

THE
American Forum
OF THE AIR



Vol. XVI

SUNDAY, APRIL 26, 1953

No. 17

**"Is Criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee
Methods Justified?"**

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

Bishop of the Methodist Church

DONALD L. JACKSON

*Republican Representative of California,
a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee*

FRANK BLAIR

Guest Moderator

Announcer: The National Broadcasting Company presents the American Forum of the Air, American's oldest unrehearsed discussion program.

This week the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion of the topic, "Is Criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee methods justified?"

Here with us to discuss this subject are: Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church and Representative Donald Jackson, Republican of California and a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

But before the debate begins, here is a message of importance.

Announcer: Today, the founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik, has asked Frank Blair to be his guest moderator. Mr. Blair.

Mr. Blair: Today, the American Forum of the Air takes a look at methods of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Bishop Oxnam has been a close observer of the Committee; and, of course, Representative Jackson, as a member of the Committee, is well qualified to tell of its activities. So let's move right into the discussion with a question to Bishop Oxnam. Do you believe criticism of the methods of the Committee is justified?

BISHOP OXNAM: Mr. Blair, I do. I think there are specific criticisms that I will bring in a moment. Before I do, I would like to say this. I believe that Mr. Jackson and I are both agreed upon two matters. First, I believe that the Communist Party is a conspiracy. I believe conspirators ought to be found, ought, in due process of law, to be tried and, if found guilty, to be punished. In the second place, I believe that Congress has the right and the duty to conduct investigation necessary to secure information upon which to base sound legislation. One other word, and we will come back to this later. Personally, I believe the churches have done far more to destroy Communism than all the investigating committees put together. We through hundred of thousands of pulpits and educational institutions are teaching theism. This strikes at the fundamental error of Communism which is atheism. We teach a spiritual view of life, which undermines the philosophy of materialism upon which Communism is based.

Mr. Blair: Congressman Jackson, are you agreed upon the things Bishop Oxnam stated?

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: I should first of all like to state that the propositions which Bishop Oxnam made have my full approval. I would go further than that by saying that I am willing to accept the proposition that Bishop Oxnam is not opposed to the House Committee on Un-American activities, and I should like to add to that, that I am certainly not opposed to any minister or to anything that has to do with the church here or elsewhere. I believe that the American Forum of the Air is doing a splendid public service in bringing matters of this kind before the American public for open discussion. It is a timely subject. It is a subject in which many millions of Americans are vitally concerned. Certainly constructive

criticism of any human institution is to be highly desired. I think that any criticism to be constructive must first of all be informed, it must be intelligent, and it must be honest. Unfortunately, 90 percent of the criticism directed at the investigating committees of the Congress, in my opinion, in the past has been criticism which strikes at the Congressional investigating structure. It is criticism which seeks the abolition of such committees as the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I don't attribute this, I might say, to criticism which will be directed by Bishop Oxnam. The criticism of the Communist Party, of course, and the Fellow Travelers and the others who criticize from that viewpoint is a criticism which may be intelligent and may be informed, but it is strictly dishonest.

Mr. Blair: Now, Bishop Oxnam, what are the methods of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which you believe to be subject to criticism?

BISHOP OXNAM: I want to deal with three, Mr. Blair, and I think perhaps I better take them one at a time. First, the nature of the so-called files and the use that is made by the Committee of these files. One ought to be able to assume that an investigating committee in developing files would investigate. We ought to be able to assume that what is there is the result of scientific study. Actually, that is not true. These files are composed of a miscellaneous lot of newspaper clippings, of pamphlets sent in sometimes by people who are not disinterested, a collection of rumors and the like. Now, that has to be proved. I can prove it. There is no objection to collecting anything. They do not collect, however, what one has written, the whole story of one's life, to get a balanced picture. Anything that is alleged to be subversive is collected. It is a matter of scissors and paste, very largely. Now, they will release this material on the official letterheads of the Committee over the official signature of a clerk and send this material out. Anyone who receives it naturally assumes that this is an opinion of the Committee. Let me be specific with a concrete case, and then we will turn to a second criticism. In the files concerning me was the statement that I had written an article upon Stalin. The paper was named, the date and the page. I knew I had never written it. So I got a copy of it, and I have the photostat here; this was written by a gentleman named Davis. But people who received the article, the material from the Committee, naturally assumed that it had been investigated; that it was the fact. It wasn't. In my case, more than 90 percent of all the material is either false, irrelevant or of that kind. Now, what do you do about this. I wrote the Committee; I requested them to correct these matters. And this is what happened, Mr. Blair, and I will conclude with this. I received finally a letter signed by the chairman of the Committee—the former chairman of the Committee—as follows: "At no time have we ever vouched for the correctness of any newspaper item."—But these items were released on their letterhead and over their signature—"The report shows the source of each bit of information and carries no conclusion of this committee. The attached report does not express an opinion or a conclusion on the part of this Committee." I say that this material collected without

scientific investigation, without balance, released that way, can damn any individual in this Nation, because it is supposed to be official. Actually, it does not represent a conclusion. It does not represent an opinion. This is a method that is fundamentally unwise, and I believe the Committee will wish to correct it.

Mr. Blair: Representative Jackson.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: I would say only that a conspiracy is the extended shadow of those who constitute it. The Committee in its work accumulates all pertinent information relative to one whose name is listed in the file. That is true. That is the only manner by which one can determine the philosophical bent of any given individual; and I might say in thousands of cases where such information has been collected, it has later been determined beyond any pre-adventure of doubt that the individual concerned was indeed a member of the Communist Party. That does not mean by any means that all of those listed in the files of the House Committee are or ever have been members of the Communist Party.

What is a file? A file is based upon the common and frequent occurrences of an individual's name in Communist fronts, his listing as a sponsor, director, editor or contributor of Communist-front or Communist publications and the editorial comments of the activities of any given individual; his consistently favorable mention in Communist Party or Communist-front publications; his personal actions which are intended to be divisive of the American people. The personal advocacy of the socialized state is certainly contributory to any file; his consistent advocacy of any part or all of the Soviet system; his opposition to any form of investigation of the Communist conspiracy or those who comprise it; his opposition to deportation of Communist Party members and front members; his opposition to legislation designed to curb Communism; his opposition to the affirmation of American loyalty oaths; and his opposition to any form of military training; the use of such phrases as red baiting and witch hunts to describe the activities of the duly constituted committees of the United States Congress; anyone who consistently deplores the use of guilt by association, but who consistently attempts to prove his own innocence by association. Those in general, and factors having to do with those expressions, are generally gathered together in the file of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, not as conclusive evidence of Communist-front activity or of membership in the Communist Party, but as being evidence which tends to indicate that such a person holds views which are contrary to those expressed under the American Constitution.

Mr. Blair: Now, Bishop Oxnham, what is your comment?

BISHOP OXNAM: I wish to comment upon that for just a moment, if you please. First of all, no investigation is made. No investigator has ever called upon me or anyone I know who has been accused in the fashion that this file accuses me. I am three hundred yards from the House. To get the philosophy of a man, wouldn't you think they would come over and at least talk to you, instead of taking some little newspaper out in Princeton, Illinois, way back in 1939 and using

that as evidence. There is this business of not getting the facts. And then if a man is opposed to compulsory military training, does that mean that he suddenly becomes subversive? Personally, I believe in the strongest national defense, but I have yet to have it proved to me that universal military training makes a fundamental contribution there.

Mr. Blair: Congressman Jackson, do you care to answer that?

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: No. Except to say in case of anyone who feels that he has come under public disapprobation, that he ran afoul of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and has no redress. To the contrary, he has redress before the greatest forum, I believe, in the entire world, the forum of the Congress of the United States, in order to answer any allegations, in order to meet any charges which he himself feels are not founded in fact.

Mr. Blair: Bishop Oxnham.

BISHOP OXNAM: In my own file there are 24 items, and most of them have nothing to do with subversive organizations. How does the Committee determine whether an organization is subversive? But to come to the second criticism. They list, for instance, that I belong to the League Against War and Fascism. I never belonged to the League Against War and Fascism from the very beginning. But when it comes to getting it taken out of the file—I have done everything possible—all you can do is to have the statement, "The Bishop wrote a letter at such and such time and said this."

The second criticism, and this is fundamental, I criticized the Committee for the incompetency of its research staff. The Committee is dependent upon research for getting accurate information. And I will give a concrete example. Mrs. Agnes E. Myer, a courageous, patriotic, competent citizen, delivered an address to the American Association of School Superintendents. Mr. Velde, the chairman of the Committee, instead of answering her arguments, announced that she had contributed an article to "Soviet Russia Today." In other words, silenced her by linking her as associated with the Communist-front situation. Unfortunately for Mr. Velde, Mrs. Meyer did not write that at all. It was written by a woman named Mayer. She did not live in Washington, D. C. She did live in the Northwest. It is a research staff that is so incompetent that it can let the chairman of the committee down in public so that he has to apologize. This is a single instance of incompetence. I could call the roll and take the entire time to show you the incompetence of this research staff that is simply not doing the kind of work that we mean by the term research. That incompetency is inexcusable. I believe Mr. Velde fired the person who gave him the sad information, but the people who have been repeating false statements concerning many of us are still there. At least, I have not heard that they have been dismissed.

Mr. Blair: Congressman Jackson.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: As far as the citation is concerned in the files relative to your name and its association with the League Against War and Fascism, is it not the case that your name does appear upon the official letterhead and the documents of that organization?

BISHOP OXNAM: No, sir, it is not a fact.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: Is it not the case, sir, in the incident of Mrs. Meyer, as you say, the investigator was fired and an apology was made? I certainly feel that as we are confronted with a world aggression in which millions and millions of people have gone under the heel of iron tyranny, that the Committee would be derelict in the charge laid upon it by the Congress of the United States if it did not investigate all possible leads, if it did not include such information as might be pertinent to the inquiry.

Now, with respect to the American Civil Liberties Union, which I understand, Bishop, you have stated was never cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, that is quite true. However, I would call to your attention, sir, that the chairman of the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union during the period of time that your name was associated with the committee in the Los Angeles area was one Harry F. Ward of New York, who was identified by Lewis Budenz before the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate of the United States as being a member of the Communist Party. Certainly his influence in that organization was considerable. The American Civil Liberties Union has also been cited in two instances by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, a duly constituted elective body and it has been cited by the Massachusetts Committee on Un-American Activities. Is it your contention in the light of those citations that the House Committee on Un-American Activities should take no cognizance of membership of such group?

BISHOP OXNAM: I am so happy that you asked about the Civil Liberties Union. May I quote from the official report of this Committee regarding the Union. This is page 4 of your report, sir, dated February 17, 1952. I quote: "The American Civil Liberties Union has never been cited as being Red dominated or as Communist by any official organization charged with the duty of investigating subversive activity." That is your own report. This is the incompetency to which I refer.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: Not at all, sir. That information—

Mr. Blair: Just a moment, Mr. Jackson, we must pause now. We may take questions from our audience during the second portion of the program, but we must pause now for this interesting message.

* * * *

Mr. Blair: Now, continuing our discussion, Congressman Jackson.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: Yes, I should like to speak for just a moment further on the matter of the American Civil Liberties Union, and I give this objectively as being the statements of duly constituted agencies, irrespective of what the report says that Bishop Oxnam has. The committee was cited in 1943 by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its report to the legislature. I quote: "The American Civil Liberties Union may be definitely charged as a Communist-front or transmission-belt organization. At least 90 percent of its efforts are expended upon behalf of Communists who come into conflict with the law. While it professes to

stand for free speech and free press and free assembly, it is quite obvious it is its main function to protect Communists in their activities of force and violence in their program to overthrow the government."

BISHOP OXNAM: I am quite amazed you would do that. Here is the official report by the former chairman of the Committee, Mr. Dies. It is dated October 23, 1939. This is the official report of your Committee, Mr. Dies speaking: "This Committee found last year in its reports there was not any evidence that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist organization. That being true, I do not see why we would be justified in going into it, I mean, after all, they have been dismissed by unanimous report of the Committee as a Communist organization."

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: What was the date?

BISHOP OXNAM: This is October 23, 1939. This other report that I read from is February 17, 1952. Now, these are your own records.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: These reports supersede the reports of the Dies Committee.

BISHOP OXNAM: This 1952 report supersedes it?

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: The report you read supersedes this.

BISHOP OXNAM: Here is the 1952 report which is even more definite. "The American Civil Liberties Union has never been cited as being Red dominated or as Communist by any official organization charged with the duty of investigating subversive activities." Either your reports do not mean anything or what you are now saying is contrary to fact.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: What I am now saying and the point I want to make is that the American Civil Liberties Union has been cited by official organizations as being subversive and Communist. Let me give the second citation. The American Civil Liberties Union was cited by the California Un-American Activities Committee, 48-49, as being "heavily infiltrated by Communists and Fellow Travelers and frequently follows the Communist line in defending Communists, particularly in the Los Angeles area."

BISHOP OXNAM: Then you mean, Mr. Jackson, that this report which is officially printed and paid for at public expense is not correct, this 1952 report?

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: Not necessarily correct. It may be that my investigations into the matter, sir, have gone to a greater length than the other investigation. I do not stand one hundred percent in all respects with either the head of my own party or with anyone else. I am an individual who prefers to find out the facts for himself. I have found out these facts.

BISHOP OXNAM: But, you see, what you are quoting is quoted in my file. So it is not new research that you have done. You have repudiated this here. I simply say this is incompetent. and that is what I am trying to prove. That is the criticism, and I think perhaps it have been proved. Since Mr. Jackson referred to the philosophy of an individual, why, here is the Episcopal address to the General

Conference of the Methodist Church. I had the honor to write it. It is signed by all the bishops of the church. I quote: "We reject Communism, its materialism, its method of class war, its use of dictatorship, its fallacious economics and its false theory of social development, but we know the only way to defeat it permanently is to use the freedom of our own democracy to establish common justice and racial brotherhood." Why does not that get into the files concerning an individual? It does not. They talk about getting a balanced view of a man's philosophy. Why don't they come over and find out what a man thinks and what he does. I don't even belong to the organizations that they allege I belong to, not any one of them, and only with three of the entire list did I ever have any association, and yet Mr. Jackson, in a letter he wrote himself says, lists that I am related to the Daily Worker. Why? Because the Daily Worker, a newspaper, referred to some speech I gave, as did the Tribune and the New York Times. I can't stop that.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: I would say to you when the Daily Worker reports an attack upon the committees of the House, it is not necessarily indicative of any particular bent, but it is of considerable interest when such things appear in the Daily Worker. I will counter your statement with showing a book, a book which was mailed out over your signature to many ministers of the Methodist Church and which I consider, after having read it very carefully, to be one of the greatest apologies for Soviet aggression I have ever read. It is called "Behind Soviet Power," by Dr. Jerome Davis. This publication is, as I say, an abject apology for Soviet aggression. As an indication of the content matter of the book, it says in one place "It would be an error to consider the Soviet leader a willful man who believes in forcing his ideas upon others." I think that that statement would be of considerable interest to the millions of human beings who are today confined in the concentration camps behind the iron curtain. It says, "Stalin went out to fight for justice for the people." I think that that would be of extreme interest to the thousands of American parents whose sons have become casualties in the war against the forces led by Stalin. I would suggest to every American listening to this program that they make an effort to obtain Jerome Davis' book, "Behind Soviet Power." I feel it is divisive. I feel it is in effect actually Soviet propaganda today.

BISHOP OXNAM: I am so happy that Mr. Jackson brought that out, because now we see the Committee really at work. As a matter of fact, this book was sent to the ministers of the Methodist Church; and had Mr. Jackson read the statement which accompanied it he would have noted it stated that Russia is a fundamental challenge to the church in this day, that we recommended this book to be read because it would give evidence of the sources of Soviet power. I was President of the Division of Foreign Missions. This book was sent because the Administrative Committee voted to send it. I signed the letter. I have no apologies. But we insisted—and I personally insisted upon this—that there be included with it the statement of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America on American-Soviet Relations. I chaired the committee that wrote that report. John Fos-

ter Dulles, the distinguished Secretary of State, was a member of it. There is no more severe condemnation of Communism anywhere than in that document we sent with the Davis book for our ministers to study. We wanted them to know the strength of Communism. We have got to fight Communism over the entire world, and for a man to come here and use that incident to indicate sympathy for Communism is indicative of the kind of methods the House Un-American Affairs Committee uses. He knows or ought to know that I have been opposed to Communism all my life, and I am perfectly willing to put the record of placing the great churches and organizations on record as opposed to Communism against anything Mr. Jackson has done. That kind of method is indicative of the incompetency to which I referred a moment or two ago.

CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: I would like to read a comment from not just the average American but from the "Committee for the Preservation of Methodism." Methodist churchmen at home, our Board of Missions, at the insistence of Bishop Oxnam, sent all Methodist ministers a book, 'Soviet Power,' by Jerome Davis. We have had a letter from a returned China missionary asking who in our church was responsible for sending that book. Jerome Davis is an outstanding apologist for Russia, has been identified with many Communist-front activities, and has frequently been commended by the Daily Worker. He wrote an article on Stalin that appeared in "The Classmate," which I understand is an organ of opinion in the church or of instruction, for July 1947, which is reproduced on page 25 of this magazine.

Mr. Blair: Bishop Oxnam.

BISHOP OXNAM: When anyone quotes this little organization of a few reactionary laymen down in Houston as impressive, it's the least bit sad. Of course, this was not sent at my insistence. As an officer of a board that had voted to send this out, one of the great boards of the Church, I signed the letter. We sent material that made it abundantly clear as to the purpose, and any intelligent criticism would have found that out.

Mr. Blair: I am sorry, gentlemen, but it is time to end today's discussion. We are also sorry that we did not have questions from our audience.

You have been listening to a discussion of the topic, "Is Criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee's Methods Justified?" Our speakers have been: Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church and Representative Donald Jackson, Republican of California and a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Now this is Frank Blair speaking for Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

(APPLAUSE.)

Announcer: One week from today our speakers will be: Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and a member of the Senate Government Operations Committee; and Representative Fred-eric Coudert, Jr., Republican of New York and a member of the

House Appropriations Committee. The subject for discussion, "Is Free Enterprise in Danger?"

* * * *

Announcer: For reprints of today's discussion on the American Forum of the Air, send ten cent sto Ransdell Incorporated, Printers and Publishers, Washington 18, D. C.

America's oldest unrehearsed discussion program is dedicated to the public debate of all sides of all issues vital to you and your country.

The American Forum of the Air is produced and moderated by its founder, Theodore Granik. Technical direction by Bill Wells. Directed by Joseph Browne.

This program has come to you from Washington, D. C.

The Proceedings of
THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

*as broadcast simultaneously over the coast to coast
radio network and through the television network
facilities of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc.,
are printed, and a limited number are distributed free
to further the public interest in impartial discussions
of questions affecting the public welfare.*

by

PRINTERS RANSDALL INC. PUBLISHERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

WASHINGTON 18, D. C.

(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)

The proceedings of the American Forum of the Air are held every Sunday afternoon from 2:30 P. M. to 3:00 P. M., E.S.T., on the National Broadcasting Company Radio and Television Networks in the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The public is cordially invited to attend these broadcasts and to submit questions from the floor to the participants.

17  17

J-20246

"diversion"

"socialist"

"VMT"

"Red Bait"

"anti investigation"

"anti guilt by access"

- ACLU Communist
- Louis Budenz
- Calif Committee

1) Filed their use
a. unsworn
b. distributed as
authorized by the
committee

- No investigation made
- Only negative pts.
Bishop's statement
anti - VMT?
- Went
- Incompetent
research staff
i.e. Agnes F. Meyer.

Writer-Actor Group Says McCarthy's Critics Unfair

New York, April 5 (AP)—A group of 28 writers, actors, and others charged today that segments of the press, radio, and television have failed to give Senator McCarthy a fair break.

Specifically they charged, in a statement sent to 700 newspapers, that "hardly any" critics reviewed the Wisconsin Republican's book, "McCarthyism, The Fight for America."

By contrast, the statement said, a book by Owen Lattimore attacking McCarthy ("Ordeal by Slander") was given "The widest coverage . . . and the most extravagant and uncritical support."

Lattimore, Johns Hopkins University professor and one of the Wisconsin Republican's first targets, is awaiting trial on perjury charges.

'Blight on Profession'

Saying that McCarthy's book "clears the air" and "forthrightly discusses every significant charge made against him," the statement asked:

"How many reviews has it had? The answer—hardly any—is a blight on a profession supposedly objective and courageous."

The statement was addressed directly to editors of the 700 newspapers.

"Some of our colleagues, in newspapers, magazines, on the radio and TV," it said, "have enjoyed a virtually unchallenged forum of loose talk on the subject of McCarthyism."

"We feel that they owe their readers, their listeners, and their consciences an accounting."

Questions Asked of Critics

"What do they, or, if the shoe fits, what do you mean by the charge that the aims of the Wisconsin senator are fine, but his methods wrong?"

"What methods have his critics used to remove traitors and subversives and security risks from Government? . . . How adequate is the substantiation of the charge that McCarthy has attacked and injured innocent people? Are McCarthy's specific charges weighed before concluding, as with Owen Lattimore, that McCarthy is wrong?"

The signers of the letter, who

said they spoke for themselves only, include:

Actor Ward Bond; author William F. Buckley; biographer Oliver Carlson; author John Chamberlain; John B. Chapple, editor of The Press, Ashland, Wis.; author Frank Chodorov; actors Charles Coburn and Adolph Menjou; Kenneth Colegrove, Northwestern University political-science professor; columnist Frank Coniff; George Creel, authority on the Far East; authors Ralph de Toledano and John T. Flynn; publisher Devin Garrity; Frank Hanighen, editor, Human Events; Karl Hess, press editor, Newsweek magazine; author Rupert Hughes; commentator Robert Hurleigh; Journalist Suzanne La Follette; author Victor Lasky; commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr.; William Loeb, publisher, The Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader; author Eugene Lyons; Rabbi Max J. Merritt of Los Angeles; author Felix Morley; J. C. Phillips, editor, The Borger (Tex.) News Herald; publisher Henry Regnery; and playwright Morrie Ryskind.

"Beautify your hair in its natural shade with **TECHNIQUE Color**"

- ★ Restores color to faded ends
- ★ Enriches both hair color and cuticle
- ★ Blends in gray hair
- ★ Highlights the hair with permanent luster

JESSIE B. F.
Success

Chai

305 Marti

Eisenhower Sets Up New Security Program

Continued from First Page

said, are some of the guides to be followed in security investigations:

1. Anything indicating that an individual is unreliable or untrustworthy.

2. Deliberate misrepresentations, lies, or omission of material facts.

Liquor Addicts 'Out'

3. Criminal, infamous, or disgraceful conduct, including sexual perversion or addiction to liquor or drugs.

4. Signs of insanity.

5. Any fact indicating that a person might be persuaded to act against the best interests of national security.

6. Any connections with sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition.

7. Sympathetic association with individuals or organizations interested in overthrowing the United States Government by violence or unconstitutional means.

8. Unauthorized disclosure of security information.

9. Serving interests of another Government in preference to those of the United States.

Along with the presidential executive order, all heads of departments and agencies got a sample of security regulations

drawn up by the Justice Department. Brownell said most officials probably would accept the sample, but asserted that they were at liberty to modify it if they should see fit.

Ike Wants Uniformity

The regulations repeat the Eisenhower standards and lay down a pattern for handling cases. If the regulations are followed—and Brownell said that Eisenhower wants uniformity in the program—any employee suspended for security reasons would have to be notified in writing of those reasons, to the extent permitted by security considerations and the protection of confidential sources of information.

He would have 30 days to reply, and his case would be considered at three levels, including a hearing before a three-man board made up of persons who don't know him and who are drawn from other departments. In the end, the decision to clear or fire him would be up to the head of his own agency.

Can Present Witnesses

In appearing before the hearing board, the employee would be allowed to present witnesses, offer evidence, and cross-examine opposing witnesses—rights that Brownell said were lacking under the old program.

If the employee were handicapped in fighting back because charges and witnesses were kept secret for security reasons, the board would be required to give due weight to that fact.

Even if he lost out at one agency, the employee might land a job with another one in some circumstances. A man who talks too much at cocktail parties, for example, might be considered a security risk if he works for the State Department, but not if he is with the National Park Service.

In answer to a question, Brownell said lie detectors would not be used under the new program. He also said that a Truman order denying Congressional investigating committees access to security and loyalty files of Government workers would still stand.

Ike's Appointees Are Undercutting His Policies

By Joseph and Stewart Alsop

WASHINGTON—Rule One for any Administration is that national policy cannot be successfully administered by men who do not believe in it. This is a rule which President Truman never learned, to his lasting misfortune. It begins to seem that the Eisenhower administration also has some lessons to learn in this regard.

The trouble in the Commerce Department began with the appointment of Craig R. Sheaffer, a pen manufacturer, as Assistant Secretary. Sheaffer's political views are suggested by the fact that he is an acknowledged admirer of the right wing rabble-rouser, Merwin K. Hart. To such a man, scientists of all sorts are automatically suspect, and Sheaffer instantly got Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks into a major row with the scientists of the Bureau of Standards. Weeks has had to eat humble pie.

By now, there are plenty of other men at the lower levels of the government who can cause the Eisenhower administration a heap of trouble. Former Senator Harry Cain, for example, has been named to the Subversive Activities Control Board. President Eisenhower has made it abundantly clear that he does not favor Senator Joseph McCarthy's methods of dealing with subversives. Yet Cain, besides being a violently eccentric man, consistently attempted to out-McCarthy McCarthy, when he was in the Senate.

Contradicting His Own Policy

THE Eisenhower trade policy calls for freer world trade, and the President has sent a strong message to Congress asking for the extension of the reciprocal trade program without essential change. At the same time, he named former Representative Joseph Talbott to the Tariff Commission. Talbott is an amiable man, well-liked in his native Connecticut. But he is also an arch-protectionist, who voted against the reciprocal trade program when he was in the House. He even apparently believes that the President should be stripped of his power to review tariff commission recommendations.

During the campaign, Eisenhower repeatedly called for bringing more people under the Social Security program. Another former Representative, Parke M. Banta, of Missouri, has been given the job of counsel in the new Health, Education and Welfare Department, headed by the able Oveta Culp Hobby. Banta's views on Social Security are suggested by the fact that, in the 80th Congress, he voted to take 750,000 people off the Social Security rolls.

Like Senator Robert A. Taft, Eisenhower unquestionably favors a moderate public housing policy. Yet still another lame duck, former Representative Albert Cole of Kansas, has been named head of the Housing Administration. In Congress, Cole was wont to complain that the idea for public housing "came from the Kremlin."

Their Beliefs Are Different

PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT is one of Eisenhower's political heroes, and he accurately pointed out during the campaign that Roosevelt and the Republican Party were responsible for initiating national conservation and land use policies. Yet the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Orme Lewis, has testified that the public lands, comprising almost a quarter of the national land area and constituting an invaluable national heritage, should ultimately be turned over to "private citizens." This is hardly what Theodore Roosevelt had in mind, and it seems extremely unlikely that it is what Dwight Eisenhower has in mind.

Another Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Felix Wormser, formerly head of Lead and Zinc Trade Association, has warmly endorsed provisions in a House Ways and Means Committee bill, for heavily increased tariffs on lead and zinc. In fact, he has implied that he had a hand in preparing these provisions. The Administration is now trying desperately to get them knocked out of the bill, which would wreck the reciprocal trade program.

What has happened is understandable enough. For one thing, a party traditionally takes care of its lame ducks, without inquiring too closely into the lame duck's views. For another, a President cannot possibly know all about hundreds of second-level appointees. Tariff Commissioner Talbott, for example, has said that he never met the President, and no one at the White House ever asked him his views on trade policy.

Moreover, an administration cannot lightly disregard the wishes of such powerful men as Senate Interior Committee Chairman Hugh Butler of Nebraska. Butler has already introduced a bill turning public lands back to the states, and he has successfully insisted on the appointment of men of like mind in the Interior Department.

Yet President Eisenhower is clearly going to have to ride the Executive branch on a very tight rein, if he is to give the country the kind of modern-minded, middle-of-the-road government for which he stands. The President may find good uses for the famous Eisenhower temper in the months to come.

McCarran Act Amendments Urged by Ike

Continued from First Page

day that extensive hearings will be held on this request. The Illinois Republican said he and members of an immigration subcommittee agreed that "an appraisal of both the needs abroad and of our domestic capabilities of absorption is necessary before a decision is made."

Complaints Eisenhower said he had received about the law included these points:

1. Strict security regulations covering crews of foreign ships in United States ports. This has been criticized by friendly nations whose nationals have been subjected to rigid questioning before being allowed shore leave.

2. Provisions allowing the Immigration Service to "mortgage" up to half the quota for future years. Eisenhower said the quota for Estonia was reported to be partially filled until the year 2146.

Called '2d-Class' Citizens

3. A provision allowing naturalized citizens, unlike native Americans, to be expatriated if they live abroad for certain periods. The President said it had been charged that this gives immigrants only "second-class" citizenship.

4. Allowing former Nazis or Fascists to enter the United States unless it can be shown they advocated setting up these systems here.

5. Permitting an alien to be deported at any time if he was ever involved in activity or an organization designed as subversive—no matter how long ago. Eisenhower said, "Such alien is now subject to deportation even if his prior affiliation was terminated many years ago and he has since conducted himself as a model American."

6. Allowing U.S. consuls to bar immigrants they think might become public charges at any time in the future, or who probably would engage in subversive activities. Eisenhower said that for a consul to decide what a person might do in the future was too much authority.

DREW PEARSON Says:

Congress Turned Thumbs Down On A Probe of Consumer Costs

WASHINGTON — Sometimes during the rush of a Congressional session, the public misses some of the most important things Congress does—or fails to do. Sometimes the session is so hectic that not even congressmen themselves catch all that happens. Accordingly, this column will publish some of the unnoticed actions or lack of action by the 83d Congress.

One thing the 83d Congress did do was to turn thumbs down on one of the most overdue probes on the national agenda—to discover exactly who gets what out of the housewife's dollar.

Partly as a result, the Eisenhower Administration is now faced with the difficulty and embarrassing fact that prices today are higher than ever while the farmer's share is lower than ever.

Prices at New Highs

It was promised that prices would go down when the new Administration removed controls last February. Instead, price levels have reached new heights. While beef cattle are selling at record lows, beefsteak is selling in the butcher shops for almost record highs. Yet Congress voted to bar an investigation.

Last September 27, President Truman wrote to Federal Trade Commission Chairman Mead asking for a "special investigation to give up a breakdown of the consumer's dollar."

Pointing out that the Government needed the information to deal with the complex problems of the modern U.S. economy, Truman said that "powerful interests are at work trying to convince the consumer that it is the farmer who is responsible for the high cost of living . . . although the farmer receives only about half of the consumer's food dollar."

Probe Was Blocked

To carry out this vital probe, the Federal Trade Commission asked the 83d Congress for \$186,000. But Congress not only cut out these funds altogether, but took the amazing step of passing a special rider stating that none

of the F.T.C.'s funds "shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar."

Senators Bricker of Ohio, Dirksen of Illinois, Jenner of Indiana, Hickenlooper of Iowa, and McCarthy of Wisconsin, all Republicans, represent millions of farmers who would like to know just who's taking money out of their pockets. Nevertheless all voted to kill any probe of prices.

Meanwhile, here's what's happening to the ever-increasing spread between what the housewife pays and what the farmer gets:

In 1945, the farmer got 54 per cent of the housewife's food dollar. In 1951, he got exactly 50 per cent. Today he's getting only 45 per cent.

The decline in the farmer's share is hitting practically all major farm products. Between the second quarter of 1952 and the second quarter of this year, the farmer's share of the consumer's beef-dollar declined 36 per cent. In the case of butter, the farmer's share dropped 9 per cent; cheese, 13 per cent; evaporated milk, 17 per cent; and fluid milk, 7 per cent.

In contrast, middlemen's fees were generally moving upward. Between 1951 and 1952 they made 17 per cent more on a pound of beef; 4 per cent more on a pound of bread; and 3 per cent more on a pound of butter.

Simultaneously, the food processing industry increased its net earnings, after taxes, 11 per cent between the last half of 1951 and the last half of 1952.

In addition to the squeeze on food products, farmers are also losing out on other basic commodities. Between December, 1951 and December, 1952, the housewife paid 4 per cent less for cotton articles, but the farmer who grew the cotton received 21 per cent less. And as the tobacco manufacturers and middlemen gradually increased their percentage of the consumer's dollar, the tobacco farmer's share dropped 15 per cent.

Costs Up A Third

As the farmer gets less and less of the consumer's dollar, the housewife is paying increasingly more for the farmer's food. In 1951, the average housewife spent \$722 per year for her family's farm products. Today, that same housewife has to pay just \$1,000 for the same yearly supply of farm food.

Government economists under the new Administration are a little timid about talking, but some of them point out that the period when prices were held firmest was under O.P.A. chief Leon Henderson and Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States. With the relaxation of price controls, they point out, both the consumer and the farmer lost while the big processor gained.

NOTE—Former Federal Trade Commission Commissioner John Carson sparkplugged the proposed investigation of the big processors' profits. When his term of office expired last spring, Eisenhower did not reappoint him.

Copyright, 1953



EX-PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Asked probe of prices



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org