

MR. LATTIMORE. I have here two references to articles by William Brandt, in Pacific Affairs, 1940, entitled, the first one, "The United States, China, and the World Market," and the other one is another reference.

MR. MORRIS. In other words, it appeared in 1941, Mr. Lattimore?

MR. LATTIMORE. I thought there were two articles by him. Let me look at this and see if it is the same.

MR. MORRIS. There is an article in 1941 by Mr. Brandt.

MR. LATTIMORE. Oh. Maybe that is the one. The first one is United States, China, and the World Market, and that is September 1940, and the second one is Economic and Living Standards, American and Asiatic, June 1941.

MR. MORRIS. Which is the article that we have been discussing?

MR. LATTIMORE. It must be the 1940 one.

MR. MORRIS. What is the name of it?

MR. LATTIMORE. The name of it is the United States, China, and the World Market. Some of the characterizations of Mr. Brandt's writing that I have made here just from recollection probably spread over both articles rather than being confined to one of them.

THE CHAIRMAN. Very well. There is no question. Propound a question, Mr. Sourwine.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, in 1940 was Frederick V. Field a man whom you respected?

MR. LATTIMORE. In 1940, yes.

MR. SOURWINE. Was he a man whose intellect and intellectual attainments you respected?

MR. LATTIMORE. He was a man whose intellectual attainments I respected primarily as an economic expert on the Pacific area.

MR. SOURWINE. Was he a friend and coworker of yours?

MR. LATTIMORE. He was—I think "coworker" would not be quite accurate, since he was primarily in the American Council and I was under the Pacific Council.

MR. SOURWINE. He occasionally suggested things to you and sent you articles?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He occasionally suggested things to me or commented on things, or I sent him things for comment, as I did to many others.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you at that time have any reason to fear that he would deliberately attempt to mislead you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. When Mr. Field sent you an article and characterized it as a straight Marxist article, did you so little regard him that you failed to consider that as a flag on the article and that you failed to have any check made as to whether it was a Marxist article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I simply read the article, Mr. Sourwine, and my opinion of the article differed from Field's.

Mr. SOURWINE. You felt, did you, that you were a sufficient judge of what was a Marxist article that, in spite of Mr. Field's warning, you could go ahead and safely print the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I didn't regard myself as an authority on Marxism, and as of 1940 I regarded Field as something of an authority on both Russia in the Pacific and China, but I am sure I didn't regard him as a Marxist authority.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you consider that he was giving you a warning when he sent you the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; not a warning. I considered that he was stating his opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. If he was stating it as his opinion, did you feel that he did actually have the opinion that this was a straight Marxist article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, of course that was his opinion. I still felt that I was quite competent to stack up my opinion against his when I read the article.

Mr. SOURWINE. If Mr. Field was giving you his honest opinion that this was a straight Marxist article, did you feel he was warning you against using it?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I felt he was submitting it to me for my consideration.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, he was urging that you do use it, wasn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't remember whether—no, I think he was stating that it was a very interesting article.

Mr. SOURWINE. He wanted you to edit it, didn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No, I think on the whole he was suggesting that it not be used. I am not sure. Let's have a look.

Mr. SOURWINE. For what purpose did he send you this article?

The CHAIRMAN. He wanted you to edit it, didn't he?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He thought it was an article that would interest me.

Mr. SOURWINE. For what purpose did he send it to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. His first letter says that he had previously asked me if I would be interested in an article on the Chinese market. The Chinese market is something that has always been of interest in America. He says he always has "the impression that, while the analysis is a straight Marxist one and from that point of view should not be altered, he is not suggesting disguise.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you forgotten why you are reading that letter, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Why I am reading it?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Why am I reading it?

Mr. SOURWINE. You are reading it, I think, to help answer my question as to why Mr. Field sent you this article.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Well, he is saying it is really a very brilliant piece of work but at the same time somewhat uneven in quality.

The main thing that Brandt is trying to say is a very important point which should be given serious consideration and should therefore not be confussed by an overdificult or by too many excursions into peripheral questions.

The CHAIRMAN. He was talking to you about publishing the article; was he not?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, he was.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think he wrote you that letter to try to get you not to use the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. He sent it to me for my interest and consideration. Certainly I don't consider it a strong recommendation. I don't think he is writing me a letter saying this is a "must" article, and you have to get it into Pacific Affairs.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know when he sent you that letter that he wanted you to use the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think he sent it to me, as many articles were sent to me, for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that he wanted you to use that article in Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't think I can construct this letter as pressure on his part to get me to publish it.

The CHAIRMAN. You did publish the article; didn't you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I published the article and I think the correspondence shows that I was rather more enthusiastic about it than Field was.

The CHAIRMAN. You had the letters and correspondence from Mr. Field.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Drawing your attention to it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I recall to you, Mr. Chairman, that I also published this article by Asiaticus.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking you about that. That will be stricken. We are dealing with the article sent to you by Mr. Field in which he draws your attention—

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully say that I think my comment is pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. Your comment is not pertinent and will not be recorded.

Mr. SOURWINE. I can conclude in a few more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, you have stated, have you not, that you did not understand this letter from Mr. Field as a warning against publishing the article?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I didn't regard it as a warning against publishing it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you regard it as an indication that Mr. Field hoped, at least, that you would publish this article?

MR. LATTIMORE. I regarded it as an indication that Mr. Field had submitted what he thought was a good article, or an article that would interest me.

The CHAIRMAN. For publication.

MR. LATTIMORE. That would interest me for consideration for publication.

MR. SOURWINE. But he wanted you to edit it, didn't he? If you weren't interested he wanted you to send it to somebody else to be edited.

MR. LATTIMORE. He thought it would have to be edited for two reasons—

MR. SOURWINE. He wanted you to edit it, didn't he?

MR. LATTIMORE. For excessive length and for vocabulary.

MR. SOURWINE. The matter of excessive length had to do with the requirements of Pacific Affairs, didn't it?

MR. LATTIMORE. It had to do with the requirements of editing, yes.

MR. SOURWINE. He was looking forward to having that article published in Pacific Affairs, wasn't he?

MR. LATTIMORE. He was stating some of the problems that would have to be considered in taking it up for decision whether to publish it in Pacific Affairs.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, when Mr. Field sent you an article in this way, stating it was his opinion that it was a straight Marxist article, and when you felt it was honestly his opinion that it was a straight Marxist article and he was suggesting or urging or hoping that you would print it in Pacific Affairs, didn't that indicate anything to you about Mr. Field?

MR. LATTIMORE. Not as of 1940, no.

MR. SOURWINE. Do you mean to testify, then, that Mr. Field's language in this letter was not a warning flag to you, either with regard to the article or with regard to Mr. Field?

MR. LATTIMORE. As of 1940 it was an indication to me that Mr. Field thought it was straight Marxist thinking. As my practice has always been for editing or for any other purpose, I read the material to form my own judgment on it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we will recess.

Senator SMITH. Dr. Lattimore, in the first paragraph of the letter of May 16, 1940, Mr. Field did state the analysis is a straight Marxist one.

MR. LATTIMORE. That was his opinion, yes.

Senator SMITH. That is what he said to you in the letter, anyway.

MR. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Senator SMITH. You read this letter at the time you got it, did you not?

MR. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Then in the second sentence, the last paragraph, he says, "I hope that you will be able to let me know what you think of it and whether or not you see any possibility of its being made into a Pacific Affairs article."

MR. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. After you got that letter you did see the possibility of its being made into an article and proceeded to do so and publish it.

MR. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. That was your decision, upon your judgment and discretion that it should be published?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Senator SMITH. Even after Mr. Field had suggested that it was a straight Marxist line, I believe he said.

All right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question.

Mr. Lattimore, in the second sentence in the May 16 letter Field says to you, "He failed to meet your deadline of the end of March—" Was that the deadline for the June issue?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I have some other questions but I do not think we should continue today.

The CHAIRMAN. Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock. We have a Judiciary Committee meeting regularly on Monday at 10:30, and there are some matters that can not very well be passed over. We will reconvene Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 2 p. m., Monday, March 3, 1952.)

INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1952

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

The subcommittee met at 2:15 p. m., pursuant to recess, in room 424, Senate Office Building, Hon. Pat McCarran (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McCarran, Smith, Eastland, Ferguson, and Watkins.

Senators McCarthy and Kem.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, committee counsel; Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

TESTIMONY OF OWEN LATTIMORE, ACCOMPANIED BY THURMAN ARNOLD, COUNSEL—Resumed

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I request the introduction into evidence of the article about which there was so much testimony yesterday, United States, China and the World Market, by William Brandt, in the September 1940 issue of Pacific Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. You are making that as a request. As soon as I have the opportunity to run through it, I will make a ruling on it.

Mr. ARNOLD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write the book *Ordeal by Slander*?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Several portions of that purport to be writing of your wife, Mrs. Owen Lattimore, or Eleanor Lattimore, is that so? Several parts of this purport to be written by Mrs. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. One chapter, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you read what she wrote?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes; I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Before it was published?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And everything, to your knowledge, as far as you know, stated by Mrs. Lattimore you know to be true?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As far as I can say so, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Well now, on page 35 of the book, Mr. Lattimore, Mrs. Lattimore says, speaking of you, "He didn't know any Russians in this country or any Communists."

That is the statement.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is the statement, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I see that book that you are referring to?

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you testify before this committee in executive session that you met Mr. Constantine Oumansky in early July 1941, at lunch with Mr. Edward C. Carter?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I believe I did; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you subsequently change that testimony to read June or early July 1941?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Maybe I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify that your meeting with Mr. Oumansky was after the Hitler invasion of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Maybe I did. I don't remember. May I ask, by the way, that I be furnished with a full copy of the transcript of my hearing in executive session?

It is very difficult for me, after 8 months, especially since I have, in reading the transcript of the other hearing, naturally got my memory all mixed up with recollections of things years ago, things recently stated about things years ago, and so forth. So that my memory is—

The CHAIRMAN. You are asking for a copy of the transcript of the executive session?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, have the executive sessions been made a part of this record?

Mr. ARNOLD. There was a request, but it has not been acted on yet.

Mr. MORRIS. The committee has not acted on that.

The CHAIRMAN. There are certain matters that have been asked to go into the record. One has just been asked for by the counsel here, entitled "The United States, China, and the World Market." Is that the one?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is the one.

The CHAIRMAN. That and two other exhibits that have been submitted to the Chairman for ruling will be admitted, but they will be admitted only for the appendix of the record.

Senator FERGUSON. I might ask, is that what counsel asked for?

Mr. ARNOLD. No, I asked for the executive sessions to be made part—

Senator FERGUSON. No, the ruling on this particular article is sufficient if it is put in the appendix?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is all right.

Senator FERGUSON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be the order.

(For The United States, China, and the World Market, see exhibit 470 in appendix I of pt. 9, p. 3680. For the two other exhibits referred to see exhibits 595 and 596, pp. 3608 and 3610.)

Senator FERGUSON. But the next question is that you asked to see the whole executive session testimony.

Mr. ARNOLD. I asked that it be put in the record, and the committee has not yet moved.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter that I will take up with the committee just as soon as the hearing is over, that is, as soon as today's session is over.

Mr. ARNOLD. But the present request is that it be shown here.

The CHAIRMAN. He has always been shown.

Senator FERGUSON. I move that he be given the record for this particular page that he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right. That is always done. That will be done.

Senator FERGUSON. It has been done in the past, yes.

Senator SMITH. Has that not been the practice?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, all along.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I should like to have for my own reference a full transcript of this testimony taken 8 months ago, which, as I say, I have now a necessarily unclear memory.

The CHAIRMAN. That makes the matter public record in place of an executive record, and that is a matter for the committee to determine.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, this would not make it a public record, to allow him personally to see it.

The CHAIRMAN. Every time he is questioned about it, he will see it.

Mr. ARNOLD. That is right. But he would like to read the whole thing.

Mr. MORRIS. May I say this, Mr. Arnold, that Mr. Lattimore has had access to that all along. That was the clear understanding that existed, and he did come in at one time and make corrections and studied it.

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is not my recollection, Mr. Morris. My recollection was that I was told I could come in immediately after the executive session and check the transcript to see if I thought there was anything inaccurate in it. But I asked at that time if I could have a copy, and I was told no.

My understanding was that I was permitted to see it that once and that once only.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, we said that you could not have a copy but that you had free access to it at all times.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall your saying that, Mr. Morris. My distinct impression was that I was allowed to see it only once.

The CHAIRMAN. You did see it and correct it? Is that correct?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right. But that was 8 months ago, and especially, as I say, with all of the subsequent hearings and transcripts that I have read, my memory of what I was then asked about things that happened years ago, and what other people have since said about things that happened years ago, necessarily creates many confusions in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on it later on.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I want to say, about that executive session, I wish to testify as freely and unequivocally as possible. But I can only testify to the best of my recollection.

I asked at that time if I might be shown documents about which I was being questioned, but the present method of questioning gives me somewhat the feeling of a blind man running a gauntlet.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. The Chair will rule as to whether or not you may have the record at a later hour.

You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. The question, Mr. Lattimore, was: Did you testify that your meeting with Mr. Oumansky was after the Hitler invasion of the Soviet Union? That is at the top of that page. That is page 37.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I stated that it was just before I went out to China, so it must have been June or early July of 1941.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Will you read the rest of that testimony on that page?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Morris then asked:

That was, therefore, after the Hitler invasion of the Soviet?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you try to recall your conversation with Mr. Oumansky on that third occasion, with a view toward determining the political atmosphere that prevailed at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I recall that Mr. Oumansky behaved more or less like the other Ambassadors that I met at that time, just before I went to Chungking, of countries allied or associated in some manner with China, that is, behaved like a diplomat.

Mr. MORRIS. He behaved like a diplomat?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I am asking again, Mr. Lattimore, if you will recall as much as you possibly can about that particular meeting, and describe the meeting in the fullest detail to the committee.

Mr. LATTIMORE. It was a dinner which began with the fact that I was going out to China. Mr. Oumansky said that he was very glad that a man well acquainted with China was going out in the capacity as an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. Then he said various things about the continuation of Chinese resistance, and so on.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you describe his attitude as combative at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I have just described it as diplomatic.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you say that the atmosphere prevailing at the dinner was one which would induce you to be at your ease?

Mr. FORTAS. If you can answer that question.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Let me see. I should say that the atmosphere was one in which I was extremely on my guard. I was going out to a new assignment with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. There had been a good deal of publicity about it. Everybody that I met in Washington was trying to find out what my assignment was. My position was that I wouldn't know my assignment until the generalissimo told me what it was, and it was that kind of a situation.

Mr. MORRIS. Again, what was the date of your assignment?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Late June or early July 1941.

Mr. MORRIS. It is your distinct recollection that you did discuss your assignment with Mr. Oumansky at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I discussed the fact that I was going out to China, but not my assignment because my attitude at the time with everybody whom I spoke was that my appointment had just been made, and the details of my assignment I would know when the generalissimo told me.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Lattimore, I will ask you some questions on the basis of that transcript.

Did you testify that your meeting with Mr. Oumansky was after the Hitler invasion of the Soviet Union?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I believe I did. I couldn't guarantee that, just to the best of my recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify that during this conversation Mr. Oumansky behaved like a diplomat?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify that you discussed on that occasion with Mr. Oumansky your assignment with Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I discussed the fact that I had been assigned; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify that there had been a great deal of

publicity about your assignment to the generalissimo, and that everyone in Washington was trying to find out what your assignment was, and that you were therefore extremely on guard?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you testify in executive session before this committee that you discussed your assignment with Mr. Oumansky?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I discussed with Mr. Oumansky the fact that I had been assigned, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 20, 1941, addressed to Owen Lattimore, with the typed signature of Edward C. Carter.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is exhibit No. 32, already introduced into our public record.

Mr. Lattimore, I offer you that and ask if you had received that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is did you receive the letter? Is that the question?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I presume that I did. It was addressed to me in San Francisco. No; it was addressed to me in Baltimore. That is right. June 20.

Mr. MORRIS. Just a minute, and we will have copies of that.

Senator FERGUSON. What year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. 1941. That would be before the Hitler—

Mr. MORRIS. We will have copies ready in just a minute.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Wouldn't that be before the Hitler invasion?

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that letter, Mr. Lattimore, for the committee?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It is dated in New York, June 20, 1941. [Reading:]

DEAR OWEN: If you have time while in San Francisco you and Bill Holland may want to arrange a private talk with Col. Philip R. Faymonville whose present address is Headquarters of the Fourth Army, Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

He would, I think, have been thoroughly at home and at ease if he had lunched with us at the Mayflower on Wednesday. I think you get the idea. It may be that if you get the same favorable impression of him which Harriet Moore and I have, he might be someone who could be exceptionally useful to you and the generalissimo at some future time in Chungking. If you wish me to, I will wire him for an appointment.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 23, 1941, addressed to Dr. Philip C. Jessup, with the typed signature of Edward C. Carter.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I offer you this letter and ask you if you have ever seen that letter before?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this letter has been identified by Mr. Mandel as a document taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and it is supplementary to the events related to the last letter. I would like to have it introduced into the public record at this time. It supplements the conversation in the letter identified previously by the witness.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness said he never saw it. I am wondering just how you tie it in, how you connect it.

Mr. MORRIS. We have examined Mr. Carter on that letter, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Carter has testified in a public record.

Mr. MORRIS. About that letter, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this letter in the record now?

Mr. MORRIS. No; at that time it was not put into the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What you mean is that Mr. Carter, as the secretary-general of the Institute of Pacific Relations, identified this letter as having been written by him and addressed to Mr. Jessup. Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. But by a mistake, obviously, Mr. Chairman, it was not introduced into the public record at that time even though it was identified by Mr. Carter as having been written by him.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, it may be inserted in the record.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder, Mr. Lattimore, if you would mind reading that letter for the committee, please.

Mr. LATTIMORE. June 23, 1941, addressed to Dr. Philip C. Jessup, care of American Express, Santiago, Chile. [Reading:]

DEAR JESSUP: Immediately following your excellent suggestion regarding General Barrows, I wrote Wilbur and asked whether he would be willing to make a presentation of a series of IPR publications to the general for the ultimate purpose which you and I discussed.

Wilbur responded in the affirmative, and I sent him a handsome assortment. These reached Barrows on the morning of June 10. Just by a pure fluke, this was the day on which Wilbur and the Bay Region IPR gave a luncheon at the Palace Hotel at which Wilbur asked me to speak of some of the latest developments in the IPR. I sat between Wilbur and General Barrows.

This morning Wilbur sent me a letter from General Barrows, copy of which I enclose. So far, so good.

I ought to add that at the luncheon I was able to emphasize to General Barrows the role that W. I. Holland and Galen Fisher are playing in the total program of the IPR. The bay region group has a scheme for an emergency study of the Japanese in California and have made some progress in getting Barrows interested in seeking to secure part of the funds from the Carnegie Endowment.

The Canadian Institute—Northwest-American IPR 2-day meeting at Victoria was realistic and worth while. The discussions were at a very high level. After Victoria I met members of the institute in San Francisco, Stanford, Berkeley, and Los Angeles. Holland is a great asset on the Pacific coast, though we miss him sorely here. Sproul's executive assistant, James F. Lash, is gradually wiping out the difficult situation that existed under Farren Scott.

I wonder whether you happened to hear Churchill's speech yesterday. Hitler, Stalin, and Churchill managed quite a spectacular week end. It so happened that last week I had lunch with Oumansky in Washington on Wednesday. We talked for a couple of hours. I was fortunate in getting Lattimore over from Baltimore, as I thought it was pretty important for him to have a long talk with Oumansky, in view of his job and the evolving world situation. It was a most illuminating 2 hours.

Sincerely yours,

The CHAIRMAN. I will say right there that admission of this instrument is a matter of weight rather than admissibility. I do not think that this business can be held down excepting as it may be material to your other connecting facts. He is not bound by this letter. The letter was not addressed to him, nor was it written by him. But it is admitted. It is a question of the weight of it rather than the admissibility of it.

(The document previously read by the witness was marked "Exhibit No. 503," and was read in full.)

Mr. LATTIMORE. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this letter establishes the fact that my recollection was wrong in believing that I had that lunch with Mr. Carter and Oumansky in Washington after the Hitler invasion of Russia. It seems to have taken place before.

The CHAIRMAN. That helps to make it material, then. That is all right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, I offer you a calendar of June 1941. You will notice that the date of that last letter is June 23, 1941.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And in the last paragraph, the sentence reads, "It so happened that last week I had lunch with Oumansky in Washington on Wednesday."

That would place that lunch as June 18, would it not, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, June 18.

Mr. MORRIS. Now in this letter of June 20, which is the previous exhibit, Mr. Carter writing to you says, in speaking of Colonel Faymonville:

He would, I think, have been thoroughly at home and at ease if he had lunched with us at the Mayflower on Wednesday. I think you get the idea. It may be that if you get the same favorable impression of him which Harriet Moore and I have, he might be someone who could be exceptionally useful to you and to the Generalissimo at some future time in Chungking. If you wish me to, I will wire him for an appointment.

So therefore, you say, Mr. Lattimore, that your testimony that this conversation took place after the Hitler invasion of the Soviet Union was inaccurate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you also said, Mr. Lattimore, that there had been a great deal of publicity about your assignment to the generalissimo.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And that everybody in Washington was trying to find out what your assignment was and that you were, therefore, extremely on guard. I would like to introduce into the record at this time, Mr. Chairman, the New York Times of June 29, 1941.

On page 9 there is a news item, "Lattimore named adviser to Chiang." This appears on page 9 of the New York Times, Sunday, June 29, 1941. May that go into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It may go into the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 504" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 504

[Source: New York Times, Sunday, June 29, 1941]

LATTIMORE NAMED ADVISER TO CHIANG—APPOINTMENT OF WIDELY KNOWN WRITER ON CHINA EVOKES PRAISE IN CHUNGKING—HELD TOKEN OF ESTEEM—AUTHOR'S IMMEDIATE TASK WILL BE TO FACILITATE AID FROM UNITED STATES

[Special to the New York Times]

WASHINGTON, June 28.—Owen Lattimore, widely known American author of several books dealing with affairs of the Far East, has been appointed as a special political adviser to the Chinese Government, and will go to Chungking immediately. President Roosevelt recommended the appointment, and General Chiang Kai-shek, according to a cable from Chungking, today officially accepted the President's recommendation.

T. V. Soong, former Chinese Minister of Finance, who is now in Washington as head of the China Defense Commission, yesterday cabled to General Chiang that Mr. Lattimore's appointment "may be considered as a major token of increasing understanding between China and the United States." The appointment is for a period of 6 months, but will probably be extended. Cables received here today from Chungking said the selection was well received in China, particularly so as Mr. Lattimore speaks Chinese fluently.

Mr. Lattimore, who has lately been engaged in special research work at Johns Hopkins at Baltimore, was born in Washington, D. C., in 1900 and was educated in England and at Harvard. At the age of 20 he first went to China and engaged in business at Shanghai, going later to Tientsin, where he became a newspaperman. Since 1926 he has been engaged in travel and research, particularly in Manchuria and China's far northwest, having had connections successively with the Social Science Research Council, the Harvard-Yenching Institute, the J. S. Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and the Institute of Pacific Relations.

His better-known books include *The Desert Road to Turkestan*, *High Tartary*, *The Mongols of Manchuria*, *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*, and *Manchuria, Cradle of Conflict*.

Mr. Lattimore's immediate tasks in China have been described as facilitating United States aid to the Chungking Government and, indirectly, to help discourage Japan from her expansionist program in East Asia.

Mrs. Lattimore and their son, David, will remain in the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have here a letter from W. C. Gilbert, Acting Director of the Library of Congress, addressed to Hon. Pat McCarran, chairman, Senate Internal Security Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C. :

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Referring to your request of October 2, 1951, a search of the New York Times index indicates that the first reference therein to the appointment of Owen Lattimore as political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek appeared in the New York Times issue of June 29, 1941.

A search of our files revealed no earlier reference.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. GILBERT, *Acting Director*.

Mr. Lattimore, does not that indicate that your testimony that there had been a great deal of publicity about your assignment to the Generalissimo, and that everyone in Washington was trying to find out what your assignment was, was inaccurate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That shows that my recollection was inaccurate. I was referring to my recollection of the general period at which I was appointed, and to the fact that there was a great deal of interest.

Actually, before the announcement was made public, a number of people knew about it, and I saw a number of people.

Mr. MORRIS. Does that not indicate, Mr. Lattimore, that 11 days before your appointment was announced, that you had discussed this appointment with Mr. Oumansky in Washington?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This indicates, Mr. Morris, that owing to the fact that up to then I had been editor of *Pacific Affairs*, one of the earliest people informed about the fact that I was getting this appointment was Mr. Carter, and that Mr. Carter took the initiative in arranging for me to meet Mr. Oumansky at lunch.

Mr. MORRIS. And do you realize, now, Mr. Lattimore, that that conversation took place at a time when Mr. Oumansky represented a Government which was at political war with the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is not the point that would stand out in my recollection, Mr. Morris. That Government at that time was strongly supporting Chiang Kai-shek's government in China with munitions and airplanes, and in that aspect was cooperating with the policy of the United States.

However, its actions may have been in conflict with the policy of the United States in other respects and in other parts of the world.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, was it the practice of the IPR to send advance copies of your articles in Pacific Affairs to Mr. Oumansky?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't know whether it was or not. As has frequently been mentioned here, advance copies of Pacific Affairs articles were circulated to all kinds of people. That was usually done by the New York office, to whom I sent the material after editing, and I would not necessarily know what article went to which people.

I was always willing to have my own material circulated in advance and criticized.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a carbon copy taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated June 28, 1940, addressed to "Dear Oumansky, His Excellency, The Soviet Ambassador," with a typed signature of Edward C. Carter.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that taken from the files of the institute?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will you receive into the record this document, which is a copy of a letter sent by Mr. Carter to Mr. Oumansky?

We have been discussing Mr. Oumansky and Mr. Lattimore's relations with Mr. Oumansky, and this letter bears on that point. I will show it to Mr. Lattimore and ask him if he has seen it before.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this the one that Mr. Mandel identified just before?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recollect ever seeing this before.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mandel, this was part of the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. An instrument that you found or a paper that you found in those files?

Mr. MANDEL. A carbon copy of a letter, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be admitted into the record.

(The letter referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 505" and is read in full below.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, will you read that letter for us, please?

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the witness may have to do a lot of talking if he reads letters with which he is not immediately concerned, and that it be read by counsel?

Mr. MORRIS. That is all right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, if I might interrupt at this time, I would like to say one thing. It is a very small point, but I have noticed sometimes the letter appears twice in our records, because it is read and then inserted. I wonder if it might be read, and that the reporter be instructed to compare the actual letter as subsequently submitted with the text as read, to be sure it is accurate, and let that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. That should be done.

Mr. MORRIS. This letter reads (exhibit No. 505 is as follows):

DEAR OUMANSKY: Enclosed for your private information is a first draft of an article by Owen Lattimore which is intended for publication in the September issue of Pacific Affairs. Even though the situation may change rapidly between

now and September, I thought that you might wish to see this advance copy of his article for it seems to me to represent an important point of view.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. Lattimore, was not that letter written during the Hitler-Stalin pact?

Mr. LATTIMORE. This was dated what?

Mr. MORRIS. June 28, 1940.

Mr. LATTIMORE. What was the date of the Hitler-Stalin pact? 1939? Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. That material article of yours, did that bear on China?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recollect. I would have to look at the article.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, how often have you seen Mr. Oumansky in the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I think three times.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us the occasions?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I saw him once, I think, for the first time I met him was when he came out to visit the Yosemite conference of the IPR, in the summer of 1936, and I saw him at a lunch at a club in Baltimore to which he was brought by Mr. Hamilton Owens, editor of the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. MORRIS. When was that?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That would be 1939 or 1940, I don't remember which, and this occasion when I had lunch with him, with Mr. Carter, those are the only occasions I recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated November 26, 1938, addressed to Constantine Oumansky, Embassy of the U. S. S. R., with the typed signature of Edward C. Carter. Attached thereto is a photostat of a letter on the letterhead of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dated December 8, 1938, addressed to Mr. Edward C. Carter, and signed C. Oumansky.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will you receive these into the record? They bear on the experiences of Mr. Lattimore, the witness here today, in connection with Mr. Oumansky, a person to whom this letter is addressed and who replied to the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mandel, the photostatic copy that you have referred to is a photostat of an instrument found in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations; is that correct?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All of these photostats are photostats of instruments found in the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your request?

Mr. MORRIS. May that be inserted in the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean both documents?

Mr. MORRIS. Both documents.

The CHAIRMAN. They may be inserted in the record.

Senator SMITH. Are you going to read those?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry. The first is a letter from Mr. Edward C. Carter, dated November 26, 1938, to Mr. Constantine Oumansky, Esq., Embassy of the U. S. S. R., Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT 506

DEAR OUMANSKY: Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the December Pacific Affairs. I think you will be interested in the brief note by O. L. (Owen Lattimore, the editor), entitled "Can the Soviet Union Be Isolated?" You can find this on page 492.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. CARTER.

The second letter reads, on the letterhead of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D. C., December 8, 1938:

EXHIBIT 507

Mr. EDWARD C. CARTER,
Institute of Pacific Relations,
129 East Fifty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CARTER: Thank you for drawing my attention to the O. L. note in the Pacific Affairs. I read it with interest and appreciation.

In the meantime I attended a luncheon in Baltimore at which Mr. Lattimore also was present and we had a most pleasant exchange of opinions.

I hope to see you soon in New York.

Sincerely yours,

C. OUMANSKY.

(Documents previously read by counsel were marked Exhibits Nos. 506 and 507, and are read in full.)

Mr. MORRIS. Attached to the letter, Mr. Chairman, is the article itself, signed O. L., under the heading of "Comment and Correspondence. Can the Soviet Union Be Isolated?" which appears on page 492 of the Pacific Affairs. May that be part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the witness should be asked whether or not he is familiar with that article.

Mr. LATTIMORE. May I look at it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does O. L. stand for you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. It may be admitted in the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 508" and is as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 508

[Pacific Affairs, Vol. XI, No. 4, December 1938, pp. 492-493]

COMMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE—CAN THE SOVIET UNION BE ISOLATED?

More than any one nation, the Soviet Union today holds the balance of power in both Asia and Europe. Was the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, in which Great Britain, as Mr. Roosevelt points out in his article in this issue, did not merely acquiesce but actively participated, intended as a necessary preliminary to the isolation and encirclement of the Soviet Union? If so, will it succeed? Any attempt to forecast correctly the results of Germany's expansion in Europe and Japan's attempt to conquer China must depend on the answer to this puzzle.

Since the betrayal of Czechoslovakia there has been a great deal of confusion, especially in England, over the theoretical question of whether the Soviet Union would have honored its conditional obligation to support France, if France had supported Czechoslovakia. This, it seems to me, is the wrong way to approach the problem. The right way is to ponder, first, the Soviet Union's very evident willingness to defend its own Siberian frontier against Japan, earlier this year, and its equally evident ability to do so successfully. This demonstration, it should be remembered, was made when the Soviet Union might well have become involved in fighting both in Europe and Asia, and is evidence that the Red army was prepared to carry on two wars at once.

Given the willingness of the Red army to fight, in the only case in which an experimentally minded aggressor has actually tried conclusions, it must be conceded that the Soviet Union holds a stronger strategic position than ever.

Against Germany, the Red army no longer has to plan for the defense of the awkward salient of Czechoslovakia, but can dig in on its own territory. To attack the Ukraine, Hitler's "pure" Germans will have to cross a belt of Slavic populations, who may for the moment be subservient, but have already been taught that the Germans will always despise and abuse them. Against Japan, the Soviet position is even better. The Japanese have been thrown back from Siberia with great loss of prestige, and forced to involve themselves more inextricably than ever in a war in China which is more hopeless than ever.

These conclusions are difficult to dispute, and seem to me to outweigh the many allegations, all of them speculative, to the effect that the Red army has been "demoralized by purges." The only positive evidence on the record is clear: France and Great Britain have not been willing to fight. The Soviet Union has been willing to fight, and has actually fought, in self-defense, but has refused to take the aggressive, even when it looked profitable, as in Siberia.

There is an implication in M. Levy's article, also published in this issue, that the Soviet Union has "revealed its permanent ambition to establish its sovereignty over Outer Mongolia." Does this mean that the Soviet Union is achieving successfully, at China's expense, the kind of aggression in which Japan appears to be failing? This appears to me to be not only an inaccurate interpretation, but one that is crudely inaccurate. The truth is that the Mongols have been driven by fear of Japan to ask for all the Soviet protection they can get. Japan may also yet succeed in driving the Chinese into the arms of the Soviet Union—where they certainly would not go of their own accord. More than that, France and Great Britain may yet be driven to beg from the Soviet Union the assistance which they refused in the case of Czechoslovakia.

For, arguing from the record, there is every probability that Germany, Italy, and Japan will go on grabbing what they can from Great Britain and France, rather than rush headlong against the enigmatic menace of the Red army. This is common sense, for Great Britain and France have surrendered every threat, while the Soviet Union has surrendered nothing, has made no bluffs that could be called, and has called one bluff very effectively.

Consequently, the recent policy of Great Britain and France has not only been disastrous to democracy and the way of evolution, making more grim the opposing extremes of revolution and counterrevolution. It has also completely failed to encircle or isolate the Soviet Union, and given it instead a greatly increased though still not clearly defined power in the affairs of both Europe and Asia.

O. L.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, did you ever know a Soviet official in the United States named Gokhman, G-o-k-h-m-a-n?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe I ever did. I don't believe I ever heard that name before.

The CHAIRMAN. Spell that again, please.

Mr. MORRIS. G-o-k-h-m-a-n, and there is the initial G. He was the consul general of the U. S. S. R., San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. He said he never heard of him before.

Mr. LATTIMORE. Don't remember him.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you can inquire whether he knew him by title rather than by name, as the consul general of the U. S. S. R. in San Francisco?

Mr. LATTIMORE. In San Francisco in what year?

Senator FERGUSON. Give him the year.

Mr. MANDEL. 1938.

Mr. LATTIMORE. In 1938? I believe I remember having lunch at the Soviet consulate in San Francisco some time early in 1938; yes. I completely have forgotten the name.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document?

The CHAIRMAN. Let us clear that a little bit, Mr. Lattimore. You had lunch at the Soviet consulate in San Francisco, and would the committee be justified in believing that at that time you met this man whose name had been mentioned, or had luncheon with him, or what was the connection of the luncheon? That is what I want.

Mr. LATTIMORE. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the connection of the luncheon with the party mentioned, Gokhman?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have only a very vague recollection of the luncheon. I believe that several IPR people had lunch at the Soviet consulate at that time.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. Was the consul general there at the luncheon?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I couldn't tell you precisely, Senator Ferguson, whether the consul general was there or whether he was out of town and we had lunch with a consul or vice consul, or what it was.

Senator FERGUSON. You cannot recall now whether the officer was there?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. How many people would you say were present?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Three or four, four or five.

Senator FERGUSON. Were you then stationed in San Francisco?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I was then living in Berkeley, and had a room in the offices in the IPR in San Francisco, from which I edited Pacific Affairs. I used to go over to San Francisco 2 or 3 days a week.

Senator FERGUSON. What was your principal employment at that time?

Mr. LATTIMORE. My principal employment at that time, in Berkeley, was writing the first draft of what eventually became my book, Inner Asian Frontiers of China, which was published in 1940.

Senator FERGUSON. But you were directly connected with the institute as editor of Pacific Affairs?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That was my only connection with the institute?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that letter, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter taken from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations, dated April 18, 1938, addressed to the Honorable Gregory I. Gokhman, consul general of the U. S. S. R., with a typed signature of Frederick V. Field.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have here three letters which represent an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Gokhman of the Soviet Union and Mr. Frederick V. Field. They relate to the testimony that has just been offered by this witness, and I would like the three of them introduced into the record after they have been identified by Mr. Mandel. Mr. Mandel will read them for the witness.

The CHAIRMAN. How did they relate to the testimony of the witness? Did they mention his name?

Mr. MORRIS. They mention his name and they mention the occasion that the witness has just testified to, namely visiting the consulate.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you like to see them?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I would like to see them, if I may. Do we have copies?

Mr. MORRIS. That is the first one, Mr. Lattimore [handing document].

There is the second one, Mr. Lattimore [handing document].

Have you three there, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Two.

Mr. MORRIS. Here is the third one, Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Two of those have not yet been identified by Mr. Mandel.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. MANDEL. Will you identify the second one, please?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the one you did identify?

Mr. MANDEL. April 18, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the next one?

Mr. MANDEL. The second is a photostat of a carbon copy of a letter, at the top of which it says "Copy to Mr. Lattimore," dated April 26, 1938, addressed to the Honorable Gregory I. Gokhman, and the typed signature of Frederick V. Field is on the top.

The third document is on the letterhead of the consulate general of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The CHAIRMAN. And the date of that is what?

Mr. MANDEL. It is dated April 29, 1938. It is a photostat of a document from the files of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is addressed to Mr. Frederick V. Field, and is signed by G. Gokhman.

Mr. MORRIS. The first one reads under date of April 18, 1938:

EXHIBIT 509

DEAR MR. GOKHMAN: I am greatly obliged for the report of the court proceedings of the trials held in Moscow March 7 to 16 of this year. I learned a very great deal from reading the verbatim reports of the important trials preceding these and look forward with great interest to scrutinizing the present volume. I wish it were possible to have more Americans read those first hand reports for I know that they explain a great deal which is rather difficult to understand in the brief and often badly interpreted articles which appear in our newspapers.

I have for a long time wanted to invite you to have luncheon with my colleague, Owen Lattimore, and myself and I wonder if it would be possible for you to do so on Monday, April 25. I should like to have you see our new headquarters at 1795 California Street and I wonder, therefore, if you could not meet us here any time after 12 noon that day so that we could show you our quarters before proceeding to lunch.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK V. FIELD.

In reply, from San Francisco, April 26, 1938—that is not the reply. I am sorry. This is another letter from Frederick V. Field, April 26, 1938, to Mr. Gokhman.

EXHIBIT 510

DEAR MR. GOKHMAN: It appears that some of the energetic although not too well-informed persons connected with the Golden Gate International Exposition have suddenly realized that the Soviet Union borders on the Pacific Ocean. These persons have approached us to know if we could cooperate in securing Soviet exhibits. While this approach to us is not official, if it is even semiofficial, I do not want to involve the American Council in the question until I learn from you what, if any, plans your country has with regard to this fair.

In a number of instances where foreign governments have not leased space the fair authorities have arranged, through special committees, to secure exhibits through private, nonofficial institutions or through individuals as a substitute for official participation. This I know is being done in the case of China which, because of war, cannot officially take part. If some move in this direction is to be made for Soviet exhibits, it is obviously in our mutual interests to see that it is done as intelligently and with the cooperation of as well-informed people as possible. Provided your country will take no official part in the exhibitions and provided the exposition authorities wish to have Soviet

exhibits, my own inclination would be to suggest to them that the question be put in the hands of the American Russian Institute. While the local branch of the American Russian Institute is, as far as I know, rather weak, the New York organization has become a fairly substantial one and might, I think, be persuaded to take an interest in this subject.

I do not, however, want to make any move on this matter until I have your advice.

It was a great pleasure seeing you yesterday for luncheon and I hope that Dr. Lattimore and I will soon be able to take advantage of your kind invitation to visit you at the consulate.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK V. FIELD.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before the next letter is read, might I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, you have testified to your memory, not as to details, but as to the fact of a luncheon at the consulate. This letter appears to refer to a luncheon at a place of the choosing of Mr. Field or yourself, or the two of you. Can you remember such a luncheon?

Mr. LATTIMORE. No; I don't. That must have been a lunch that Mr. Field had with the consul. I believe the only time I ever met him was at the consulate.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not have a copy of that letter at the time it was read. The reading of it seemed to indicate that Mr. Lattimore was at the luncheon. May we have the wording again?

Mr. MORRIS. The last paragraph reads:

It was a great pleasure seeing you yesterday for luncheon and I hope that Dr. Lattimore and I will soon be able to take advantage of your kind invitation to visit you at the consulate.

Does that not indicate, Mr. Lattimore, that the invitation had been extended to Mr. Field and to you?

Mr. LATTIMORE. It indicates that an invitation to lunch at the consulate had been extended to Mr. Field and myself, but I don't think it indicates that I was at the lunch that had already taken place, that had been mentioned.

Senator FERGUSON. Might I inquire, Mr. Lattimore, how many times you did have a luncheon at the consulate?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Just that once, as far as I can remember.

Senator FERGUSON. Just once?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, and I don't remember that man. I don't remember. It was an inconsequential social lunch, as far as I remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, the first of these three, the one dated April 18 from Mr. Field to Mr. Gokhman, was an invitation to Mr. Gokhman to have lunch with Mr. Field and yourself?

Mr. LATTIMORE. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the 25th. The letter of the 26th indicates that there was a luncheon on the 25th. Are you saying now that you were not present at that luncheon on the 25th?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Not that I can recall; no. You see, I was living, as I say, in Berkeley, and it may have been a date that I couldn't come over, or something of that sort.

Mr. MORRIS. The third letter, Mr. Chairman, dated April 29, 1938, on the letterhead of the consular general of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 2563 Divisadero Street, San Francisco:

EXHIBIT 511

DEAR MR. FIELD: I have your letter of April 26. I regret to advise that so far I have had no official information as to whether the U. S. S. R. will or will not participate in the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1939.

The question referred to in your letter should be taken up, I believe, with the American Russian Institute in San Francisco, which is a quite independent institution and not a branch of that in New York.

I would be glad if you and Mr. Lattimore could have lunch with me at the Consulate on Friday, May 6, at 1 o'clock. If that date meets with your convenience, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

G. GOKHMAN.

Senator FERGUSON. Did you show where that had been addressed to?

Mr. MORRIS. That is addressed to Mr. Frederick V. Field, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1795 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are the three letters?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be received.

(Documents previously read by counsel were marked "Exhibit Nos. 509, 510, and 511, consecutively, and were read in full.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lattimore, is it this luncheon of May 6 at the Consulate which you did attend?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have no recollection as to the date.

The CHAIRMAN. These exhibits have already been identified and have been inserted into the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Lattimore, do you know a Soviet official named Vladimir Rogov?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I remember meeting him.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you meet him in the United States?

Mr. LATTIMORE. Yes, I met him here in Washington.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us the circumstances, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. As clearly as I can recall them, Rogov had been the correspondent of Tass, the official Soviet news agency in Shanghai all during the war, that being possible because Russia was neutral as regards Japan, so that the Russian news agency operated in Japanese-occupied Shanghai. He was being transferred from Shanghai to London. I forgot the exact year, whether it was 1943 or 1944, somewhere along there.

Somebody, I believe Mr. Carter, arranged for several people to meet Rogov at the Cosmos Club here in Washington in the afternoon for the purpose of asking him questions.

The CHAIRMAN. That was what date?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I am not sure of the date, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. And the year?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I have a note here that it was in 1944.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that a luncheon?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't believe it was; no. I believe that tea was served or a choice of tea or drinks.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was pretty late in the afternoon to have a luncheon?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The middle of the afternoon.

Mr. MORRIS. How long did it last, Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. LATTIMORE. I don't recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was present at the meeting?

Mr. LATTIMORE. The only person that I clearly recall being present, because I walked out with him afterwards—

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, it will be necessary to recess for a few minutes.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we can have the question read when we return, and have an answer put in then rather than cutting the witness off?

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess subject to the call of the Chair. We will be back here today. We will return as soon as possible.

(A brief recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. Due to a series of votes that have been taken in the Senate, and will probably be taken during the rest of the afternoon, it is necessary to adjourn this meeting until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. The committee stands adjourned until that hour.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 4, 1952.)

INDEX TO PART 9

(NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.)

A	Page
Aaronson, Norma-----	3061
Abend, Hallett-----	3108
Academy of Sciences (Russia)-----	3235
Acheson, Dean-----	2943, 3026, 3031, 3110
Afghan Government-----	3220
AFL. (<i>See</i> American Federation of Labor.)	
Agrarian Democracy in Northwest China-----	2971, 3148
Agricultural Organization of New Zealand-----	3168
Aldo Cafe (Washington, D. C.)-----	3067
Alexandroff, Mr-----	3224
All-Union Central Committee (Soviet Second Congress)-----	3107
Allen, Mr-----	2986
Allen, James S. (<i>See</i> Sol Auerbach.)	
Allin, B. W-----	3167
Alsop, Joseph-----	2955, 2957, 3053, 3113
Amerasia-----	2978, 3002, 3144
America in Action-----	3169
American Aid to China-----	3052
American Anthropologist-----	3104
American Church (Shanghai)-----	3144
American Civil War-----	3188
American Express (Santiago, Chile)-----	3264
American Federation of Labor (AFL)-----	3046
American & Foreign Power Co-----	3079
American Foreign Relations-----	3167
American Foreign Service Journal-----	3005
American Friends of the Chinese People-----	3144, 3169
American Mercury-----	2981
American Peace Mobilization-----	3145, 3197
American-Russian Institute-----	3242, 3273, 3274
American War of Independence-----	3188
American Youth for a Free World-----	3057
American Youth for Democracy, Communist Party Youth Organization (AYD)-----	3055, 3056, 3059
America's Town Meeting of the Air-----	3212
Andreau, Caesar-----	3057
Andreau, Jane Speed-----	3057
AP. (<i>See</i> Associated Press.)	
Arens-----	3241
ARI. (<i>See</i> American Russian Institute.)	
Armed Forces (United States)-----	3011, 3012, 3013, 3022, 3060, 3160, 3263
Armed Services Committee-----	3114
Armstrong-----	3167
Army (United States)-----	3060, 3160, 3263
Arnold, Fortas & Porter-----	2898
Arnold, Thurmand-----	3206, 3207, 3259
Arthur, Sir-----	3249
Asahi Institute of the Far East-----	3168
Asiaticus. (<i>See</i> Hans Mueller.)	

	Page
Associated Press (AP)-----	3032, 3220
Atcheson, George-----	2913
Atlantic Monthly-----	2981
Auckland University College-----	3168
Auerbach, Sol (James S. Allen)-----	2987, 3061, 3125, 3128, 3190
Austern, Hilda (Hilda Ray; Hilda Beetholtz)-----	3167
Australia and the Far East-----	3167
Australia in the Word Depression-----	3167
Australian Council for Scientific and Industrial Research-----	3168
Austrian Embassy (Moscow)-----	3225
AYD. (<i>See</i> American Youth for Democracy.)	

B

Baker, Newton D.-----	2985, 3177
Baldwin, Hanson-----	3070, 3154
Ballinger, Sid-----	3058
Baltimore Sun-----	3035, 3040, 3231, 3268
Banff Conference (IPR)-----	3190
Bank of England-----	2981
Bankers Trust Co-----	3080
Baring, Danzil-----	3167
Barkoff, Mr-----	3224
Barmine, Alexander-----	3097, 3098, 3099, 3100, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3108, 3234, 3253
Barnes, Joseph-----	2976, 2977, 2986, 3099, 3102, 3103, 3125, 3138, 3165, 3201, 3202
Barnes, Kathleen-----	2986, 3126, 3128, 3137, 3167, 3168, 3241
Barr, General-----	3114
Barrows, General-----	3264
Bassett, Ted-----	3057
Bates, M. S-----	3169
Beach, Ethel-----	3061
Bell, Sir Charles-----	2981, 3241
Belshaw, Horace-----	3167, 3168
Benitez, Conrado-----	3167
Bentley, Elizabeth T-----	3201
Berle, Adolph-----	3004
Berliner Tageblatt-----	3168
Bertram, James-----	3169
Berzin, Gen. Ian Antonovich-----	3099, 3102, 3107
Better Economic Order-----	3167
Biddleman-----	2961
Big Five-----	2990
Big Yankee-----	3059
Bingham, Woodbridge-----	3103, 3141
Birobidian-----	3173
Bissell, Mr-----	3019
Bisson, T. A-----	3019, 3125, 3128, 3165, 3169
Board of Economic Warfare-----	3200
Boeke, J. H-----	3167, 3173
Bolsheviks-----	3107
Book and Magazine Guild-----	3061
Bordofsky, Ben-----	3060, 3061
Borodin-----	3235
Borton, Hugh-----	3167, 3168
Boulter, V. M-----	3167
Bowman, Isaiah-----	3198, 3219
Bradley, General-----	3114
Brandt, William-----	3249, 3250, 3254, 3259
British-French Negotiations-----	3226
British Government-----	2990,
2991, 2997, 3011, 3021, 3024, 3076, 3078, 3079, 3109, 3119, 3137, 3140,	
3172, 3175, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3196, 3223, 3224, 3226, 3248, 3249, 3269,	
3270.	
British Loans (Chinese Nationalist Government)-----	3148
British Railway Loans-----	3131
Brogan, D. W-----	3167, 3168

	Page
Brooklyn College	3168
Browder, Earl	2976, 2977, 3072
Bucharin	3173
Budenz, Louis F.	2958-2962, 2964, 2966, 2969-2977, 2979, 2981, 2984, 3053, 3054, 3093, 3103
Bureau of the Budget	2921
Burmese Government	3109
Butterworth, Mr.	3078
Byrnes, James F.	3109, 3112
Bywater, Hector	3139, 3154, 3155, 3157

C

California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1948	3073
California University	2981, 3168
Camden Post Office (N. J.)	3167
Camp Unity	3058, 3061
Can the Soviet Union be Isolated	3269
Can We be Neutral	3167
Canada: An American Nation	3167
Canadian Forum	3195
Capital	3184
"Capital Stuff"	2993
Carlson, Gen. Evans F.	2979, 3059, 3060
Carnegie Endowment	3216, 3264
Carroll, Esther	3169
Carter's Barn	2992, 2994, 2995
Carter, Edward C.	2921, 2979, 2989, 2990, 2992, 2994, 2995, 2997, 3014, 3064-3068, 3131, 3135- 3138, 3145, 3167, 3171-3173, 3176, 3193, 3199-3201, 3220-3222, 3227, 3228, 3230, 3234, 3236-3238, 3242-3244, 3250, 3260, 3263-3267, 3269, 3274.
Catholic Quarterly	2997
Catholic World	3094
CBS. (<i>See</i> Columbia Broadcasting System.)	
Central Government (China)	3187
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)	3007
CGT	3057
Chamberlain	3247, 3248
Chamberlain, Joseph B.	2985
Chamberlain Review	3139, 3247
Chamberlain, Neville	3196, 3223
Chamberlain, William Henry	2916, 2981
Chambers, Whittaker	3213, 3214, 3216, 3246, 3247
Chan, Hansu. (<i>See</i> Chao-ting Chi.)	
Chao-ting Chi	2989, 3126, 3128, 3136, 3140, 3141, 3142, 3143, 3158, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164, 3165, 3166, 3194, 3205.
Chapman, Abraham (John Arnold)	3061
Charney, George Blake	3059
Chatham House	3172, 3178
Chavez, Senator	2963, 2964, 2965
Chen Han-seng (Raymond D. Brooke)	2989, 3126, 3128, 3241
Chennault, Gen. C. L.	3029, 3069
Chernavin	3139
Chew Sih Hong	3159, 3160, 3161, 3163
Chi (father of Chao-ting Chi)	3140, 3161, 3165, 3166
Chi, Chao-ting	2989, 3126, 3128, 3136, 3140, 3141, 3142, 3143, 3158, 3158, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164, 3165, 3166, 3194.
Chi, K. P.	3161
Chi, Kung Chuan	3159, 3161, 3162, 3164
Chiang Kai-shek	2921, 2978, 2979, 2989, 2990, 3007, 3008, 3011, 3012, 3018, 3019, 3022, 3026, 3027, 3033, 3046, 3052, 3053, 3078, 3087, 3088, 3108, 3110-3114, 3124, 3144, 3184, 3187, 3198, 3209, 3210, 3212, 3262, 3265, 3266.

	Page
Chiang Kai-shek, Madam	3009, 3069, 3144
Chicago Tribune	2998, 3043
China Critic	3168
China Daily News	3060, 3163, 3164, 3168
China Defense Commission	3266
China Greets the New Year	3169
China International Treaties	2990
China Lobby	2945, 3002, 3018, 3020, 3036, 3037-3039, 3041-3044, 3049, 3050, 3096, 3106, 3108, 3109, 3114, 3143, 3144
China Today	3135, 3138, 3143, 3144, 3169
Chinese Central Government	3187
Chinese Communist Government	2989, 2999, 3017, 3019, 3020, 3060, 3076, 3078, 3079, 3081, 3082, 3120
Chinese Embassy (Washington, D. C.)	3037, 3042
Chinese Hand Laundry Alliance	3160
Chinese Land Tax	3173
Chinese Maritime Custom Service	3148
Chinese Nationalist Army	3012, 3112, 3114
Chinese Nationalist Blockade of Communist China	3078
Chinese Nationalist Government	2978, 2979, 3008, 3010, 3011, 3023, 3024, 3033, 3046, 3058, 3070, 3078, 3087, 3108, 3109, 3110, 3111, 3112, 3113, 3120, 3142, 3143, 3148, 3184, 3198, 3265, 3266
Chinese Nationalist Treaty with Russia	3010
Chinese Revolution	3135, 3138, 3184, 3185, 3187, 3188
Chomeley, Miss (Elsie Fairfax)	3142
Christian Medical Council	3144
Chu Tong	3060
Chungking Embassy	3212, 3213
Churchill, Winston	2990, 3115, 3264
CIA. (See Central Intelligence Agency.)	
CIC. (See Commerce-International China.)	
CIO. (See Congress of Industrial Organizations.)	
Civil Service Commission (Board of Appeals and Review)	3158, 3159, 3160, 3163, 3164
Clark, Marjorie R.	3167
Clipper	3176
Clubb, O. Edmund	2912, 2943, 2944, 2945, 2946, 3000, 3002, 3003, 3004, 3048, 3066, 3068
Colegrove, Kenneth W.	2928, 3054, 3069, 3070, 3097
Collier's Magazine	2956, 2957, 2958, 2974, 2975, 2976
Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS)	3040, 3041
Columbia University	3168
Comintern	3107, 3165, 3185, 3188
Commerce-International China (CIC)	3014
Committee on Appropriations (Senate)	3081
Committee on Armed Services	3114
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy	3058, 3060, 3061
Committee on Foreign Affairs (House)	3026, 3110
Committee on Foreign Relations (Senate)	2948, 2949, 2961, 2968, 2976, 2977, 3114
Committee on Un-American Activities	2999, 3013, 3071, 3073, 3080, 3102, 3246
Commodity Control in the Pacific Area	3167
Communist Chinese Army	3060, 3112, 3184, 3204
Communist International	2899, 3132, 3183
Communist Labor Youth League	3058, 3061
Communist Party	2897, 2902-2909, 2914-2919, 2923-2926, 2932, 2933, 2942, 2947, 2951-2956, 2958, 2961, 2965, 2967, 2969-2971, 2976-2991, 2995-3007, 3017-3021, 3027-3032, 3036-3039, 3045-3047, 3052-3063, 3069-3078, 3092-3120, 3123-3149, 3152-3167, 3170, 3179-3191, 3197, 3205, 3208, 3214, 3218, 3219, 3226, 3232-3236, 3245, 3247, 3252, 3253, 3259.
Communist Party (China)	2915-2919, 2955, 2956, 2971, 2976-2981, 2989, 2990, 2996, 2999, 3007, 3017, 3020, 3027-3030, 3060, 3076, 3078, 3103, 3108-3110, 3118, 3124, 3127-3136, 3140-3149, 3152, 3154, 3157-3166, 3179-3190, 3245
Communist Party (Germany)	3134
Communist Party (India)	3109

	Page
Communist Party (Japan)-----	3069
Communist Party (Korea)-----	3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3117
Communist Party (Kremlin)-----	2915, 2919
Communist Party (Moscow)-----	2915
Communist Party (New York City)-----	3055, 3057
Communist Party (New York County)-----	3057
Communist Party (New York State)-----	3057, 3058, 3060
Communist Party (Puerto Rico)-----	3057
Communist Party (Russia)-----	2915
2919, 2923, 2981, 2995, 2997, 3073, 3113, 3180, 3189, 3197, 3235, 3236	
Communist Party (United States)-----	2897, 2909, 2947,
2980, 2984-2988, 2991, 3004, 3020, 3046, 3049, 3052-3062, 3071-3074,	
3092, 3094, 3106, 3123-3133, 3146, 3191, 3197, 3208, 3214, 3218, 3247	
Compass. (<i>See</i> Sunday Compass.)	
Condliffe, J. B.-----	3167, 3168
Congress. (<i>See</i> United States Congress.)	
Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO)-----	3046
Congressional Record-----	3029, 3030
Conover, Harry-----	3167, 3168
Cooke, Admiral Charles Maynard-----	3012, 3013, 3014
Cooks-----	3221, 3222
Corales, Juan Sias-----	3057
Corpus Christi College (Oxford)-----	3168
Cosmos Club (Washington, D. C.)-----	3274
Council for American-Soviet Friendship-----	3061
Council on Foreign Relations-----	2982, 2988
Cubues, Eugene-----	3057, 3058
Currie, Lauchlin-----	2921, 3052,
3053, 3197, 3198, 3199, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3208, 3209, 3210, 3211, 3212	

D

Dafoe, John W-----	3167
Daily (Washington, D. C.)-----	2993
Daily Peoples World-----	3045, 3071, 3072, 3073
Daily Worker-----	2897, 3040, 3060
Daladier-----	3196
Davies, John P-----	2913, 3006, 3007, 3068, 3113
Davis, Elmer-----	3041, 3159
Dawes, Clarence E-----	2912
Deak-----	3167
Deane, Mr. (Hugh)-----	2986
DeCaux, Len-----	2986
D'Elia, Paschal M-----	3167, 3168
Democratic League (China)-----	3113
Democratic Party-----	3046
Denny, George V., Jr-----	3212
Department of Justice. (<i>See</i> United States Department of Justice.)	
Deportation Proceedings against Desideriu Hammer-----	2955, 2962, 2967-2969
Desert Road to Turkestan-----	3266
Dewey, A. Gordon-----	3167, 3168
Die Weltbuhne-----	3166
Dillingham Building (Honolulu)-----	3173
Dimanshtein-----	3173
Diskin, Lou-----	3058
Dooman, Eugene-----	3003, 3005, 3053, 3054, 3069, 3097
Draper, Theodore-----	3169
Dulles-----	3167
Dunmon, Mr-----	2912
Dunne, George H-----	2997

E

Eastern Industrialization and Its Effect on the West-----	3167
Economic and Living Standards, American and Asiatic-----	3254
Edward (King of England)-----	3140, 3248
Edwards, Clyde S-----	3154

	Page
Eggleston, F. W.....	2981
Eighth Route Army.....	3060, 3204
Eisler, Gerhardt.....	3134
Elliott, William Y.....	3167
Emmerson, John K.....	3005
Emperor of Japan.....	3054, 3069, 3070, 3071, 3140
Employee Loyalty Investigation (State Department).....	2948, 2961, 2968, 2975, 2976, 2977, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3049
Engels.....	3182, 3184
Epstein, Israel.....	3059
Executive Offices of the President.....	2921

F

Fairbank, John K.....	3207, 3208, 3212, 3213
Fanelli, Joseph F.....	2967
Faymonville, Col. Philip R.....	3265
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).....	2945, 2954, 2955, 2982, 2983, 3054, 3055, 3063, 3064, 3071, 3103, 3106, 3163
Federal Court of New York.....	2970
Ferguson, Senator Homer.....	2989
Field, Frederick Vanderbilt.....	2926, 2953, 2954, 2984-2986, 2994, 3059, 3125-3128, 3145, 3167, 3190, 3191, 3195, 3197, 3203-3206, 3208, 3249, 3250-3258, 3271-3274.
Financial Cutting Edge in Partition of China.....	3167
Fisher, Mr.....	3244, 3264
Fitch, George.....	3144
Fitch, Geraldine.....	3144
Flashes from China.....	3169
Fleming, Peter.....	3193
Fleugel, Dr. Edna R.....	2917
Focke-Wulf Condor Planes.....	3224
Food Research Institute.....	3168
Foreign Affairs.....	2917
Foreign Investments in China.....	3168
Foreign Policy Association.....	2906, 2917, 3253
Foreign Service. (See United States Foreign Service.)	
Forman, Harrison.....	3225, 3226, 3229, 3230
Fortas, Abe.....	2898, 2939, 3017, 3123
Fortune Magazine.....	2981
Foster, William Z.....	3071, 3072, 3073, 3092
Franco-Prussian War.....	3224
Franco Spanish Government.....	2945, 3120
Free French.....	3109
Freeman Magazine.....	2966
French Government.....	2991, 2997, 3109, 3110, 3119, 3186, 3196, 3226, 3270
French Revolution.....	3188
From Canton to Shanghai.....	3132, 3134, 3170
Fuehrer. (See Adolph Hitler.)	
Fulbright, Senator J. William.....	3069

G

Gedye, G. E. R.....	3224
General Electric Co.....	3079
General Purposes Budget for 1938.....	3177
General Services Administration (GSA).....	2967
German Army.....	3223
German Bourgeois Revolution of 1848.....	3184
German Embassy (Moscow).....	3224, 3225
German Government.....	2982, 3186, 3196, 3223, 3224, 3226, 3227, 3269
German-Russian Nonaggression Pact.....	3220, 3222-3224, 3226, 3227, 3241, 3268
Gilbert, W. C.....	3266
Gilchrist, Colonel.....	3160
Glazebrook, G. deT.....	3167
Gokhman, Gregory I.....	3270-3273

	Page
Indian Government.....	3076, 3078
Indonesian Government.....	3109
Indonesian Nationalists.....	3109
Inner Asian Frontiers.....	3105, 3266, 3271
Inquiry.....	2981, 2982
Institut International d'Agriculture of Rome.....	3168
Institute of International Studies (Yale University).....	3168
Institute of Pacific Relations.....	2899,
2901, 2903-2907, 2910, 2915, 2917, 2918, 2921, 2923-2925, 2927, 2929,	
2940, 2942, 2943, 2948, 2951-2954, 2980-2986, 2989-2998, 3023, 2055,	
3058, 3099-3102, 3106, 3123, 3131-3139, 3144-3149, 3152-3159, 3167,	
3168, 3171-3174, 3176, 3177, 3191, 3195, 3199-3208, 3212, 3220, 3221,	
3225, 3229, 3233-3244, 3248-3254, 3263-3272.	
Institute of Pacific Relations (American Council).....	2980, 2985, 3055,
3058, 3102, 3137, 3171, 3204, 3205, 3206, 3208, 3233, 3244, 3254.	3272
Institute of Pacific Relations (American-Northwest Council).....	3264
Institute of Pacific Relations (Australian Council).....	3139
Institute of Pacific Relations (Banff Conference).....	3190
Institute of Pacific Relations (Bay Region).....	3264
Institute of Pacific Relations (British Council).....	3136,
3138, 3147, 3149, 3154, 3157, 3233, 3236, 3238	
Institute of Pacific Relations (Canadian Council).....	3264
Institute of Pacific Relations (Chinese Council).....	3136,
3138, 3147, 3148, 3149, 3152, 3154, 3233, 3236.	
Institute of Pacific Relations (Japanese Council).....	3135, 3176, 3233
Institute of Pacific Relations (National Councils).....	2990, 3168, 3238, 3243, 3244
Institute of Pacific Relations (Pacific Council).....	3102, 3168, 3171, 3208, 3254
Institute of Pacific Relations (Russian Institute).....	3229
Institute of Pacific Relations (Soviet Council).....	2908,
3023, 3123, 3135, 3138, 3139, 3149, 3155, 3156, 3173, 3174, 3176, 3177,	
3229, 3233, 3234, 3239, 3240, 3241, 3244.	
Institute of Pacific Relations (Yosemite Conference).....	3278, 3243, 3268
International (Communist).....	2999, 3132, 3183
International Book Store (San Francisco).....	3071, 3072, 3073
International Publishers.....	3184
International Reply Coupons.....	3168
International Studies Conference.....	3174
Intourist Hotel (Moscow).....	3221, 3222
IPR Notes.....	3244
Isaacs, Harold.....	2916, 3138
Italian Government.....	3110, 3186
Izvestia.....	3134

J

Jaffe, Philip J.....	2978, 3165, 3169
Japan's Place in the Modern World.....	3167
Japan's Policies and Purposes.....	3167
Japanese Emperor.....	3054, 3069, 3070, 3071, 3140
Japanese Government.....	2982,
3011, 3048, 3054, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3119, 3135, 3137, 3138, 3139,	
3173, 3187, 3188, 3194, 3202, 3217, 3266, 3269, 3274.	
Japanese Monroe Doctrine.....	3137
Jefferson School Book Shop.....	3055, 3056, 3058, 3060, 3061
Jefferson School of Social Science.....	3055, 3056, 3058, 3060, 3061
Jessup, Philip C.....	2905, 3167, 3263, 3264
John Hopkins University.....	2900, 2901, 3037,
3083, 3084, 3107, 3191, 3198, 3211, 3215, 3218, 3242, 3250, 3266	
Johnson, Nelson T.....	2912
Judd, Walter.....	3114, 3141, 3160

K

Kahn, Albert.....	3071, 3073, 3092
Kaji, Ryuichi.....	3167, 3168
Kantorovitch.....	3173, 3174

	Page
Karachi Embassy (Afghanistan)-----	3219
Keeney-----	2968
Kennan, George F-----	3000, 3008, 3010, 3011, 3048, 3076
Kerner, Robert J-----	2981
Key Economic Areas in Chinese History-----	3138, 3165
King Edward (England)-----	3140, 3248
King William (Prussia)-----	3224
Kizer, Benjamin H-----	3199
Knowland, Senator William F-----	3029, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3044, 3045, 3046
Koerber, Lenka Von-----	3167
Kohlberg, Alfred-----	2981, 3037, 3042, 3054, 3106, 3143
Kramer, Aaron-----	3061
Kremlin-----	2915, 2919, 3098, 3113, 3114, 3134, 3224
Krivitsky, General Walter-----	3102
Kuomintang Government-----	2990,
	2995, 3027, 3033, 3134, 3182, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3186, 3187
Kurile Islands-----	3007

L

Labor Research Association-----	3061
Labor Youth League-----	3059, 3058, 3061
LaGuardia, Mayor-----	3070
Lamont, Corliss-----	3060
Land and Sea and the Destiny of Japan-----	3194
Landau, Jacob-----	3035
Landon-----	2913
Lang, Olga-----	3126, 3128
Langer, Senator William-----	3070
Larson-----	2978
Lash, James F-----	3264
Lasker, Bruno-----	3167, 3168
Lasky, Victor-----	2897, 3043
Lattimore, David-----	3194, 3266
Lattimore, Owen-----	2897-3275
Lattimore, Mrs. Owen (Eleanor)-----	2898, 2901, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068, 3259
League of Nations-----	2291, 2997, 3168
Lee, York-----	3060
Lenin-----	3185, 3187, 3189, 3236
Levy, Roger-----	3167, 3270
Lewis, Fulton, Jr-----	3041
Library of Congress-----	3107, 3153, 3154, 3236
Lieu, D. K-----	3167
Life Magazine-----	3009
Lindt, A. R-----	3167
Lines of Cleavage in Inner Mongolia-----	3240
Lin Yatang-----	3167
Lin Yu-----	3133, 3167, 3168
Lin Yu-Wan-----	3173
Literary Digest-----	2981
Little Brown & Co-----	3056, 3058
Little Brown Girl Degree-----	3193
Liverpool University-----	3168
Lockwood, William W-----	3199
Lodge, Senator Henry Cabot-----	2955, 2956
Loeb, Julius-----	3169
London Airport-----	3231
Louisville Courier-----	3035
Loyalty Board (State Department)-----	2943,
	2944, 2945, 2948, 2961, 2968, 2975, 2976, 2977, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3049
Luce, Emory-----	3144
Luce, Henry-----	3096
Luce Publications-----	2982

M

	Page
Ma Hai-teh	3169
Ma, Ning	2971
MacArthur, Gen. Douglas	2997, 3053, 3054, 3070
Made in Japan	3168
Makers of Public Opinion about the Far East	3167
Manchester Guardian	3168
Manchu Abdication and the Powers	3167
Manchuria, Cradle of Conflict	3266
Mandel, William M.	2986, 3061
Mander, Linden A.	3167, 3168
Mao Tse-tung	2976, 3009, 3059, 3186, 3187
Marsh, Frank	3159, 3160, 3163
Marshall, Gen. George C.	3007, 3008, 3012, 3026, 3039, 3109, 3111, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3116, 3118
Marshall Mission	3007, 3008, 3012, 3026
Marshall Plan	3118
Marx, Karl	3060, 3130, 3131, 3132, 3138, 3177, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3181, 3182, 3184, 3185, 3187, 3188, 3196, 3236, 3248, 3249, 3251, 3252, 3253, 3255, 3257.
Matsui, Miss Haru	3169
Matsuo, M.	3167, 3168
Matusow, Harvey M.	3055-3063
Mau Ming	3146, 3148
Max, Allen	3060
Maxwell, B. W.	3167
May Day in Tokyo	3169
Mayflower Hotel	3263, 3265
McCarran Act	3046
McCarthy, Senator Joseph R.	2946, 2955, 2981, 3036, 3054, 3077, 3078, 3083, 3085, 3096, 3097, 3098, 3103, 3108, 3218, 3219, 3231
McClellan, Senator John L.	3069
McCullough, Admiral	3159, 3160, 3161, 3163
McGovern, Professor	2928, 3053, 3054, 3069, 3097, 3105
McInnis, Edgar	3167, 3168
McMahon, Senator Brien	3039
McMillen, William H.	3159, 3162
McMurray, John V. A.	2912
Mechanics Institute Building (San Francisco)	3176
Medina, Judge	2897, 2970, 2985
Meeting on Pacific Affairs	3135
Meens, Father Charles	3144
Memering, H. R.	3159
Merkuloff, Mr.	3224
Merrell, W. P.	3167
Michigan University	3168
Migration and Planes of Living, 1920-34	3167
Miller, Margaret	3167, 3168
Millet	2912
Millis, Walter	3167
Mitchell	2978
Molotov, Vyacheslaff M. (Molotov)	3224
Mongols of Manchuria	3266
Moore, Harriet	2986, 3126, 3128, 3132, 3133, 3135, 3136, 3149, 3156, 3167, 3168, 3171, 3172, 3236, 3241, 3242, 3243, 3244, 3265
Morgan	2960, 2961, 2962, 2966, 2968
Moscow Airdrome	3224
Moscow Conference	3156
Moscow Garrison	3224
Motylev, V. E.	3135-3139, 3147, 3149, 3152, 3155, 3171- 3174, 3176, 3221, 3222, 3229, 3234, 3236, 3238-3240, 3243, 3247, 3248
Mueller, Hans (Asiaticus)	2989, 3128, 3130, 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3139, 3148, 3154, 3155, 3156, 3157, 3158, 3167, 3170, 3174, 3175, 3177, 3181, 3182, 3185, 3186, 3187, 3188, 3190, 3236
Munson, Lyle	3007
Murphy, J. Morden	3079

	Page
Murrow, Edward R.....	3041
My Country and My People.....	3167
N	
National Peking University.....	3168
Nationalist Chinese Government.....	2978,
2979, 3008, 3010, 3011, 3023, 3024, 3033, 3046, 3058, 3070, 3078, 3087,	
3108-3113, 3120, 3142, 3143, 3148, 3184, 3198, 3265, 3266.	
Native Customary Law in the Netherlands East Indies.....	3167
Navy (United States).....	3012, 3013
Nazi-German Pact.....	3228, 3230
Nazi Party.....	3073, 3094, 3226, 3228, 3230, 3241
Need for Constitutional Reform.....	3167
Nehru, Pandi Jawaharial.....	3078
Nesi, Jim.....	3058, 3060, 3061
Nesi, Ruth.....	3058
Neutrality: Its History, Economics and Law.....	3167
New Century Publishers.....	3061
New China Daily News.....	3144, 3163, 3164, 3168, 3195
New Haven Register.....	3035
New Masses.....	3003
New Republic.....	3035
New World (Novyi Mir).....	3107
New York Federal Court.....	2970
New York Herald Tribune.....	3035
New York State Educational Committee.....	3058, 3059, 3062, 3063
New York Times.....	2979,
2997, 2998, 3040, 3069, 3108, 3222, 3223, 3224, 3265, 3266	
New York World-Telegram.....	2967
New Zealand.....	3167
Nixon, Senator Richard M.....	3046
NKVD. (<i>See</i> Ogpu.)	
Norman, Winifred.....	3061
North China Daily News.....	3163, 3164, 3168
North Korean Government.....	3029, 3031
Northwestern University.....	2928
Norton, Robert.....	3169
Novyi Mir (New World).....	3107
O	
O'Donnell, John.....	2993
Office of War Information (OWI).....	3053, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3207, 3213
Ogpu (NKVD).....	3224
Old State, War, and Navy Building.....	2921, 3209
One Who Survived.....	3102, 3103
Ordeal by Slander.....	3231, 3259
Organized Labor Faces the New World.....	3073
Organized Labor in Mexico.....	3167
Oudendyk.....	2916
Oumansky, Constantine.....	3260,
3262, 3263, 3264, 3265, 3266, 3267, 3268, 3269	
Our Children.....	3169
Our Job in the Pacific.....	3055, 3058
Overseas News Agency.....	3026, 3032, 3034, 3035
Owens, Hamilton.....	3231, 3268
OWI. (<i>See</i> Office of War Information.)	
P	
Pacific Affairs.....	2905-2913,
2916, 2918, 2921, 2925, 2956, 2980-2983, 2991, 3019, 3101, 3125, 3128-	
3139, 3144-3149, 3152-3157, 3166-3168, 3173-3197, 3203-3208, 3231-	
3238, 3242, 3244, 3248-3257, 3266, 3267, 3271.	
Pacific Affairs Bibliographies.....	3167
Pacific Problems.....	3195

	Page
Pacific Publishing Foundation, Inc.....	3073
Pacific Weekly.....	3168
Palace Hotel (San Francisco).....	3264
Paris, Leonard.....	2977
Pauley, Edwin M.....	3053, 3054
Pauley Mission.....	3053, 3054
Pauley Report.....	3054
Pearl Harbor.....	2982, 3060, 3070, 3113, 3217
Peking Government.....	3184
Peking National University.....	3168
Peking & Tientsin Times.....	3024
Penfield, James.....	2913
Penrose, E. F.....	3167, 3168
Peoples Daily World.....	3045, 3071, 3072, 3073
People's Songs, Inc.....	3056, 3057
Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution.....	3138
Phillips, P. D.....	3167
Philosophical Library.....	3060
Pickering, E. H.....	3167
Pivot of Asia.....	3104
Plot Against Peace.....	3071, 3073
Poison for Profit.....	3169
Polish Government.....	3223
Political Affairs.....	3061
Pollard, R. T.....	3167, 3168
Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome.....	3168
Poppe, Prof. Nicholas.....	3235, 3236, 3240
Population Theories and Their Application.....	3168
Porter. (See Arnold, Fortas & Porter.)	
Porter, Catherine.....	3167, 3193, 3241
Potemkin, Vladimir P.....	3224
Praesidium (U. S. S. R.).....	3242, 3243
President's Loyalty Review Board.....	3001, 3049
Preuss, Lawrence.....	3167, 3168
Price, Harriet.....	2986
Price, Harry B.....	3144
Price, Mildred.....	2986, 3062
Princeton University.....	3200
Progressive Party.....	3057

R

Reader's Digest.....	2981
Red Star Over China.....	3062, 3182, 3185, 3188
Reede.....	3167
Reid, John Gilbert.....	3167
Remer, C. F.....	3167, 3168
Reporter.....	3017
Republican Party (GOP).....	2948, 2949, 3026, 3045, 3110, 3111, 3112
Rhee, Syngman.....	3026, 3027, 3028, 3029, 3032
Ribbentrop, Joachim Von.....	3223, 3224, 3225
Rice.....	2912
Rice Export from Burma, Siam, and French Indo-China.....	3167
Ringwald.....	2913
Rise of Land Tax and Fall of Dynasties in Chinese History.....	3167
Rivers, Juan Santo.....	3057
Road to War.....	3167
Robertson, C. J.....	3133, 3167, 3168
Robertson, William S.....	3079
Rockefeller Foundation.....	2981
Rodgers, Manville.....	3169
Rogov, Vladimir N.....	3174, 3274
Romm, Vladimir.....	3173
Romulo, Brig. Gen. Carlos.....	3070
Roosevelt, Nicholas.....	2981

	Page
Roosevelt, President-----	2921
2976, 2977, 2979, 3052, 3053, 3087, 3088, 3198, 3202, 3209, 3210, 3211, 3265, 3269.	
Rosinger, Lawrence-----	2986
3021, 3059, 3067, 3075, 3078, 3079, 3126, 3128, 3249,	3253
Ross, I. Clunies-----	3167
Ross, Norman-----	3061
Rothman, Michael-----	3169
Royal Central Asian Society-----	2900, 2901
Royal Geographical Society-----	2900, 2901, 3024
Royal Institute of International Affairs-----	3131
Russell, Francis J.-----	3086
Russell, Senator Richard-----	3069
Russia-----	2908
2916-2920, 2925, 2947, 2977-2982, 2991, 2997-3002, 3007-3011, 3018, 3023-3026, 3032, 3048, 3076, 3087-3093, 3103, 3107-3114, 3117-3125, 3128, 3135-3140, 3146, 3149, 3152, 3167, 3168, 3174, 3176, 3182-3197, 3201, 3203, 3223-3232, 3236, 3240-3243, 3248, 3252, 3255, 3260, 3262, 3265, 3268-3274.	
Russian Academy of Sciences-----	3235
Russian Army-----	2997, 3098, 3224, 3270
Russian Embassy (Washington, D. C.)-----	3268
Russian Foreign Office-----	3224, 3235
Russian-German Nonaggression Pact-----	3220, 3222, 3223, 3224, 3227, 3226, 3241, 3208
Russian Institute (IPR)-----	3229
Russian-Japanese Neutrality Pact-----	2982
Russian Revolution of 1905-----	3107
Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party-----	3107
Russo, Augusto-----	3224
Ryan, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A.-----	3167

S

Sabotage-----	3071
Sacher, Harry-----	2967, 2969, 2985
St. Louis Post-Despatch-----	3035
Saito, H.-----	3167
San Francisco, Calif.-Peoples World-----	3045, 3071, 3072, 3073
Santos Hearing-----	2967, 2968
Santos, John (Alias Desideriu Hammer)-----	2955, 2962, 2967, 2968, 2969
Saturday Evening Post-----	2981, 2982
Schiller, A. Arthur-----	3133, 3167, 3168
Scholefield, Guy H.-----	3167
Schulenberg, Count Frederick Werner-----	3224, 3225
Schumpeter, Elizabeth Boody-----	2981
Schweitzer, Leonard J.-----	3094
Schwellenbach, Judge-----	3199
Schwellenbach, Senator-----	3144
Science and Society-----	3060
Scott, F. R.-----	3195, 3264
Scroggs, William O.-----	3167
Sears, Louis M.-----	3167
Second Congress of the Soviets-----	3107
Second World War-----	2990, 2999, 3007, 3060
Secretariat (IPR)-----	3168, 3244
Senate Committee on Appropriations-----	3081
Senate of the United States (See United States Senate)	
Service, Donald-----	2912
Service, John S.-----	2961, 3000, 3002, 3004, 3048, 3049, 3068
Settlement of the Australian Tropics-----	3167
Sharman, Lyon-----	3167
Shanghnessy, Edward-----	2967
Shepardson, Whitney H.-----	3167
Shippe, M. G. (See Hans Mueller.)	
Shoemaker, James-----	3200
Siberian Russian Army-----	3011

	Page
Sino-Japanese War	3188
Slipping Past Japan's Censor	3169
Smedley, Agnes	3060, 3061
Snow, Edgar	3061, 3126, 3128, 3182, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3188
Social-Democrats	3180
Social Democratic Party of Latvia	3107
Social and Economic History of Japan	3167
Social Science Research Council	3266
Socialist Party	3130, 3131, 3183, 3186, 3189
Sokolsky, George	3043
Solution in Asia	3054, 3055, 3056, 3058, 3059, 3062, 3063, 3069, 3071, 3073, 3089, 3105
Soong, T. V.	3266
South Korean Government	3025, 3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3033, 3035, 3047, 3048
South Manchuria Railway	3023
South Manchuria Railway Co.	3168
Soviet Communism: A New Civilization	3167
Soviet Five-Year Plans	3176
Soviet Military Intelligence	3103
Soviet Russia Fights Crime	3167
Soviet State	3167
Soviet Union	2903, 2916-2920, 2925, 2947, 2977-2982, 2991, 2997-3002, 3007-3011, 3018, 3023-3026, 3032, 3048, 3076, 3087-3093, 3103, 3107-3114, 3117-3125, 3128, 3135-3140, 3146, 3149, 3152, 3167, 3168, 3174, 3176, 3182-3197, 3201, 3203, 3223-3232, 3236, 3240-3243, 3248, 3252, 3255, 3260, 3262, 3265, 3268-3274.
Spanish Government	2945, 3120
Special Correspondent with Bandit and General in Manchuria	3167
Sproul, Robert Gordon	2985
St. Louis Post Dispatch	3035
Stalin, Joseph	2997, 3115, 3139, 3140, 3185, 3205, 3220, 3222, 3226, 3227, 3235, 3241, 3247, 3264
Stassen, Harold	3074, 3075, 3076, 3078, 3082, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3097
State Department	2899, 2901, 2905-2907, 2910-2913, 2917-2921, 2940-2945, 2948, 2951, 2961, 2963, 2975-2977, 2982, 3000-3007, 3010, 3011, 3017-3022, 3026, 3027, 3030-3051, 3053, 3068, 3071, 3074-3076, 3078-3080, 3092, 3108, 3113, 3115, 3197-3203, 3209, 3214-3219
State Department (Employee Loyalty Investigation)	2948, 2961, 2968, 2975, 2976, 2977, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3049
State Department (Far Eastern Division)	2911, 3209
State Department (Foreign Service)	2899, 2901, 2945, 3000, 3005, 3036, 3037, 3051
State Department (Loyalty Board)	2943, 2944, 2945, 2948, 2961, 2968, 2975, 2976, 2977, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3049
State Department (Office of Economic Adviser)	3209
Steamship <i>Washington</i>	3193
Steely, E. Newton	3158, 3159, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164, 3165
Steiger, Andrew J.	3126, 3128
Stein, Guenther	3126, 3128, 3133, 3157, 3167, 3168
Stettinius	3011
Stewart, Maxwell S.	3169
Stewart, Senator Tom	3070
STKM	3221
Stone, William T.	3200
Stradneks	3107
Strong, Anna Louise	3126, 3128
Sub, Organizations and Publications Guide (House Committee on Un-American Activities)	3073, 3080
Sunday Compass	3024, 3025, 3026, 3040
Sun Fo	3070
Sun Yat-sen	3167, 3168, 3182, 3188
Sun Yat-sen: His Life and Its Meaning	3167, 3168
Supreme Court. (See United States Supreme Court.)	
Survey	3205
Survey of International Affairs, 1934	3167

	Page
Suveroff, General-----	3224
T	
Taft-Hartley Act-----	3046
Talbott, E. Guy-----	3169
Taracuzio-----	3242
Tass-----	3274
Tawney, R. H.-----	3103
Taylor, Senator-----	3069
Ten-Year History of the IPR-----	3173
Thackrey, Mr-----	3034
Third Alternative-----	3203, 3206
Third Internationale-----	3160, 3163
Third World War-----	3073
Thomas, Norman-----	3190
Thorpe, General-----	3053
San Min Chu I : Three Principles of the People-----	3137, 3188
Through the Eyes of a Japanese Newspaper Reader-----	3157, 3167
T'ien Hsia Monthly-----	3167
Tikhii Okean-----	3137, 3173, 3174, 3241
Times (New York)-----	2979,
	2997, 2998, 3040, 3069, 3108, 3222, 3223, 3224, 3265, 3266
Timperley, H. J.-----	3133, 3167, 3168
Ting Ling-----	3169
Tokyo Embassy-----	2912
Tokyo Imperial University-----	3168, 3200
Tolischus, Otto D-----	3070, 3223
Tomkins Square Youth Club-----	3060
Tooker, Dorothea-----	3169
Toronto University-----	3168
Town Hall, Inc-----	3212
Toynbee, Arnold J-----	2981, 3167
Trachtenberg-----	2961
Trade and Trade Barriers in the Pacific-----	3167
Treasury Department. (<i>See</i> United States Treasury Department.)	
Triple Demism of Sun Yat-sen-----	3168
Trotsky, Leon-----	3138, 3185, 3187, 3205
Truman, President-----	3001,
	3009, 3026, 3045, 3049, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 3115, 3116, 3117
Tsarist Russia-----	3188, 3189
Turlington-----	3167
Twain, Mark-----	3250
Twin Loyalties in Siam-----	3133, 3167
Two Fathers of Their Countries-----	3169
Tydings Committee-----	2903, 2904, 2928, 2947-2952, 2955-
	2962, 2964-2966, 2968, 2969, 2972-2976, 2980, 2981, 3019, 3045, 3052,
	3053, 3071, 3093-3097, 3108, 3136, 3144, 3145, 3148, 3190, 3191, 3251
Tydings, Senator Millard-----	2903, 2904, 2928, 2947-2952, 2955-
	2962, 2964-1966, 2968, 2969, 2972-2976, 2980, 2981, 3019, 3045, 3052,
	3053, 3071, 3093-3097, 3108, 3136, 3144, 3145, 3148, 3190, 3191, 3251
Tyler, Charlotte-----	3167
U	
UGT-----	3057
Un-American Activities Committee-----	2999, 3013, 3071, 3073, 3080, 3102, 3246, 3247
Un-American Activities Committee Report, 1947-----	3071, 3073
Un-American Activities Committee (California) Report 1948-----	3073
Under Trojan Horse Tactics (report)-----	2998
Unfinished Revolution in China-----	3059
United Nations-----	2990, 3034, 3069, 3073, 3117, 3120, 3220
United Office and Professional Workers-----	3061
United Press (UP)-----	3032, 3100, 3220
United States Armed Forces-----	3011, 3012, 3013, 3022, 3060, 3160, 3263
United States Army-----	3060, 3160, 3263
United States and China-----	3212
United States, China, and the World Market-----	3254, 3259, 3260
United States Congress-----	2920, 2957, 2978, 3026, 3029, 3111, 3169

	Page
United States Department of Justice	2955, 2956, 2957, 2958, 2959, 2967, 2972, 2973
United States District Court (Baltimore)	3247
United States Embassy (Chungking)	3212, 3213
United States Embassy (Karachi, Afghanistan)	3219
United States Embassy (Tokyo)	2912
United States Foreign Service	2899, 2901, 2945, 3000, 3005, 3036, 3037, 3051
United States Fourth Army (Presidio, San Francisco)	3263
United States Government	2899, 2905, 2906, 2910, 2920, 2922, 2942, 2961, 2973, 2982, 2985, 2987-2991, 3011, 3019, 3027-3034, 3039, 3046, 3049, 3052, 3054, 3070, 3073, 3078, 3087, 3091, 3092, 3106, 3110, 3113, 3115, 3119, 3120, 3137, 3161, 3163, 3201, 3210, 3213, 3216, 3265-3267
United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs	3026, 3110
United States Immigration Service	2967
United States Information Service in China	3212
United States Library of Congress	3107, 3153, 3154, 3266
United States Lines	3191, 3193
United States Navy	3012, 3013
United States News and World	2923, 2980
United States Reports	2925, 2927
United States Senate	2897, 2934, 2963, 2966, 2968, 2976, 3014, 3045, 3098, 3114, 3209, 3275
United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations	2948, 2949, 2961, 2968, 2976, 2977, 3114
United States Supreme Court	2970
United States Treasury Department	2920
United States in World Affairs in 1934-35	3167
University of California	2981, 3168
University of Liverpool	3168
University of Michigan	3168
University of Toronto	3168
University of Washington	3168, 3235
UP. (See United Press.)	
Ushiba, Tomohiko	3167
U. S. S. R.	2903, 2916-2920, 2925, 2947, 2977-2982, 2991, 2997-3002, 3007-3011, 3018, 3023-3026, 3032, 3048, 3076, 3087-3093, 3103, 3107-3114, 3117-3125, 3128, 3135-3140, 3146, 3149, 3152, 3167, 3168, 3174, 3176, 3182-3197, 3201, 3203, 3223-3232, 3236, 3240-3243, 3248, 3252, 3255, 3260, 3262, 3265, 3268-3274.
Utley, Miss Freda	2928, 3042, 3077, 3094, 3095, 3108, 3144

V

Van Kleeck, Mary	3126, 3128
Varga	3235
Vasilevitch, Pavel. (See Ian Antonovich Berzin.)	
Verlag, Agis	3170
Vincent, John Carter	2912, 2945, 2957, 2978, 3000, 3003, 3004, 3014, 3032, 3048, 3068, 3077, 3086, 3089, 3092, 3108
Vinter. (See Ian Antonovich Berzin.)	
Voitinsky, Grigorii N.	3135, 3140, 3147, 3149, 3152, 3171, 3174, 3232, 3234, 3235, 3241
Volks	3242
Von Kanton Big Shanghai	3166, 3168
Von Koerber, Lenka	3167
Von Ribbentrop, Joachim	3223, 3225

W

Wales, Nym	3127-3128
Walker, E. Ronald	3167
Wall Street Journal	2982
Wallace, Henry A.	2957, 2961, 3024, 3053, 3055, 3058, 3112
Walter Hines Page School of International Relations	2900, 3141
Wang Yu-Chuan	3133, 3167, 3168
Ward, Harold	3169
Warren, Governor	3046

	Page
Washington Post.....	3040
Washington Treaties.....	3194
Watertown Times (New York).....	3035
Way of a Fighter.....	3029
Webb.....	3140, 3173
Webb, Beatrice.....	3167
Webb, Sidney.....	3167
Wedemeyer, Lt. Gen. Albert C.....	3004, 3005, 3012, 3114
Welles, Sumner.....	2921
Western Powers.....	3029
What Will Congress Do.....	3169
Where Nippon Sits on a Volcano.....	3169
White Book.....	3011
White House.....	2920, 3052, 3053, 3199, 3202, 3208, 3211, 3212
White Paper.....	3113
White Russian Armies.....	3235
White, Senator Wallace H.....	3070
Wholesale Book Corp.....	3060
Who's Who.....	3107, 3212
Whyte.....	3137, 3139, 3172
Wilbur.....	3264
Wilbur, Ray Lyman.....	2985
William (King of Prussia).....	3224
Williams, W. Wynne.....	3133, 3167, 3168
Winter, Ella.....	3127, 3128
Wittfogel, Karl.....	2928,
	3097, 3103, 3106, 3132-3134, 3141, 3165, 3166, 3194
Wittfogel, Mrs. Karl. (See Esther S. Goldfrank.)	
Workers Book Shop.....	3058, 3060, 3061
Workers Library Publishers.....	2999
World Policies and World Economics.....	3235
World Production and Consumption of Sugar.....	3168
World-Telegram (New York).....	2967
World War II.....	2990, 2999, 3007, 3060
World War III.....	3073
World Youth Festival (Budapest).....	3057
Wright, Philip G.....	3167

Y

Yakontoff, Victor A.....	3128, 3169
Yale University.....	3168
Yalta Agreement.....	2979, 3007-3013
Yanaihara.....	3176
Yarnell, Admiral Harry E.....	3198
Years of Fulfillment.....	3167
YMCA. (See Young Men's Christian Association.)	
York, Lee.....	3060
Young Men's Christian Association.....	3144
Youth.....	3059
Yu, Bishop Paul Pin.....	3144

Z

Zemelis. (See Ian Antonovich Berzin.)	
Zimmerwald Conference.....	3107
Zinkin, Maurice.....	3110
Zinoviev.....	3235

