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102-25233-148
Reference is made to my telephone call of November 27th, to Mr. J. J. McGuire of the Bureau, in which I advised him of an editorial which had appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on November 27, 1950. Pursuant to that conversation, a copy of this editorial is attached hereto.

Encl.
ES 62-10498

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
Lowenthal Book Blasting F.B.I. Reflects a Pecue Like Truman's

The relationship between Max Lowenthal's attack on the F.B.I. and Philip Murray's keynote speech at the C.I.O. convention denouncing 'McCarthyism' is purely coincidental. Lowenthal's book and the C.I.O. convention speech have one thing in common. Both reflect a partisan defense of the present Administration and both approaches are based on superficial liberalism that looks no good for the republic.

Murray's harangue, defending Dean Acheson, was a red herring which was meant to take some of the sting out of the black-eye that the labor groups got in the recent election. It was an effort to divert attention from C.I.O. political failure. It was at the same time a pretty definite indication that the C.I.O. intends to go on making the same mistakes in the future.

It was not 'McCarthyism' that swept the Republican candidates into office in November. It was a public protest against present Administration policies, particularly in regard to Communism here and abroad and a resentment against the crude way in which the labor groups tried to ram their own platforms down the throats of the electorate.

The Lowenthal book is the first post-election shot fired to lay low one of the pet peeces of Mr. Truman. It is common knowledge that Lowenthal and the President are buddies. It is likewise known that the author of the book has been questioned by a Congressional committee on his association with Communist personalities.

Edgar Hoover gets in Mr. Truman's hair more than any government official in Washington. The director of the F.B.I. is sincerely convinced that the Communist movement is a real threat to our American security. Harry Truman does not believe that.

The Communists have carried on a persistent campaign of distortion and vilification against Hoover and the F.B.I. This organization is the one agency in the country that has syndicated the Stalins at every turn. Without the evidence of the F.B.I. counter-agents in the Communist party, the conviction of the II Red leaders could never have been attained. The stooges of the Kremlin want to discredit Hoover, destroy the F.B.I., and be relieved of any effective check on their own actions more than anything else.

For political reasons President Truman would like to depose Mr. Hoover, but to date he has not been able to do so. The storm of protest in Congress and among the public would be overwhelming.

Truman has no sympathy for the Communists. We are convinced of that. We is and has been, however, a very mistaken man in his judgment of the menace. The President is as much concerned for the security of the nation, most likely more concerned, than any ordinary citizen. But he is also a stubborn man and would like to reduce his dislike of Edgar Hoover to action and remove him. We do not know whether or not Mr. Truman previewed the anti-F.B.I. book as it is reported he did the volume written by Jonathan Daniels. It can be easily assumed that he is not displeased with Lowenthal's effort to smear Hoover and the F.B.I.

These two incidents, a speech by Philip Murray and the publication of a book reflecting the Administration's opposition to a government agency are separate and isolated events. Both, however, reveal a certain mental attitude toward the Communist issue which has been characteristic of the present Administration and its most avid supporters. It is evident that they look upon the late election returns as merely the result of an off-year protest. We believe they are wrong. Public sentiment has shifted and crystallized on this subject of Communism and political death awaits the politician who has not yet realized the turn in the tide.
I talked to him and we had discussed this in the Bureau and had decided we would not comment upon the book.

I told him I would be happy to talk with him but thought he was entirely correct.

I told him that although Lowenthal did quote Mr. Hoover nevertheless the quotes were of his own choice and selection and that we had declined all comment on the book other than to state in response to inquiries that Mr. Lowenthal had not contacted us.

I told him that the Director could not do this and he did not care to.

I told him that there were a lot of objective, fair-minded people who knew the Bureau that he would have no difficulty.

I told him one suggestion occurred to me that he had done work for them before and that we
I told him I would give the matter some further thought. I have
given some thought to the suggestion that we review
the book. I think that possibly he would doubtless do
a good job the effectiveness would be just as a result of his
I am sure, could do
an effective job.

A further thought occurs to me
this morning. What would be wrong with our suggesting that
review the book as he could write from a knowledge of inside the
Bureau and of course he would be cooperative with us.

Telephone number is

I think this is
a good idea.
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Attached herewith is a book review of the "Federal Bureau of Investigation" by MAX LOWENTHAL as written by W. G. ROGERS, a book reviewer for the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The foregoing is being submitted for the information of the Bureau.
Legal Expert Assesses FBI and Reports on His Findings

Reviewed by W. G. Rogers

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION. By Max Lowenthal. (William Sloane Associates. $4.50. 559 pp.)

In 1908 the 60th Congress, subscribing to the opinion that any "general system of espionage" or "central secret service bureau" was repugnant to democratic principles, refused to empower Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte to employ detectives. As soon as the session ended, it says here, he employed them anyway, setting up the Bureau of Investigation, now called the FBI.

In a painstaking, detailed examination of the record, Author Lowenthal claims some of the things Congress warned would come to pass have come to pass. Indefatigably compiling pro and con quotations from public hearings, trials, the press and other sources, without editorializing, he says the FBI has been accused in responsible quarters of sending agents provocateurs into labor unions and radical organizations, of making arrests without warrants, of illegal search and seizure.

He gives Editor and Publisher Hoover's National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (a weekly devoted to the interests of the Fourth Estate) as authority for the charge that the FBI suppressed news by "intimidating local citizens and ignoring local authority" and misbehaving as "police state agency." Figures show, he says, the bureau's wide renown, it is actually responsible for about 1% of "all the arrests effected and convictions secured" in the United States. Some of its claims to having caused the arrests of kidnappers and big-time gangsters, and even to having protected the country efficiently from spies and saboteurs, are challenged.

Lowenthal is a lawyer whose numerous government services include the term as secretary of Hoover's National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. He says that an American should "worship God in his own way." If he thinks the Negro's weapon is the stark, unsentimental truth.
62-25733-154

CHANGED TO

62-100311-2

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE: SEP 22 1953

64

[Handwritten note]

By mysterious design, best known to the author and publisher, copies of this book sprouted on the desks of Members of Congress and Federal jurists on the heels of a letter from a Sloane official stating "this unbiased and profoundly conservative approach" would lead to some startling conclusions on the FBI. The dust jacket hails Lowenthal as "a conservative in the most profound sense" and asserts he does not "color his material, editorialize, or draw conclusions".

Now because the book adds up to an attack on the FBI, which can be expected to be a standard reference for years, it is fitting that these claims to conservatism and objectivity be examined. It is altogether proper and conservative to fret over the possibility that a federal police force can grow into an arm of terror in a police state. When such fears parallel Moscow radio attacks on the FBI and writings of notorious Communist fronters, one can ask: "Who's conservative now?"

Mr. Lowenthal is a wealthy New York lawyer, who has been weaving in and out of Washington in various capacities for 30 years. The most detailed biography of Harry S. Truman to date (The Man of Independence) identifies him as the man who weaned the President from the realistic thinking of Pendergast to the rarefied liberalism of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Last September Lowenthal acknowledged varying degrees of intimate acquaintance with 22 known Communists, red spies and notorious fellow travellers, including Alger Hiss, John J. Abt, Charles Kramer and Lee Pressman, who is even now seeking to identify himself with conservatism. Lowenthal told the House Un-American Activities Committee: "The number of people I didn't know were members of the Communist party is something that makes my hair stand on end." So much for the new conservatism.

And now to objectivity. The jacket claims that for every quote questioning the practices or efficiency of the FBI, Lowenthal quotes the FBI reply or replies of FBI defenders, "including, of course, J. Edgar Hoover". This reviewer learned that not one question was addressed to Hoover or the FBI by Lowenthal. And it is difficult, if not well nigh impossible, to find a kind word for the FBI in the book. However, it reeks with criticism, most carefully traced to source in the most elaborate set of source notes in many a year. And these are most carefully edited to fit the slant against the FBI.

Much is made of an investigation of the FBI by Robert H. Jackson when the Supreme Court Justice was Attorney General. Not one word is included from his report, which emphasized the fact that the acts of every FBI agent are subject to examination by defense lawyers. Jackson said that if civil liberties are "in danger in this country, it is not by the FBI" and reported that with a record of 96 per cent convictions in cases brought by the FBI "not one case has been reversed by an appellate court because of 'third degree' or other improper treatment of defendants". Among many other editions "against" the FBI there is a quotation of an attack by former Senator Carl Hatch, but no mention of a virtual retraction two days later. Thus kind words for the FBI die under the Lowenthal scissors.

Lowenthal belabor the FBI as a menace to freedom of speech and freedom of thought. At the same time he criticizes the FBI for not being efficient enough, holding that the atomic spy case and the case of his friend Hiss should have broken sooner. In his brief, which is heavy reading, he cites a panel of cases from Sacco-Vanzetti and the World War raids of A. Mitchell Palmer to the Judy Coplon affair as offering evidence against J. Edgar Hoover... FBI today.

The verdict of this reviewer on Lowenthal is "not guilty" of conservatism and "guilty" of objectivity "against" the FBI.
Senator Murray (I. Mont.) will become chairman of Senate Labor committee in the next Congress in the place of Senator Thomas (U., Utah), defeated by 22,000 votes. In this change union leaders gain probably their most substantial victory in the recent election. While Thomas has been friendly to the unions in his 18 years in the Senate, he stated several months ago that union leaders preferred Murray to himself as chairman of the Senate committee. The unions gave him no campaign financial aid. As for the GOP minority on the Labor committee, there is talk of placing newly-elected Senator Francis Case (S.D.) to the place left vacant by Donnell's defeat. Case authored a labor bill in the House in 1946 which was vetoed by Truman.

---

* * * * *

THE GORDON GRAY PLAN: Edna Lonigan writes -- The Gray Report signals the transformation of ECA, from a purely economic project to one of military planning in the economic field. Grants for "technical assistance" -- Mr. Gray proposes -- should be raised to half a billion a year for several years, apart from "emergencies". Private investment is to be kept securely under Governmental control through tax exemptions, Government guarantees and investment treaties. In return the investors are presumably to accept little "Wagner Acts" wherever they operate.

The military characteristics of State planning are more in evidence in the Gray Report than in the Marshall Plan literature, presumably because the climate today is more militaristic (which we should not confuse with defense). Mr. Gray says that the North Atlantic Planning Agencies will try to avoid "an unchecked scramble for supplies", (that is, competition) by a system of priorities under supranational administration. They will also introduce a "system for guiding supplies of scarce materials among the free nations", that is, rationing. They will control the "flow of goods" and contract for long-term production of goods within the member nations.

The U.S. must encourage "other countries" to adopt sound currencies (but who is to encourage us?). The United States must eliminate "unnecessary barriers to imports", or tariffs as they used to be called in days of less elegant language. We must also "adjust" our agricultural price supports and surplus programs so that they will not burden world trade. That sounds like a new Brannan Plan. We should, of course, join the ITO and give the President power to reduce tariff rates unilaterally when he thinks there is an emergency. We should stop the procurement policy of preference for American goods in government purchasing.

Our loans must be "channelled to those areas and for those purposes where reasonable performance in the political and economic fields can be achieved". If that is not the new technocratic imperialism, what is it?

---

RE-EXAMINATION OF HISTORY: Revisionism ("how-we-really-got-into-it") has apparently won a victory by breaching the inhospitable wall of the standpat American Historical Association. That body will hold a meeting in Chicago during the latter part of December and one of the speakers will be Professor Charles C. Tansill, whose views, critical of our entrance into both World Wars, are well known.

Indeed, the session of December 29 will deal with the subject of "American Entry into World War II", and Professor Dexter Perkins of the University of Rochester is scheduled to talk on "The Roosevelt Foreign Policy and Public Opinion, with some Commentary on Revisionist History". This particular session will be chaired by Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis of Yale, who is scarcely sympathetic with the revisionists (see his recent negative review of William Henry Chamberlin's America's Second Crusade, in the New York Times Book Review). But, on the other hand, Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, sometimes called the "Father of Revisionism", will be present at the Chicago meeting, and is expected to provide fireworks. Dr. Barnes' latest contribution to Revisionist literature is his pamphlet Rauch on Roosevelt: A Study in Appearance and Realities.
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62-25783 156-16/
November 27, 1950

Your kind letter of November 21, 1950, has been received, and I deeply appreciate your commendatory remarks. It is reassuring to know that my associates and I have a friend such as you with abiding faith in this Bureau and its work.

With the able support of law-abiding, loyal citizens of this nation, corruption and subversion can be combated effectively.

Thank you very much for writing me as you did.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

NOTE: The address was obtained from the telephone directory.
It is "The Investigator Pays" which was an attack on the Chicago-St. Paul Railroad reorganization and an indictment of Wall Street. One chapter of this book contains a Supreme Court decision; however, when the Supreme Court decision is analyzed it is found that it was a minority opinion.

I do not see where this would be of any help to us. There are too many important things to look into.

LBN
November 27, 1950

Memorandum for Mr. Hoover:

This observation may be completely haywire; however, considering the attention that Max Lowenthal's book is presently getting, it appears to me it is a foregone conclusion that Lowenthal's book will be a "best seller" and that as a result, it will repose in libraries all over the country.

As a documented book, it will be reference material for years to come, and in my opinion, there is only one satisfactory answer to a book of this nature and that is, there should be another book with a title such as "J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

A book prepared now could be carefully documented and if written by the most prominent author available, it will become likewise a best seller and a reference work so that in the future, when library indices are searched, both books would be referred to simultaneously.

A book such as I have in mind would not be an answer to Max Lowenthal, but a separate book citing the accomplishments, aims, and ideals of the Bureau together with the aims and ideals of its detractors. All important and pertinent items in Lowenthal's book could be refuted by documented material without reference to the fact that it is a refutation.

I believe that there will be a gigantic, nationwide movement from the entire left wing to use Lowenthal as a constant and continuous source of attack on the Director and the Bureau and that some counter-agent is a "must."

Further, such a book written while you are still living and head of the FBI will have far greater effect nationally in helping to render more ineffective the Bureau's left wing critics. Such a book could be an authoritative expose of Red Fascism at work in America. If the Lowenthal book stands unchallenged in the absence of another documented publication, great harm can be done, in my opinion, for the reason that the Bureau's friends and others opposed to the left wing will lack in source material.

There is no doubt in my mind but there will be a book on John Edgar Hoover, it being merely a question of when, and, personally, of the opinion that the proper time is now.

There are undoubtedly many reasons why the Director would not wish such a book published at this time; however, it seems to me that the disadvantages of such a book at the present time are far outweighed by the advantages, not only to the Director personally but to the Bureau and the American public as well.

Respectfully,

S. J. Tracy
December 4, 1950

6Q-25735-143

Mr. Stanley J. Tracy
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Stanley:

Your memorandum of November 27, suggesting a book, was most thought-provoking. There is certainly considerable merit to what you have to say. You may rest assured that I will be glad to keep your views in mind.

At this time we are giving some consideration to a recent request which we received from a very respectable group, although I am fearful that the time required may make it impossible for us to cooperate.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely,

J. Edgar Hoover
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(22-25733-164JL6)
November 30, 1950

Your letter dated November 24, 1950, has been received and I am sincerely appreciative for your interest in writing as you did.

It is reassuring to know that your confidence in and support of our organization are unshaken by the attacks leveled at it in Han-Clawenthal's recent publication. We of the FBI are, of course, of the opinion this book should not be dignified by a comment from me.

I hope that our efforts will always merit your approbation.

Enclosed is some material I thought you might like to read.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosures
Mr. Dondro's Statement

59 FEB 21 1951
With reference to the attached letter from that Abbatichio sent he would like to suggest that Abbatichio send a strong letter to William Sloane Associates pointing out the inaccurate reference to his article as an illustration of the inaccuracies in the book and to also inquire of William Sloane as to whether they secured permission from the FBI to quote from his article as it appeared in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin which is a restricted publication.

I think that this might give them a little something to think about.

A letter acknowledging communications is attached.

DIRECTOR'S NOTATION: "OK.H"

ADDENDUM, 12-6-50, JIM

SAC Abbatichio, Cleveland, advised he had talked to was writing a strong letter to William Sloane Associates as outlined above. Further, that was writing an article which he was sending on to for inclusion in one of the next issues of.
Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file. One or more of the following statements, where indicated, explain this deletion.

- Deletions were made pursuant to the exemptions indicated below with no segregable material available for release to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 552</th>
<th>Section 552a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)(1)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(2)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(7)(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(7)(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(4)</td>
<td>(b)(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(5)</td>
<td>(b)(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.

- Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.

- Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

- Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

- Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

- For your information:

- The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

   62-25733-167
December 2, 1950

Dear [Name],

It was a real pleasure to receive your letter of November 27, 1950, with enclosure, and I want to thank you for your good wishes.

I am enclosing some material I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure
Unmasking the Communist Masquerader
Excerpt from Congressional Record, 9-1-50

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 3/9/47 BY BU

FBI
Relief

Date of issue: 1951-06-07

Received by: [Name]

Received by: [Name]

Dec. 2 1950
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FBI/DOJ
Dear [Name],

Your recent note concerning Max Lomenthal's book has been received.

I was extremely gratified by your comments, and I do hope that my administration of the activities of the FBI will always merit your approval.

Enclosed is some material I thought you might like to peruse.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Mr. Dondero's Statement, 9/1/50
WASHINGTON FROM PORTLAND VIA SFRA 1 S1 11-24-50 9-30 AM  ME
DIRECTOR FBI  U R G E N T
RE BOOK ENTITLED QUOTE THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION UNQUOTE BY
MAX LOENETHAL. RE SAC LETTER SIX FIVE DATED SEPT. SIX LAST.
FOLLOWING EDITORIAL APPEARS ON EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE OREGONIAN,
PORTLAND, OREGON, THIS MORNING. QUOTE AN AMERICAN OGPU. WHITE
HOUSE SPOKESMAN CHARLES G. ROSS, ASKED CONCERNING REPORTS THAT
PRESIDENT TRUMAN HAS "TWICE REJECTED SUGGESTION THAT J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECT A SUPER-INTELLIGENCE SERVICE. "TELLS THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
THAT HE HAS NO INFO ON THE MATTER. OUR LITTLE SIDE COMMENT IS TO
THE EFFECT THAT THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION IS AS TO WHETHER THERE IS TO
BE A SUPER-INTELLIGENCE SERVICE QUESTION MARK. IF MR. HOOVER WERE
APPOINTED TO SUCH A POSITION, HE PROBABLY WOULD ATTEMPT TO CONDUCT
HIMSELF WITH SOME RESTRAINT, THOUGH HE IS NOT GIVEN
TO MODESTY. SO, PROBABLY, WOULD ANYONE ELSE UNDERTAKING SUCH A
POSITION. BUT DEPENDING ON THE COURSE OF EVENTS, SUCH A SUPER AGENCY
COULD EASILY BECOME ONE OF THE CHIEF DOMESTIC ISSUES. IT ISN'T
JUST A MATTER OF DECLARING THERE IS TO BE SUCH A THING. CONGRESS HAS
NOT SURRENDERED ITS POWER TO THAT EXTENT. THE CREATION OF THE
FBI UNDER THEODORE ROOSEVELT--EVEN IN ITS THEN MODEST PROPORTIONS--
WAS AN ISSUE OF THE FIRST MOMENT. AND THE ESTABLISHMENT NOW OF AN
OVERALL AGENCY WOULD REALLY GET THINGS GOING. SO FAR AS THAT IS
CONCERNED, WE ARE NOT SO CERTAIN THAT UNDER OATH BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL
HEARINGS, MR. HOOVER COULD JUSTIFY HIS SELECTION,
On 12/2/50, SAC, New York, advised that on 12/1/50 he interviewed Republican Congressman Leonard W. Hall, Second District, New York, at his home in Oyster Bay, New York, concerning an applicant for whom the Congressman was given as a reference.

During the interview, Congressman Hall stated that he was in complete disagreement with MAX LOWENTHAL and that he commends the Bureau for its good work.
December 6, 1950

Honorable Leonard W. Hall
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Congressman:

I have been informed by Mr. Edward Scheidt, Special Agent in Charge of our New York Office, concerning your recent conversation with Special Agent [redacted].

I could not let the opportunity pass without expressing my sincere appreciation for your commendatory remarks regarding my administration of the activities of the FBI and your views on Max Lowenthal’s recent publication. I am grateful for your interest and support and trust that our efforts will always merit your approval.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

sincerely yours,

[Signature]

cc - New York
ATTENTION SAC: Reurl 12-2-50.

[Redacted]

December 6, 1950

[Redacted]
December 2, 1950

62-25733-172

Dear ____________

Thank you very much for your most welcome letter of November 27, 1950, and the enclosed ____________

I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for your fine comments. It is most reassuring to know that my associates and I have your confidence in the work we are doing. I commend you for the objective and effective manner in which you have outlined your observations concerning the activities of the ____________.

I hope that this organization will always merit your continued faith and approbation. I am enclosing some material which may be of interest to you.

Enclosure

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date: 52 Jan 10 1951]

[Redacted]
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I think we should find out who issued this statement. Yes I very frankly.

Clyde Tolson
What Happened to a Man Who Attacked J. Edgar Hoover

By NATHAN HOLLIS

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 18-19 (AP) - A man who attacked J. Edgar Hoover in his own home was sentenced to 10 years in prison today.

The man, identified as John Doe, pleaded guilty to the assault and was sentenced by Judge John Smith. The attack occurred on July 18, 1988, outside the FBI headquarters.

Doe admitted to the attack in his plea bargain, stating that he was acting on behalf of a political group seeking to expose government corruption.

The FBI has not released details about the case, citing ongoing investigations into the attack.

The incident has sparked controversy and raised questions about the safety of government officials. Hoover, who has served as the FBI director since 1972, is one of the most prominent figures in the American government.

The attack comes as the FBI faces increasing scrutiny over its role in the investigation of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The agency has been criticized for its handling of the case, which has led to questions about its ability to protect the nation from future threats.

Hoover, who has been an advocate for strong government surveillance, has defended the agency's actions, stating that it is working to improve its handling of such cases.

The attack has also raised concerns about the safety of other government officials. The FBI has increased security at its headquarters and other locations, including the White House, as a precaution.

The incident has sparked a debate about the balance between national security and individual rights. Some have called for increased oversight of the FBI, while others have defended the agency's actions as necessary to protect the country.

The attack has also raised questions about the role of the media in reporting on such cases. The FBI has been criticized for its handling of the media's requests for information, stating that it is committed to protecting the privacy of its agents.

The incident has also raised questions about the role of the courts in handling such cases. The FBI has been criticized for its handling of the case, stating that it is committed to protecting the privacy of its agents.
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MR. TOLSON

L. B. NICHOLS

November 29, 1950

58768

Two or three people have suggested to me that someone is back of the Lowenthal book. I am certain that this is not likely because we know that the publisher has no use for Lowenthal. I am going to talk to Lowenthal today and I am going to tell him about the statements that have been coming to us and explain to him just what our position has been and I will tell him that they might desire to come out with a statement which would cauterize in advance any publicity which would link them with the book.

LBN

DIRECTOR'S NOTATION: "I would certainly speak to them & let them know the rumors." H.
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December 2, 1950

62-25733-176

Dear [Name]

I have received your note of November 20, 1950, together with enclosure, and I do want to thank you for bringing to my attention the copy of your letter to [Name].

I do hope you will drop me a line concerning any developments in the situation mentioned in your letter to [Name].

Sincerely,

J. Edgar Hoover

All information contained herein is unclassified.

Date: 11/9/50

G.I.R. 1

DEC 2 - 1950
COMMA - FEB
TO:  MR. TOLSON  
FROM:  L. B. NICHOLS

SUBJECT: MAX LOWENTHAL BOOK

In connection with the Max Lowenthal book, I feel that it is necessary, as quickly as possible, to check the sources quoted by Lowenthal in his book and to have in one place what Lowenthal says, what the sources actually show, and the facts along with any possible explanation necessary to justify the Bureau's action. I have in mind that we will find in the sources referred to by Lowenthal, statements not used by Lowenthal which would contradict and cast a reflection upon his objectivity.

I think sooner or later we are going to have to meet this book head on. Since the book is being billed as objective, I feel this is the easiest point on which to base our counterattack.

This, of course, is a big job and with the work assigned in our division, we frankly do not have the supervisory personnel necessary to do this job in the time in which it should be done. I, therefore, would like to recommend that three supervisors, preferably ones who have been in the Bureau for a long period of time and who are good at research, be temporarily detailed to this project.

At the present time I have Mr. Jones working on the project full time and I have instructed that the duties on his desk be turned over to another supervisor. Assisting Mr. Jones are two supervisors from this division.

It is believed that six supervisors can do this job in two or three weeks time.

It is contemplated that since this is essentially a research project, as the supervisors complete item by item, I will then go over it personally so that once it is typed up, it can be typed in final form.

LBN: ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 62 FEB 28 1951
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XXXXXXX-25733-178
December 3, 1950

Dear [Redacted],

Your letter dated November 28, 1950, together with enclosure, has been received.

I do want to thank you for your expressions of confidence in the FBI and my administration of its activities. I hope that our efforts will always merit your approval.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing some material which I thought you might like to peruse.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Due to Freedom
Congressional Record, Hon. Dondero's Speech
How Communists Operate

[Redacted]
TO:  
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Personnel Files Section  
Records Section  

See Me  
For Appropriate Action  
Send File Note and Return  
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DATE 5/18/52  BY 8/12/52  

Clyde Tolson
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOIPA DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
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FBI/DOJ
I thought you would be interested in the progress we are making in checking the various sources in Lowenthal's book. As of 9:00 A.M. this morning we had completed 1,110 of the 3,346 references. Some of the references can be checked quite quickly while others require a great deal of time. It is impossible, of course, to estimate just how long it will take to finish the project but we hope to have it well along by next weekend. The chief difficulty at the present time is locating some of the material Lowenthal cites. In some instances it appears that even the Library of Congress will not have the publications.

On the whole Lowenthal has been most accurate in his quotations and we have not found anything really outstanding wherein he has misquoted. The chief thing it appears will be the accumulation of matters, which in themselves, standing individually, do not mean too much.

We have noted that Lowenthal's source references are very badly padded in some instances. On some simple little point that no one will dispute he will cite 10 or 12 references, all of which say practically the same thing.

You will be kept advised from time to time as to our progress. Everyone is bearing down on this particular project and we will, of course, complete it just as soon as is humanly possible.
Office Memo

TO: Mr. Tolson
FROM: Mr. Clegg
DATE: November 10, 1950
SUBJECT: THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Pursuant to the request of Mr. Nichols, [redacted], called [redacted] today and advised [redacted] we had recommended him for a review of Lowenthal's book which, as you know, will be released on November 11. [Redacted] that we were vitally interested in this matter and that Lowenthal's book was right down the party line. [Redacted] that the purpose of the call was to advise him that he might receive a request from [redacted] and also to advise him of our interest.

[Redacted]

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

[Redacted]

RECORDED - 20 DEC 1950

EX-123
Attached is an editorial from the San Antonio Express written by Mr. M. M. Harris, editor, which appeared in the issue of November 25, 1950 and which I thought you would be interested in reading.
In Which the Coyote Attacks the Lion

Presidential Press Secretary Charles G. Ross pulled the worst public relations faux pas of his otherwise astute career in emphasizing the long-time friendship of Mr. Truman with Max Lowenthal, New York lawyer who wrote "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," sharply critical of Director J. Edgar Hoover. Mr. Hoover's quarter century of service in building the F.B.I. into the world's best national police system carries more prestige than the record of the President himself.

It is natural that the F.B.I. should be the target of subversive elements which it has so effectively attacked. Lowenthal, described by Jonathan Daniels as responsible for much of Mr. Truman's "liberal" thinking, could bear further scrutiny by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The same goes for Albert E. Kahn, author of "High Treason—The Plot Against the People," whose earlier book, as pointed out by Fulton Lewis, Jr., apparently inspired much of the Lowenthal trash. At any rate the Bureau pays that the author did not come to the agency for any research data.

Paradoxically enough, Morris L. Ernst, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union—which leans over backwards to defend the legal rights of all, including the shadier elements—writes in December Reader's Digest: The Bureau "has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom, invites complaints against its agents and has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process."

Lowenthal's suggestion that F.B.I. Director Hoover was passed over in the Presidential appointment of Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as head of the Central Intelligence Agency is pretty much beside the point. Hoover's agency has a different job from that assigned to Smith, and the duties are about equally important and should be separate.

Virginia Representative Harrison, member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, put it mildly when he said that Hoover's record of achievement is "so outstanding that no mud slung at him is going to stick." In fact, it is the mud-slingers who will be called on the carpet to explain their reasons—which are not too difficult to imagine—for vilifying the one man who has not lost his head in dealing with America's internal and external enemies.

In conclusion it might be noted that the only time that the F.B.I. has fallen down on the job has been when the President's political-minded Attorney General has applied protection pressure. If Congress wants something juicy along that line, it might investigate the soft-pedaling of the Kansas City scandal.
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: MR. TOLSON

FROM: L. B. NICHOLS

DATE: November 24, 1960

SUBJECT:

I am attaching hereto a copy of the excellent review of Father Walsh on the Josefowenthal book.

LBN Attachment

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED.

RECORDED: 162-20730-181
DEC 5 1960
Two Critic Appraisals A Critical Volume on the FBI and Its Boss

By Ben. Edward A. Walsh, S.J.

The FBI's profiles in damaging the U.S. government, as described in this book, have been controversial since the moment of its inception. During World War II, the FBI was tasked with fighting against espionage and sabotage within the U.S. government. Today, it continues to operate under the same mandate, but its methods and tactics have come under increased scrutiny.

In his review of "A Critical Volume on the FBI and Its Boss," Ben Edward A. Walsh, S.J., examines the book's critical appraisal of the FBI. He argues that the book's claims are not based on fact, but rather on speculation and political bias. Walsh believes that the FBI is an essential part of the U.S. government and that its work is necessary to protect the country from foreign influence.

Walsh argues that the book's author, a former FBI agent, has a personal vendetta against the FBI and its agents. He claims that the author's personal experiences with the FBI have clouded his judgment and led him to make baseless accusations.

Walsh concludes that the book is not a fair or accurate representation of the FBI and its work. He urges readers to critically evaluate the book's claims and to consider the FBI's role in protecting the country against foreign influence.

In summary, Walsh believes that the book's claims are not based on fact, but rather on personal bias and vendetta. He urges readers to critically evaluate the book's claims and to consider the FBI's role in protecting the country against foreign influence.
The Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Max Lowenthal, was published last week by William Sloane Associates (539 pp., $4.50). The Washington Post presents two reviews of this controversial book. One is by the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, regent of Georgetown's School of Foreign Service and an authority on Soviet Russia. The other is by Joseph L. Rauh, jr., former MacArthur staff officer, former Deputy Housing Administrator and now a Washington lawyer. He has been counsel in many important civil liberties cases.

J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation
gress. Not one of them, Republican or Democrat, has raised the pother of trivia assembled in this book. After every flurry and investigation, Congress consistently voted the necessary funds and refused to hamstring the bureau.

Mr. Lowenthal is greatly alarmed over secret files. The danger of FBI records being diverted to unlawful use is no greater per se than that attending any accumulation of confidential reports in the State Department, in local police files, in hospitals, in the archives of the armed forces, in the records of practicing physicians and lawyers. The mounting expenses and budget of the FBI are cited as insufficient to bring all Government departments in recent years, a trend so marked and comprehensive as to bring about the Hoover (Herbert) Commission on the reorganization of the Federal Government. The recurrent drive to bring all emblems of the FBI under Civil Service control is renewed by Mr. Lowenthal despite the consistent refusal of the Congress to do so.

The director of the bureau, Mr. J. E. Hoover, is criticized for his speech-making and alleged publicity proclivities; but no mention is made of the frequent appearances of other high Government officials on lecture platforms, at political gatherings, at picnics and on Nation-wide electioneering tours. Exception is taken to the practice of former FBI agents accepting lucrative positions in private industry. No mention is made of the scores of former Government officials and Senators who have opened offices in Washington for the practice of law or for other purposes in which their experience and special knowledge of Government is of great benefit to their clients. Mr. Lowenthal himself, when recently questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was accompanied by a lawyer who had been a distinguished member of the Senate.

The publications of the bureau on crime prevention, juvenile delinquency and similar community problems are denounced. But no mention is made of the tons of Government literature published and distributed by other agencies on such subjects as soil conservation, gardening, rotation of crops, fertilizers, pest control, peanut crops and the ravages of termites.

The training programs of the bureau, including both agent training and the Police Academy for officers of the various State, municipal and county jurisdictions, are criticized either as inexpedient or as infringement of state jurisdiction... In sober judgment this latter activity, now called the FBI National Academies, has been a highly laudable demonstration of police cooperation now existing between the Federal agency and the numerous State and local police units. The lack of such a unified front against criminality and the ready refuge thus afforded to criminals was one of the defects in crime enforcement cataloged by the President's Research Committee on Social Trends (1933).

High officials and men of lower rank from local police jurisdictions throughout the Nation have assembled regularly since 1926 in the halls of the FBI for advanced courses in professional police work. During the past 15 years 2,252 of them, including sheriffs and parole officers, came to Washington at their own expense, paid for their own board and lodging for three months and returned to their respective communities fortified in morale and improved in technique. Among the trainees were representatives of Scotland Yard, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and other foreign governments, such as Egypt, China and the Netherlands. The present reviewer has personally interviewed dozens upon dozens of these graduates of the FBI National Academy and found no evidence of the sinister doubts and suspicions apparently lurking in Mr. Lowenthal's mind.

It may be asked: Has this anthology of anti-Hooverisms no merit whatsoever? Its sole contribution would seem to consist in having swept up and put between bookcovers about all that has ever been said or imagined in defamation of the FBI. Consciously or unconsciously, Mr. Lowenthal has compiled a quick reference manual for all hostile elements, foreign and domestic, who seek ammunition for destroying confidence in one of our most trusted security agencies.
It Is 'the Civil Libertarian's Brief Against the National Police Force''

By Joseph L. Remk, Jr.

THE MOST IMPORTANT TING about Max Lowenthal's book is that it was written at all. This book contains a brilliant exposition on the facts of one of the most humiliating disclosures in recent history, the so-called wire-tapping affair. This book is a brief on the facts of the case and as such it is a masterpiece of exposition.

Max Lowenthal did not write the book to win applause, nor did he write it for his publisher, nor did he write it to gain favor with the authorities. He wrote it to tell the truth, to tell the facts as he saw them, and to tell them in a way that would make it impossible for anyone to deny the facts. He wrote it to make it impossible for anyone to deny the facts.
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FBI Study Is Hardly ‘Objective’

RAUTH. From Page 7

composed primarily of men from the South.

"It was a dastardly thing for him to do, and he ought not to have done it."

The result of the bitter charges and counter-charges was a compromise: a recommendation that the FBI should some day be placed under Civil Service, but not at that time. Unfortunately, the author leaves the subject hanging there.

MR. LOWENTHAL’S last chapter is one very close to his heart. A man who has devoted his life to civil liberties, he shows his deep concern at the growth of FBI dossiers on men and women in all walks of life. The author also takes up the role of the FBI in obstructing confrontation of witnesses in loyalty cases—an issue now before the Supreme Court.

The author is, of course, less well qualified when he leaves the field of civil liberties and enters the field of crime detection. Even here, by dogged documentation, he carefully briefs the case against the FBI in an effort to deflate its claims of perfec-

tion: "... the New York City police built up the case against Hauptman ..." Dillinger was run down because of the work of a local Indiana police sergeant ..." Karpis was traced following the capture of a number of his gang by Postoffice inspectors; Brunette was located by New York City police "only to have Hoover dash to New York" and stage "melodramatic raids;" the eight German saboteurs were "detected" by the Coast Guard only to have "Mr. Hoover ask the admiral at the head of the Coast Guard to reprimand his subordinates, for intruding upon the FBI’s jurisdicti-

don."

Whittaker Chambers’ pumpkin material "was revealed in the slander suit" of Alger Hiss; Fuchs and Gold were uncovered "due to the work of the Canadian police." It would be fascinating reading if Mr. Lowenthal’s book were serialized side by side with Mr. Hoover’s answer.

BACK IN 1948, a prominent American had this to say of the FBI:

"There is a disposition in both branches of Congress to idealize the FBI. Those who are in the FBI are people just like we are. Their blood runs through their hearts and goes through their bodies. They eat. They wear clothes. They are simply human beings. There is nothing sacrosanct about the FBI.”

The man who said this is no wild-eyed radical. He probably wouldn’t even mind being called a conservative. His name is Senator Tom Connally of Texas. The trouble is that Senator Connally wasn’t wholly right. The FBI has been treated as sacrosanct, as being beyond the pale of criticism. Mr. Lowenthal’s great contribution is his effort to make Connally’s dictum come true.

The question naturally arises whether Mr. Lowenthal would have made a greater contribution if he had written the objective study his publisher claims for him instead of preparing the brief that he actually wrote. Mr. Lowenthal clearly believes that it is time that we take a look at one side of the record of our national police forces.

The cause of freedom has seldom been sustained or advanced by objective studies presenting a carefully balanced picture of all sides of the question. It has been advanced by the great writings of such men as William Lloyd Garrison and Thomas Jefferson, who "dotted eloquently for freedom without thought of personal risk."

Mr. Lowenthal has not written with the fire and eloquence of such men. But his powerful documenta-

tion is his substitute for the greater literary inspiration offered by his predecessors.

ALL THINKING people acknowledge that there are pro-Russian spies and saboteurs in our midst. But we must not, in our efforts to ferret out spies and saboteurs, discard the liberties which Americans have unhesi-

tatingly defended with their lives.

Solutions to these problems can come only through intelligent public discussion of the issues. The reactionaries of the right and the Communists on the left seek and serve only to obscure them. It is up to the great bulk of the people in the vital center to see that these issues are thoroughly discussed and carefully evaluated. What we need now is an objective evaluation of how to obtain maximum security with a minimum infrin-

gement on personal liberties. Mr. Lowenthal has presented a magnificent brief on one side of this problem.
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Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Dear Father Walsh:


I want you to know that I was tremendously pleased with your comments concerning our organization. It goes without saying that my associates and I are highly encouraged by your words and your keen analysis of the publication which directed such an unjustifiable attack against us. Your review will do much to unmask the real and sinister motive behind the book.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

November 27, 1950
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Office Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, Memphis

SUBJECT: EDITORIAL
THE COMMERCIAL APPEAL
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

DATE: November 29, 1950

Attached hereto is a copy of the editorial entitled "Smearing the FBI," which was reprinted in "The Commercial Appeal," Memphis, Tennessee, on November 27, 1950.
EDITORIAL
RE: FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FROM: THE COMMERICAL APPEAL
NOVEMBER 27, 1950
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December 4, 1950

Dear [Name],

Your letter postmarked November 27, 1950, has been received, and I want you to know that my associates and I greatly appreciate your generous expressions of confidence. It was thoughtful of you to extend the Season’s Greetings, and I hope that you, too, will have an enjoyable Christmas and a happy New Year.

I am enclosing some material which I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Enclosure

Excerpt from Congressional Record, 9-1-50

NOTE: Files reflect considerable cordial correspondence with this individual.

Dec 4 1950
Comm. 68
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FBI/DOJ
December 2, 1950

Your letter dated November 28, 1950, has been received. I do want to thank you for your expressions of confidence in our organization.

Enclosed is some material which I thought you might like to read.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure
Excerpts from the Congressional Record, September 1, 1950

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 5/19/97 BY 3713
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TOLSON:

I told him that I doubted it.

I told him we did and I arranged for the New York office to pick it up. I told him that it would certainly be done.

L. B. Nichols

All information contained herein is unclassified.

Date 11/9/97 by B.J.
Honorable George B. Vallen
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

My dear Senator:

I have read with great interest an account of your remarks before the Senate on December 2, 1950. I want to take this opportunity to tell you how grateful I am for your strong support of my associates and me in the work of this Bureau.

You presented your observations in a most effective and objective manner. Your clear and succinct statement will certainly do much to focus the spotlight of truth on a book which is filled with distortions, misstatements and half-truths.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

Mailed 17 Dec 1950. COMM. PA.
Book is as Impartial as Moscow's
New Says Nevada Republican

Dr. J. L. Malone, senior member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in his new book, "The Case of MacArthur," has written a series of articles for the FBI that have been published in newspapers and magazines. The author has cited various examples of Communist infiltration of government and business, and has pointed out the need for continued vigilance.

Malone said that the book "is an unbiased view of the issue, and I am confident that the information contained therein is accurate and reliable."

He added that, "The FBI has always been careful to point out that the information contained in the book is based on facts, and that the book does not contain any expressions of opinion or personal views."

Malone said that the information contained in the book has been thoroughly checked and verified, and that it is based on reliable sources.

He also said that the book is not intended to be a political statement, but rather a factual account of the investigations conducted by the FBI.

Malone added that the FBI has always been committed to the protection of the United States and its citizens, and that the book is a reflection of that commitment.

He concluded that the book is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the intelligence and security challenges facing our nation, and that it is a must-read for anyone interested in the FBI and its role in protecting the country.

The FBI has always been committed to the protection of the United States and its citizens, and that the book is a reflection of that commitment.

He concluded that the book is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the intelligence and security challenges facing our nation, and that it is a must-read for anyone interested in the FBI and its role in protecting the country.
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As a by-product of our research into the sources used by Lowenthal, we have developed some rather interesting figures which we thought might be of interest to you.

The following table shows the breakdown of the individual sources used by the author:

**SOURCES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Record</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports of Attorney General</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports of FBI</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Hearings (House and Senate)</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Report (Charges against Attorney General Palmer made by Louis F. Post and others, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, 1920)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh Report (Charges of illegal practices of Department of Justice, 66th Congress, 3rd Session, 1921)</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewers Report (Brewing and Liquor interests and German and Bolshevist propaganda, Senate Resolutions 307 and 439, 65th Congress, 1st Session, 1919)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Radicalism (Investigating activities of Department of Justice. Senate Resolution of October 17, 1919, a report on activities of Bureau of Investigation. 66th Congress, 1st Session, 1919)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Hearings and Congressional Reports</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Books and articles</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,346</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also interesting to note that in connection with the references to newspapers, Lowenthal used 368 references from the New York Times alone. A review of the newspaper references indicates that all of them are from very substantial publications, there being...
only several references to the former publication known as PM. Other references are from papers like the Chicago Tribune, the Baltimore Sun, Philadelphia Record, New York Herald-Tribune, et cetera.

These figures revealed two things:

1. That Lowenthal has devoted a tremendous amount of time to research and apparently to accumulating material on the FBI.

2. It illustrates the magnitude of our problem in our efforts to check back on the many sources to reveal his many inconsistencies and to uncover his technique of distortion.

For your information, we are devoting the early phases of our research to Chapters 28 through 38. These chapters, of course, cover the more recent material.
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Jack Corley's editorial, which is attached, was excellent. You will note they have been running Fulton Lewis' column on the editorial page of the Commercial Appeal. I can very well see how it would be rather awkward for the paper to review the book.

L. D. Nichols

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCONDITIONAL DATE 9/9/91 BY JSL

NOT RECORDERED

[Signature]
In accordance with a telephone conversation with Assistant Director L. E. Nichols, there are transmitted herewith articles appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on November 21 and 24, 1950, entitled, "Lowenthal In the Brandeis Tradition" by Raymond F. Brandt, and "Book Attacking FBI Aroused Congressman" by Bert Andrews. Mr. B. H. Reese is the managing editor of this newspaper.
Mr. Stein advised that this program was entitled "Books on Trial" and was broadcast each Tuesday. Sterling North, book reviewer for the New York World Telegram, acts as moderator.

ASAC Stein called this morning pursuant to Mr. McGuire's instructions and advised him that it would not be possible for the Director to appear on this program. He stated that in view of these facts he was thinking of securing some outstanding man to attack the book and was considering stated, however, that his plans were not definite; that he was merely thinking the matter over. ASAC Stein did not comment and ASAC Stein does not think the program will go through.

The above is furnished for your information.
Ed Delaney of the Wall Street, Massachusetts, Herald News called and wants to see me on next Tuesday in connection with the Max Lowenthal matter.

I told him I would be glad to see him.

LENING
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MR. TOLSON
L. B. NICHOLS

December 6, 1950

I have explained to him that in view of the uncertainty, the Director feels that it would be impossible for him to accept the very kind invitation to speak at the banquet of the Grand Lodge of Washington on the night of February 20th. I told him, however, the Director was looking forward to attending his annual breakfast if he were in town.

KL was very enthusiastic. He is disturbed no end about the Lowenthal book and intends to talk to the President about how ill-timed and unwise this book is.

CC: Jones

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 2/21/52 BY BILL
Memorandum to Mr. Nichols

November 27, 1950

In July, 1949, the Cleveland Plain Dealer did a two-page spread on Bureau firearms training. Again this material was furnished to the Bureau for review.

Occasionally it is true the Plain Dealer publishes material not highly complimentary to the Bureau, as on April 14, 1950, when a story concerning the Knoxville atomic energy installation was published which contained a left-handed dig at the Bureau. When this was pointed out to the Plain Dealer, they were very apologetic and said they had not realized that derogatory comments might attach to the story. It is certainly true that generally our relations with the Plain Dealer have been excellent. It is a morning paper which serves Cleveland and the whole Cleveland area and is generally considered to be the best newspaper in Cleveland.
I have explained to the Director that in view of the uncertainty, it would be impossible for him to accept the very kind invitation to speak at the banquet of the Grand Lodge of Washington on the night of February 20th. I told him, however, that the Director was looking forward to attending his annual breakfast if he were in town.

... was very enthusiastic. He is disturbed no end about the Lowenthal book and intends to talk to the President about how ill-timed and unwise this book is.

CC: Jones
December 6, 1950

Dear [Name],

Your letter of December 1, 1950, has been received, and I want to express my sincere personal appreciation for the interest which prompted you to write.

Your continued confidence in our organization is deeply gratifying to all of us in the FBI.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing some material which I thought you might like to read.

Please accept my very best wishes for a pleasant Christmas Season and for every happiness in the New Year.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

Enclosure

Dandeu's Report—Before House of Representatives 3-1-50
Dear [Name],

It was a real pleasure for me to read your letter of December 3, and I want you to know how much I appreciate it.

I am enclosing some material which I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Congressman Dondero's statement concerning Max Lowenthal in Congressional Record of 9-1-50.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 12/1950 BY B123
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62-25733-19697
December 7, 1950

Dear [Redacted],

Your letter dated December 4, 1950, addressed to the Attorney General, has come to my attention.

It is encouraging to know of your appraisal of the recent publication by Max Lowenthal and I trust that my administration of the activities of the FBI will always merit your approval.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing some material which I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

All information contained herein is unclassified.

Date [Redacted] by [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Bureau

Dondero's Speech--Congressional Record Sept. 1, 1950.

Foe to Freedom

New Communities

NOTE: Address per directories.
Director, FBI

SAC, Memphis

EDITORIAL
"The Nashville Tennessean"
Nashville, Tennessee


Mr. COLEMAN A. HARWELL is Vice President and Editor of this paper. This editorial defends the Bureau and is critical of MAX LOWENTHAL.

Inclusion: Mounted clipping of editorial, "Doing Its Job."

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE: 12/1950. REV. 112

80-114

BC

NOT RECORDED
73 DEC 26 1950
December 12, 1950

Mr. Coleman A. Harwell
Editor
The Nashville Tennessean
Nashville, Tennessee

Dear Mr. Harwell:

I have had the pleasure of reading your excellent editorial "Doing Its Job" which appeared in the December 3, 1950, edition of The Nashville Tennessean.

I want to take this occasion to express the sincere appreciation of all of us in the FBI for your comments concerning our organization and for your forthright defense against the attack made in Max Lowenthal's recent publication. You have performed a real service to us by bringing to the public's attention some of the real facts regarding the matters discussed.

Thank you for your expressions of confidence and I hope that our efforts will continue to merit your approbation.

Sincerely yours,

cc - Memphis
ATTENTION SAC: Reurllet 12-7-50

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

JAN 4 1951
December 8, 1950

Dear

Thank you very much for your note of November 30, 1950. I appreciate your support and confidence in this matter.

I am enclosing some material which I thought might be of interest.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten note: J. Edgar Hoover]

Enclosure

Congressman Sonder's statement concerning Max Lowenthal in the Congressional Record of 9-1-50.
Memorandum to Mr. Nichols

November 21, 1950

(7) Preparation of memorandum.

(a) It is proposed that only one item will appear on a page.

(b) At the top of each page will be the chapter number and the title of the chapter.

(c) Immediately beneath will be the page and line.

(d) The next item on the page will be the pertinent quotation from the book, which, of course, will be typed.

(e) The next item will be the word "comment." Under this will appear, first, any necessary explanation with regard to the quoted portion of the book which appears above. If the quotation is true and there are no other angles to be considered, there will be a statement to the effect that the quotation is accurate. If there is a misquotation or a quotation out of context, of course, this will be set forth. If the entire quotation gives a distorted or completely inaccurate picture, the true facts will be set forth to refute.

(f) The material will be typed with wide margins. The original will be on unwatermarked bond and there will be five thin whites and a yellow. Straight type will be used. The pages will not be numbered until the project is completed and approved.

(g) After the project is completed, it will be possible to read the book by reading the memorandum.

Attachment
As the hearings drew to a close, the question remained whether the
work of the Committee, devoting itself solely to the
question of police brutality in this country, in which the
question of race is deeply involved, could have successfully
handled the problems that were present in such a situation. During an
interview with Miss Bearden, Senator King cautioned the Committee: "We
must not make this proceeding a mere sewer of镫g the mud that
imped all the accusations and charges and vicious statements, of
persons of various persons throughout the United States."
TO: Director, FBI  
FROM: SAC, New York  
SUBJECT: MAX LOWENTHAL; ASSOCIATES INFORMATION CONCERNING

DATE: November 28, 1950

I. L. B. Nickols

This memorandum is classified as unclassified information

On 11/27/50, SA(A) [redacted] who is on complaint duty received the following information telephonically from [redacted]:

[Redacted information]...was advised that we would make appropriate inquiry and that he would then be advised as to the availability of Mr. Hoover.

The above information was telephonically furnished Inspector John McGuire, Bureau, 11/27/50, by ASAC C. W. Stein.

Mr. McGuire said he would check to see if Mr. Hoover would be available for the requested interview on Thursday, 11/30/50.

Mr. McGuire was also advised that [redacted] desired to know whether Mr. Hoover would be available by about 10:30, 11/29/50.

[Redacted]

5 DEC 28 1950
Letter to Director

On the morning of 11/28/50, Assistant Director L. B. Nichols said that ASAC Stein should inform that Mr. Hoover was completely tied up on Thursday, November 30, with prior commitments but that he himself would be available to confer with that date.

ASAC Stein then telephonically advised that Mr. Hoover would be unavailable for interview on that date due to prior commitments but that his assistant, Assistant Director L. B. Nichols, would be available and would be ready to discuss this case with them.

I then furnished the address of our Bureau and Mr. Nichols' room number.
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62-25733-205,106,107
December 9, 1950

Dear Max Lowenthall,

Your letter of December 1 has been received, and I appreciate the thoughts which prompted you to write as you did.

My associates and I find great satisfaction in this expression of your support. I am enclosing some material I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

Director

Enclosure

Congressman Dondero's statement concerning Max Lowenthall in the Congressional Record on 9/1/50.

04090
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
House of Representatives
WASHINGTON, D.C.

November 27, 1930

William Sloane Associates
11 West 57th Street
New York, New York

Gentlemen:

I am returning herewith your book, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," written by Max Lowenthal. I do not care to have my library contain copies of such trash which is typical of that which can be read at anytime in The Daily Worker and other Communist Party publications.

As a former F.B.I. agent, I have the greatest respect for the character and integrity of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and all the F.B.I. personnel, and feel confident this fine organization is capable of protecting our country against spies, subversives and subversives. On the contrary, the author of this book has had so many dealings with nefarious characters in government that I doubt his capability to criticize the efforts the F.B.I. has made.

I do, however, appreciate your sending me the book, but would suggest that this returned copy be autographed and forwarded to Moscow where I am sure it will be appreciated.

I want to assure you in closing, that I do not intend any reflection upon the character or loyalty of the publishers of the book in any way.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Harold H. Velde,
Harold H. Velde, M.C.

Encl.
November 30, 1950

Honorable Harold A. Velde
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Congressman:

I have read with great interest the copy of your letter dated November 27, 1950, directed to William Sloane Associates, 119 West 57th Street, New York, New York, and I want to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for the expressions of confidence concerning this Bureau contained in your communication.

We of the FBI deeply appreciate the effective manner in which you have presented your comments, and I am certain that your action in returning the book will give the publishers some food for thought.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
Dear [Redacted]

I have received your letter dated December 5, 1950, and I want to send this note of appreciation for your comments concerning our organization.

It is reassuring to know of the appraisal you made of the recent publication by Max Lowenthal in which he directs an unjustifiable attack against the FBI. In this regard, I am enclosing some material which I thought you might like to read.

Your Holiday Greetings are most welcome and I appreciate very much the thoughts which prompted them.

May I express to you my sincere good wishes for a joyful Holiday Season and a New Year filled with happiness.

Sincerely yours,
J. Edgar Hoover

Enclosure - Hon. Dondero's statement

NOTE: [Redacted] was in communication with the Director in May, 1947 and was afforded a courtesy reply.

It is deemed appropriate to recognize the correspondent's Holiday Greeting at this time, although he is not known personally to the Director.

[Redacted]
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December 6, 1950

Mr. C. Wilson Harder  
President  
National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.  
Drawer 473  
Burlingame, California

Dear Mr. Harder:

By letter dated December 2, 1950, you requested that we forward you the enclosed material which he had previously reviewed.

It is a pleasure to be of assistance in this regard.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED.

DATE 5/1/42  BY 6/27

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

cc - Springfield with copy of incoming.  
San Francisco with copy of incoming.

Enclosure:

Dandero's statement on Max Lowenthal before House of Representatives, September 1, 1950.  

NOTE: Previous correspondence of a cordial nature has been received from.

NOTE: Incoming indicates that the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., has a weekly news letter entitled "Small Business". These are supplied free of charge to over 1,000 weekly newspapers by the Western Newspaper Union.

(See next page)
NOTE CONTINUED

He requests material be forwarded to the above individual.

NOTE: The tickler copy of a letter from Mr. Harder, 11-25-50, indicates the following enclosures were sent to him and these therefore being forwarded to Mr. Harder:
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November 28, 1950

Dear [Redacted],

I am most appreciative of your thoughtfulness in sending me the enclosure with your note of November 24, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

All information contained herein is unclassified.

DATE: [Blacked out]

[Other redacted text]
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67-25733-2113912
November 30, 1950

Dear (Recipient's name)

EX-37

Thank you very much for your cordial letter of November 28, 1950, enclosing a copy of a newspaper article.

I appreciate your commendatory remarks and I hope that my associates and I will always merit your confidence in the work of this Bureau. The enclosed data may be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Dondero's statement

NOTE: The chronic card box contains a card on this individual but in view of the cordial commendatory nature of the incoming it is thought a short cordial reply should be sent.
He asked if Mr. Hoover was in or out of town and was told that he is out of town but we will be talking with him soon.

He said he just wanted to tell Mr. Hoover that he thought he would be interested that this morning at the President's press conference some reporter brought up a certain book that was written by Mr. Lowenthal not long ago and asked the President if he approved or disapproved the book. The President said "I haven't read the book; I haven't read it; haven't seen it, and so I don't either approve or disapprove it - I just don't know anything about it and I suppose a fellow has a right to write anything he wants to in these days."

Then someone else said Mr. President is the fact that Mr. Hoover is still head of the FBI mean that you still think well of him?

I wrote down this quote: the President said "Mr. Hoover has always been well thought of by me." Nothing further was said on the subject.
said he expected this to come up several conferences ago and it didn't — and here it comes up. He said this is about what they at the White House had discussed that the Boss would say if they asked him when there was a lot of discussion about it.

The President hadn't read the book at that time and he said he guessed he would take a look at it sometime; he had been hearing so much about it — but he naturally has been too busy lately — and he said he still hasn't read it.

said he didn't personally think he had missed too much.
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Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI.
FROM: SAC, New York.

DATE: 12/22/50

SUBJECT: "THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION", BY MAX LOWENTHAL.

ATTENTION: L. B. NICHOLS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Attached hereto are photostatic copies of an unsigned article captioned "A Book That Rocked Washington" that appeared on page 2, columns 2-3 in the December 11, 1950 issue of the "UMHews", official publication of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America which was received on 12/22/50 by this office. This article cites material from captioned book which is favorably reviewed.

The incident referred to in paragraph three of this article has been previously reported. No identification of the plant was made in paragraph one, wherein reference is made to "an employer in a eastern plant" who told UE Members recently that an FBI Agent had inquired whether any of the union members were "giving him trouble", and that "We'll take care of anyone you want".

The above for information.
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All information contained herein is unclassified.

Date: [Redacted by Blurred Text]
TO: Director, FBI
Attn.: Asst. Director L. B. Nichols
FROM: SAC, New York

DATE: December 19, 1950

SUBJECT: INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE;
INTERNAL SECURITY - I.S.L.

Re N.Y. teletype dated 12/18/50 which advised that a copy of "Labor Action" was being forwarded Special Delivery to the Bureau.

Attached is the 12/18/50 copy of "Labor Action".
BOOKS and Ideas

New Book on FBI Lifts Curtain on Federal Thought-Policing


By SAM ADAMS

A few weeks ago, Max Lowenthal, a corporation lawyer, engaged for many years in government service, friendly with President Truman and familiar with the ways of Washington, published his lengthy, and documented account of the FBI. He traces its origin, development and place in American society.

The picture is not a pretty one. How could it be, since the material deals with a police agency of the government engaged in the primary job of spying on the populace?

Its very nature as a police and spy agency of the federal government, and the specific tasks assigned to it make it inevitable that the FBI and its individual agents should always threaten the bounds of legality, even when it does not pass them, which is often enough. It lives in a nether social world of its own: its ways are devious and dishonest. Its objectives are the entrapping of individuals or organizations who may or may not be unpopular.

Yet the FBI is a successful organization. It is beyond normal criticism. Director J. Edgar Hoover has done an excellent public relations job for himself and his agency. That was not difficult since there were altogether too many newspapers, organization individuals, and particularly newspaper columnists who acted as self-appointed publicity agents for the FBI and especially its director, J. Edgar Hoover, the country's outstanding intellectual-s spirit. The book is a crusade for years in behalf of his friend Hoover.

It is not difficult to understand why a documented book on the FBI, which could not be anything else but condemnatory, should evoke a dirty campaign against its author even before the book was published. The reactionary press, with classic self-interest as a big business and monopolistic combine, joined the conspiracy for obvious reasons.

The FBI is a reactionary defender of the economic and political status quo and, in turn, must be defended against its critics no matter what the issues and the facts are. In the case of men like Winchell, who optimize the prostitution of the capitalist press, there is an unbroken backing in the warm sun of a federal police agency. The slightest criticism of the FBI brings out this horde of semantic thugs in a frenzied defense of the agency and its director.
The FBI Claque Throws Mud at Lowenthal

Thus the reception of Lowenthal's book. Before the book was published, Hoover's friends in Congress began the campaign against Lowenthal personally. Nothing concrete, you understand. Representative Dendro, the notoriously ignorant reactionary, Republican from Michigan, saw to it that the Congressional Record contained his speech of innuendos against Lowenthal. He actually knew Alger Hiss ... he was the friend of Stalinist fellow travelers . . . There is doubt about his loyalty. Why not? Didn't he write a book critical of the FBI? Isn't that reason enough to suspect a man?

Dendro's speech found its way into Wimp's column; it was printed in hundreds of newspapers and read by millions of people who are daily tuttted by a column which tells them what celebrities are getting married or divorced, who is being courted by whom, what happened in this hotel and that party, and throws in... the inside dope on the politics of the world.
The Scripps-Howard New York World-Telegram and Sun which rarely, if ever, writes an editorial on a book, did so in the case of "The Federal Bureau of Investigation". It protests the "one-sidedness" of the book and its use of quotations from numerous editorials from the Telegram which sustain Lowenthal's description of the FBI. In a rather pathetic manner, The Telegram reminds its readers that it has printed many more editorials and stories favorable to the FBI, at a ratio of 100, as a matter of fact, and then rises to the defense of Mr. Hoover, boasting that at the same time that President Truman did not appoint Hoover head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Raymond Moley, sometime aid of President Roosevelt, former New Dealer, and presently columnist for *American" and partisan-defended Lowenthal's praise of himself as "the first of the American book deeply into the problem of political administration" in the work that he did for the House Judiciary Committee. Moley does not review the book (there is a favorable review in the same issue of the magazine) but rises to the defense of the FBI.

No Attempt to Refute Facts in Book

"What is really important is the status of the FBI itself," writes Moley. "The confidence of the public in its efficiency and integrity, and the importance of anyone who can speak with authority, is such a question, as I do, that it is by all odds the most concrete police and investigative agency that this country has ever seen." You see, it is not the contents of the book, its material and its documentation which is important but the status of the FBI itself. What Moley is really saying is that the book threatens that status because it tells the bitter truth about the agency.

Here are sufficient examples of the opinion of the Right. On the fence, we have Max Lerner, well-known liberal and columnist for the New York Post. He also thinks the book is one-sided; it does not deal with the good things that the FBI has done. For example, it has practically wiped out kidnapping! Doesn't Mr. Lerner really know better? One would like to believe so, but with our liberals one can never be sure.

The real question, and this Max Lerner certainly should know, is what role the FBI plays in the social and political life of the country, particularly in relation to the political, economic and social organizations of the labor movement existing in the framework of class society in the United States.

Lowenthal's book is not a thesis on this question and we doubt very much that this is its main interest. His is a clear-sighted and fearless interest in civil liberties, and his book charges that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its successive attorneys general, has violated the basic principles of democratic and legal process and has become the very pernicious spy agency which the Senate and Congress of 1938 feared it would become.
resisted Theodore Roosevelt's demand for such a police agency to fight crime.

The most interesting thing about the campaign against the book by Lowenthal is that none of its critics dares to question the documented material of the book. Not one of them has found an error in the book. Not one of them has successfully questioned a single reference in this documented work. The criticisms of it are general in tone and defensive of the FBI, irrespective of the trenchant comments of the book. The reason for this, as we shall show in our next article, is that the material of the book is irrefutable.

The FBI has grown from a simple governmental police agency into a vast bureaucratic enterprise, with an enormous dossier on millions of people based largely on material supplied by informants. Properly termed (re)POXIS, "anony-mous" individuals, hearsay, tapped wires, self-appointed spies, and its own agents. Hoover's own social and political views very often form the basis for the judgment of an individual's "loyalty." Here, Moley's diabolical attempt to defend Hoover against the charge of being a leading actor in the "Palmer Raids" is stupid and as ridiculous. Certainly, Moley could not have read a book for Lowenthal quotes repeated from the Instructions of Mr. Hoover. Was Hoover merely a "clerk" as Moley declares? We are pretty certain Hoover would never accept that description of himself, just as we are certain that Hoover believes himself to be not an ordinary policeman but a man of high integrity, great intellect and considerable knowledge.

In the book's documents, at least, Hoover represented himself, during the days of the Palmer Raids which he helped direct, as an authority on Marxism theory and the politics of socialism. It was he who sent directives to the numerous agents of the department on what Marxism is, the nature of the various social movements, the conflicting crimes of the political organizations, the working of the mass raids.

Main Function: Thought-Police Agency

One does not need to go back that far, however, to establish the role of the FBI. We are not too greatly concerned with the FBI's work against crime. We regard crime as a social problem and criminals as symbols of individuals in the same category as professional spies, informers, and the present-day informants. But obviously, there has been no reduction of crime in this country; quite the contrary. Kidnapping has not wholly abated; the punishment for its offense has only been made more severe. Sex crimes have not lessened with the Mann Act or its policing by Hoover's department; they have increased.

If Hoover's organization were primarily concerned with these matters of social crime, we would say little or nothing about it, but that is not its main occupation. Its main activity is policing the economic, and political activity of the labor movement in its variegated forms, in setting up standards for political, economic and social thought, in policing such thought, in creating a vast dossier system containing information on public and private characters, individuals which it has no business accumulating, and of operating in various ways to set itself up as the real censor of the nation—by methods which are the antithesis of democratic and legal process.

Examples: The material of the files of the FBI are unchallengeable. Those supplying information can never be cross-examined. The reason for that is a typically bureaucratic one: it would expose the informant and thereby break down the FBI system.

Examples: The attorney general's list of "subversive organizations" is based on FBI material. Organizations placed on the list cannot challenge it by any legal process because the list is a product of administrative decree and the material of the FBI cannot be investigated for its veracity or lack of it.
War Brought Out Its Reactionary Role

Examples: the standards of political and thought loyalty are set by the FBI and its director. Thus, being a liberal makes one suspect at once as a "soft-headed parlor pink." Opposing Franco and supporting the Loyalist government in Spain is proof per sé that one is a "communist," or a "fellow traveler," or opposed to our "great traditions and institutions."

Example: "the Observer," columnist for the New York Times, once wrote a letter to the State Department denouncing "something or other"—I forget how it was, maybe something to do with Spain." One day in 1940 he received a letter stating that his communication had been filed and the contents noted. The reply came from the FBI!

Such examples are endless and we shall detail them in our forthcoming review.

The point is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as a central police and spy agency, cannot but violate the elementary democratic rights of the citizenry in an effort to encompass either the full scope of the powers given to it by Congress or those which it assumes itself. The tradition of the FBI has been reactionary and anti-democratic. It is true that during the height of the New Deal, its role was relatively diminished, but the outbreak of war reas

changed that. The present war situation and the struggle against Stalinism has only served to increase the activities of the FBI and to raise to a new height the sacrosanct, unattainable position of what is after all a subsidiary of the Office of the Attorney General of the Department of Justice.

A book on this bureau, critical as it is, has brought the wildcats out. Even before it was actually off the press, the FBI had already inspired attacks on it and its author. Since its publication, the campaign has become even more strident. For "a police agency cannot stand the light of day."

As to the more specific reasons for the discomfort of the bureau and its directors, we will deal with them in our review next week, and it will indicate why Hoover and his reactionary friends are so concerned.
TO: SAC, El Paso

SUBJECT: RESEARCH

DATE: December 2, 1950

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

There is attached an editorial entitled "Unfair Book About G-Men", which appeared in the November 30, 1950 issue of the El Paso Herald-Post.

It is to be noted that this editorial defends the Bureau in connection with MAX LOWENTHAL's book "The Federal Bureau of Investigation", and is otherwise laudatory.

As the Bureau is aware Mr. EDWARD M. POOLEY, Editor of the El Paso Herald-Post, has been extremely critical in the past with respect to enforcement agencies and branch offices of Federal agencies here in El Paso. It is thought that the Director may desire to direct a note of appreciation to Mr. POOLEY.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 12/1/50 BY BMS

Encl.
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107 AUG 6 1964
Unfair Book About G-Men.

There is a great deal more to say than has been written in the book about the FBI, according to Mr. Lowenthal. He is critical of the book and its treatment of the FBI. The book, he says, is unbalanced and has little space given to the FBI's solid accomplishments and to favorable comment thereon even from the same sources Mr. Lowenthal quotes as critical.

For instance, the book includes numerous quotations from editorials in the Scripps-Howard newspapers concerning isolated actions of the FBI—all critical. Nowhere do we find any favorable Scripps-Howard comment about the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. Yet our own recollection is that Scripps-Howard's editorial appraisals of the work of the FBI and of Mr. Hoover have been about 10-to-1 favorable. That's probably a better rating than these columns have given any other government agency or human institution.

We cannot help but wonder why Mr. Lowenthal gives a favorable rating to the book. No other, that is, except for the editor who was in charge of the bureau of public information and who was never given any space in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, the government is as secure in the confidence of the public and of Congress. The same goes for its director, Mr. Hoover. And for the good reason that the confidence has been well earned.

Mr. Lowenthal is a published author who has been in and out of Washington over the last 30-odd years. He is known as an unfailingly critical reporter, yet never made any secret of his belief in Mr. Hoover and the whole G-men story. Only thing now is that he has written a book about it.

One item of news interest in the book is Mr. Lowenthal's confirmation of an oft-repeated rumor that President Truman rejected a suggestion from military advisers that Mr. Hoover be appointed head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). But that reflects no discredit on Mr. Hoover. To the contrary, the discredit goes to Mr. Truman who missed an opportunity to make something of the CIA.

It is well known that the CIA, under a succession of administrators, has not been worth its salt—and we're not here downrating able Gen. Taylor Smith, present CIA chief, who has been in office long enough. However, the decision not to appoint Mr. Hoover is now reflected in the caliber of management of operatives of the G-men.
December 6, 1950

Mr. Bernard E. Peole

El Paso Herald-Post

El Paso, Texas

Dear Mr. Peole:

Your interesting editorial entitled "Unfair Book About G-Man" has been brought to my attention, and I want to take this opportunity to express to you my personal appreciation for the commendatory remarks you set forth concerning the work of this Bureau.

It is most gratifying to know that you have presented this matter to your readers in this objective and effective manner. I hope this Bureau will continue to merit your faith and confidence.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

CC: El paso
December 6, 1950

Dear,

Your letter dated November 30, 1950, has been received, and in the absence of Mr. Hoover from the city I am taking the liberty of acknowledging it. I will bring it to his attention upon his return.

Sincerely yours,

Helen W. Gandy
Secretary

NOTE: has been in correspondence with the Bureau on several occasions in the past and his letters were acknowledged over Miss Gandy's signature.
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DATE: 521951  BY: 521951
TO: MR. NICHOLS
FROM: M. A. [Redacted]
SUBJECT: THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION BY MAX LOWENTHAL

While calling the Bureau on other matters this morning Mr. Scheidt mentioned the attached item which appeared on page 10 of today's issue of the Daily Worker reflecting that on December 18, 1950, there will be a review of the Lowenthal book in which Albert Kahn and Stetson Kennedy will be among the speakers. Mr. Scheidt stated that arrangements would be made to cover the meeting through confidential informants and that the Bureau would be appropriately advised.

MAJ.
Attachment
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The Illegal Gestapo Built Up

By FBI Against the Foreign-Born

By Harry Raymond

When Justice Department agents launched their midnight and early morning October raids, arresting law-abiding non-citizens in cities from New York to Los Angeles, they were following the illegal and undemocratic pattern of secret police terror devised in 1919 by present FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover.

The most revealing chapters of the Max Lowenthal's sensational book, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," describe in minute and carefully documented detail Hoover's far-flung plans for transforming the U.S. into a police state. Hoover, according to Lowenthal, chose the night hours for his brutal 1919-1920 raids on homes and meeting places of men and women singled out for special political persecution.

Night raids, according to Hoover's directives sent out at that time, would catch the victims by surprise, possibly in bed, with less chance for the prisoners to get in touch with lawyers.

Under the FBI raiding technique, Lowenthal points out in his chapter entitled "The Drag-net," Hoover sought his largest hauls in meeting rooms of radical organizations, which were spotted by his band of stool-pigeons. Next on the boss C-man's list of places to raid are choral societies and schools for foreign-born adults.

"Here the Bureau's agents picked up both teachers and students, including those on their way to class, and others on the street suspected of having that destination," Lowenthal writes.

On Hoover's list of subversive establishments are small shops, restaurants, cafes, bowling alleys, billiard and pool parlors, barber shops, concert and lecture halls. Lowenthal quotes Senator Walsh as summing up the testimony about a Detroit raid that netted "merry-makers in a ball in progress, and even the orchestra... a corps of professional musicians commonly employed about the city."

Men and women walking in the area where the 1919 Hoover raids were made were snatched up by the FBI gummies.

Also included in the Detroit arrests of the foreign-born were an "American-born college instructor who had come down from the university during the holidays to teach... physical geography"; a 17-year-old boy who had been caught while at the House of the Masses to see a man about a job; a dozen men who had been having a drink of near-beer in a cafe on the first floor of the building; "one man who had stopped out of curiosity;... one young man in the cooperative restaurant which had better meals at cheaper prices than any place around there, and he always ate there."

Jackson H. Boden, counsel to AFL president Samuel Gompers, summed up Hoover's shibboleth with this parallel: "That sort of thing was under the government of the czar, the commonest thing in the world... The police created and discovered conspiracies from day to day."

One of Hoover's big brave night raids in New York City, according to a New York Times report quoted in the book, resulted in the jailing of 700 prisoners, among whom were "twenty-five women, half of them apparently girls of high school age."

The C-men singled out for arrest and special rough treatment were "steel and brass workers, carpenters, painters, printers, restaurant waiters, teamsters, mechanics, shoemakers and manual laborers."

Former U.S. Attorney Phineas Fisher Kane of Philadelphia described them in testimony before a Senate committee as "dangerous people. They were the sort of stuff of which we..."
make good citizens. ... The
great majority of them were
workingmen, some doing well,
many of them with families here,
with ties that would have kept
them.

Sen. Walsh called the great
bulk of persons arrested and
persecuted by Hoover's men
during the foreign-born raids
as "the raw material out of
which the American public
school has made and will make
in the first generation native to
our soil our sturdiest manhood
and the peers in devotion to this
country and its ideals of any of
its citizens."

LONG BEFORE Hitler set
up his Gestapo, J. Edgar Hoover
had worked out methods of tor­
turing "confessions" from his
victims.

"The biggest job the G-men
had after arresting radicals was
to get confessions from them,"
Lowenthal states.

He goes on to quote a Detroit
lawyer, attacked by the bureau's
branch chief as a radical, as
testifying before the Judiciary
Committee how agents went
about the job of wringing "con­
fessions" from prisoners.

The men were taken to fifth
floor of the Federal Building
and were, he said, "taken ad-
vantage of by the Federal agents
... announcing ... that as
soon as they sign statements
... they would forthwith be

let out, and that anyone who re
fused to make any admission,
whether truthful or otherwise,
would be detained. The alien
would be sent back repeatedly
... until his spirit was broken
down and he would be willing
to subscribe to anything."

A year before this statement
was made, Lowenthal points out,
Hoover wrote an "urgent letter"
to the Immigration Bureau on
the subject of "confessions."

"He asked the Bureau to re­
fuse to free any prisoner on
bail unless he answered the
questions put to him by the Bu­
eau's detectives," reports Low­
enthal.

The Justice Department is
again seeking to use the old
police techniques to break the
spirit of not only foreign-born
but native-born Americans as
well. But today the spirit of
peace and democracy is grow­
ing stronger under fire of those
who, like Hoover, would prop
themselves up with the fascist
McCarran Law and destroy our
constitution and all democratic
liberties.

---

ASP Forum on
Lowenthal's Book
On FBI, Dec. 18

Max Lowenthal's book on the
FBI will be reviewed at a forum
of the Writing and Publishing
Division, National Council of the
Arts, Sciences and Professions,
Monday, Dec. 15 at Hotel Cornish
Arms, 311 W. 23 St. Albert Kahn
and Stetson Kennedy will be
among the speakers.

REFERENCE TO TRUMAN AND LOVENTHAL

Under the caption "Washington Wire," the December 4, 1950, issue of New Republic (signed by the initials "T.R.E.") states under "Notes" (page 4) the following: "Truman and Max Lowenthal, author of the new book critical of the FBI, used to be close friends. In this intimacy with Truman, Bert Andrews, head of the Herald Tribune's Washington Bureau who reviewed the book, seemed to find sinister implications, a new test of guilt by association." 

SUMMARY OF REVIEW

He concludes by stating "Mr. Lowenthal's indictment is much too impressive to be dismissed." He calls for an independent commission to study our security needs.

Following are the main points within "A Dossier On the FBI: 1908-1950:"

1. One is tempted to praise Lowenthal's courage in writing a sober indictment of the FBI.

2. The most significant fact about the FBI today is that its disapproval of it may be equated with disloyalty.

3. J. Edgar Hoover has long answered criticism by impugning the character or motives of critics. Barth quotes from the book the complaint of a Detroit lawyer concerning treatment of his client in 1920 and Mr. Hoover's estimation of him: "He is regarded as a Bolshevist leader." Also Barth quotes remarks Lowenthal attributes to the Director in 1940 and 1950 to illustrate that the Director still attacks the motives of those criticizing the FBI.
Memorandum to Mr. Nichols  
Re: Book Review of Lowenthal's Book  

December 5, 1950

4. The book is "an objective picture" only in the sense that the author refrains until the final paragraph from editorial comment.

5. Lowenthal's method, like the method of the FBI, has been to assemble "unevaluated facts... that serve his purpose devastatingly.

6. Barth outlines the method of selective compilation used by Lowenthal and states "He quotes alternately the FBI's critics and its defenders... Often the defense is more damning than the attack." The impact of the book may be diminished because of its unrelieved condemnation of the Bureau. "Credit to Hoover when credit is due might have given it a better balance."

7. "The most extensive and perhaps the most valuable portion of the book is the account of the Palmer raids. Mr. Lowenthal makes it plain that Mr. Hoover "bore a heavy responsibility for the actual conduct of the raids - a responsibility he has repeatedly disclaimed in recent years."

8. "It is a disappointment that Mr. Lowenthal did not analyze current FBI activities with anything like the same thoroughness (meaning the same thoroughness with which he analyzed the Palmer raids.)"

9. "Commenting on the fact that the American Bar Association did yeoman service following the raids of the 1920's, Barth states "Mr. Lowenthal, himself a lawyer, has written a book which, as a challenge to authority, does honor to his profession."

10. Barth says the FBI has passed beyond the limits of which the late Harlan Stone reorganized the Bureau in 1924. It definitely passed them in 1939 and, still further passed them when instructed to investigate the loyalty of federal employees. "In the course of these activities it compiled great numbers of secret dossiers on American citizens who were guilty of no criminal conduct." It resorted to "wire tapping and the use of anonymous informers...." Barth has here apparently deviated from a review of the book and embarked on an unfavorably critical analysis of FBI authority which has resulted in what he terms "anxiety now experienced by great numbers of loyal Americans...." He refers to these people as being spied upon, their telephones tapped and in fear lest voluntary associations they join may be called subversive.
Memorandum to Mr. Nichols
Re: Book Review of Lowenthal's Book

December 5, 1950

11. "What Mr. Lowenthal fails to make clear is that the danger to individual freedom arises from the power given to Mr. Hoover not from any malevolence on his part....It is beside the point that Hoover has good intentions....A secret police is a police that operates in secret, that maintains secret dossiers, that uses secret agents. The FBI, at least in part, now answers this description."

12. There is urgent need for a commission to make an impartial study of internal security needs and its relationship to individual freedom. Lowenthal's indictment is too impressive to be dismissed.
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ENCLOSURE
The New Republic in the
CLASSROOM

For thirty-six years the New Republic has been used as a supplementary text in colleges and universities all over the United States.

Professors of Economics, History, Sociology and English have long recognized its value as a means of bringing the immediate present into the classroom.

In the New Republic the students meet mature minds that are neither cynical nor indifferent. They are brought face to face with ideas and problems that will shape their lives and to which they will make their own contributions. They come in contact with good writing and good reporting. They learn about significant books and writers, take part in discussions and controversies, and are kept abreast of proposals and plans for meeting the challenge of the future for which they are being prepared.

If you are a teacher will you please consider the New Republic for your classes this Fall Semester?

SPECIAL CLASSROOM RATES
Each student's copy costs 10¢ weekly (half the regular price) if ten or more are mailed to a single address. Free desk copies are included for each instructor. Orders may be placed for any number of weeks, even for one week only, if desired, or for the entire semester. Copies are mailed from Washington, D. C., on Tuesdays, two days before the New Republic appears on any newsstand. Students are assured of receiving the magazine while the news and topics are fresh and exciting.

Advance payment is not necessary. You need only fill out the order form provided below and send it to us. The bill will be sent later.

ORDER FORM

NEW REPUBLIC, 40 East 49 Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Please send me ................................ copies of the New Republic for ................................ weeks beginning with the issue which will reach us about ...................................

@ 10¢ a copy (regularly 20¢). Payment will be made on receipt of your bill.

Name........................................ College or University...................................

City........................................ Zone........... State...................................... 12/4/20
WASHINGTON WIRE

W HATEVER I may think about General MacArthur," said one of Washington's top diplomats here last week, "I have never known him wrong militarily." This is one aspect of as bizarre a situation as this column can remember. Two nations which do not recognize each other, which do not exchange envoys, were fighting each other on the territory of a third with the first (USA) genuinely uncertain what the second (China) was fighting about. Nor was this all.

Chinese Communists moved down into Korea in mid-October, with fanfare and propaganda, to surprise advancing UN forces. After a fierce, bloody encounter, they appeared to fall back for a while; UN troops couldn't find them. There was every motive in the world for Russia to embroil America in full-scale war with China. But had she done it? It was like balancing on the edge of a precipice blindfolded. Nobody knew. From Truman down everybody assured China we had no territorial ambitions. With what effect? Nobody knew. But as the 7th Division advanced it enveloped two reservoirs (Changjin and Pujon) which fed power into the grid which supplies both Korea and Manchuria. Out our troops did not cut the power lines. Current flowed and propaganda, to surprise advancing UN troops couldn't find them. There was every motive in the world for Russia to embroil America in full-scale war with China. But had she done it? It was like balancing on the edge of a precipice blindfolded. Nobody knew. From Truman down everybody assured China we had no territorial ambitions. With what effect? Nobody knew. But as the 7th Division advanced it enveloped two reservoirs (Changjin and Pujon) which fed power into the grid which supplies both Korea and Manchuria. Out the news came, the newsmen were fighting each other on the territory of a third with the first (USA) genuinely uncertain what the second (China) was fighting about. Nor was this all.

Chinese Communists moved down into Korea in mid-October, with fanfare and propaganda, to surprise advancing UN forces. After a fierce, bloody encounter, they appeared to fall back for a while; UN troops couldn't find them. There was every motive in the world for Russia to embroil America in full-scale war with China. But had she done it? It was like balancing on the edge of a precipice blindfolded. Nobody knew. From Truman down everybody assured China we had no territorial ambitions. With what effect? Nobody knew. But as the 7th Division advanced it enveloped two reservoirs (Changjin and Pujon) which fed power into the grid which supplies both Korea and Manchuria. Out our troops did not cut the power lines. Current flowed and communication, to surprise advancing UN forces couldn't find them. There was every motive in the world for Russia to embroil America in full-scale war with China. But had she done it? It was like balancing on the edge of a precipice blindfolded. Nobody knew. From Truman down everybody assured China we had no territorial ambitions. With what effect? Nobody knew. But as the 7th Division advanced it enveloped two reservoirs (Changjin and Pujon) which fed power into the grid which supplies both Korea and Manchuria. Out our troops did not cut the power lines. Current flowed but from behind the battle area from one antagonist to another. It still flows. We have stated this would happen; now it was proved. Furthermore UN troops did not cross the Yalu; they came up and stopped. It was communication by sign language. Nevertheless, it was communication. Did this affect the Chinese decision? Again, nobody knows, but something did.

But at the start of last week in the alternating moods of Washington there was a sudden brief flare of hope. For a time at least it was thought Chinese resistance might be only token. This was dissipated by strong counter-attacks, and the whole issue of MacArthur's promises and judgment have hung in the balance. Yet almost certainly, somehow, somewhere, assurance had been given China that we would consider a borderline buffer zone.

With events developing so fast in a situation so fantastic it is impossible to say what happens next. But we feel confidence in outlining the following background. MacArthur planned his wind-up attack three weeks earlier but postponed it to get winter supplies and to protect his exposed right flank.

Arrival of the Chinese UN mission in New York at the same time as resumption of the offensive was simple coincidence. Again MacArthur was so confident of the result that he signaled his plan in advance (one vehicle in the United Press) and issued one of his characteristically bombastic communiques, besides the promise to troops they would be "home" by Christmas (which to MacArthur apparently means Japan, where he has lived so long it seems home). Finally, MacArthur was not acting in this move alone as some alarmed observers felt; his plans had Pentagon, State Department and White House approval and in this instance were approved by the British. They have confidence in MacArthur the General, gravest doubts about MacArthur the statesman.

Congress is back and Washington seems like itself again. We can settle ourselves now for a comfortable two-year period of White House-Congressional turmoil. It would be un-American to suggest that this is a bad system or that improvement could be made. For the moment the issue is deficit-inflation. The Baltimore Sun's able Mark Watson figures that four months' rehabilitation outlay is $12.4 billion on top of some $25 billion previously authorized. For this staggering obligation it is Truman's job to get more money and higher taxes. It is the main business of the Lame Duck session, due to sit only about three weeks.
There's a Washington theory that if Acheson shaved his moustache half his troubles with Congress would disappear. We feel he would have to go further than that. His gray-reddish upswept eyebrows would have to go, too. They match the moustache. Then the aristocratic nose that looks so hawklike in profile. But that wouldn't be enough, either; the tailored clothes, the protruding handkerchief and sleeve cuffs, the arched-out necktie: these are an affront to midwest Congressmen. Would that suffice? No, it goes deeper still. As we watched him bantering with reporters last week, lightly and humorously fending off questions whose only purpose was to discom­bovel him, we saw that internal changes would be needed to scale him down to Knowland-Wherry-Taft size. His in­dependence of judgment must be modified, few observers feel Truman ap­book.

selected foreign issues in three years; served mournfully: seven. On the other end of the scale, Kem has approved only twice, Malone, Washington bureau who reviewed the this intimacy with Truman, Bert An­
drews, head of the FBI, used to be close friends. In
the forties. Apparently Mr. Brock agrees, that wouldn't be enough, either; the

would have been permitted in the ring in the first place.
The Traitor is a damn bad novel, ex­
citing in spots only because Shirer, despite himself, gets excited by the drama of the events at hand. Like Berlin Diary, this book represents, obviously, much rewrite. After the fact. New York City.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir: Robert St. John's notes on Bill Shirer's The Traitor (the NR, November 11) are insipidly bad, and for all the wrong reasons. Strikes me that St. John, like Shirer, e.g. with punching Marshall, Taft and a number of vulnerable set-ups in order to make the ringside judges and referrees forget the fools de­ivered—albeit with good, woovy, well­intentioned left hooks—by both writers in approximately the same period. I mean that both St. John and Shirer were early, abject left-wing rowel boys who never should have been permitted in the ring in the first place.
The Traitor is a damn bad novel, ex­
citing in spots only because Shirer, despite himself, gets excited by the drama of the events at hand. Like Berlin Diary, this book represents, obviously, much rewrite. After the fact. New York City.

Ray Brock

Sir: Mr. Brock and I have only one thing in common: we both were once reporters in Yugoslavia for American newspapers.

Mr. Shirer and I have many things in common, among them the fact that Nazi Propaganda Chief Goebbels placed Berlin Diary and From the Land of Silent People on his list of the 10 worst books of the forties. Apparently Mr. Brock agrees, which gives him something in common with Herr Goebbels. He says further that Shirer and I should never have been "per­mitted in the ring," and that too is akin to the Nazi policy of suppressing the voices of those with whom one does not agree.

Robert St. John

New York City

Wendell S. Richardson

Sir: Russia was a Socialist country be­tween February and October, 1918, in the sense that Germany became a Socialist country in November, 1918. There were many social reforms on paper and a dem­ocratic constitution. But the later history of the Weimar Republic (or, for that matter, of republican Austria) is a warning against taking this temporary swing to the Left as synonymous with the establish­ment of Socialism.

A. J. P. TAYLOR

Los Angeles Conservatism

Sir: At a meeting of teachers tonight I discovered that at least two (Canoga Park and Hamilton) high schools, and presumably all other high schools in the city of Los Angeles, have received orders to remove from the library shelves all copies of The Nation and the New Republic magazines, and to lock them up.
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ORGANIZED labor and liberals are still studying the 1950 elections for future political guidance. The CIO, the AFL, the ADA and independent unions have all been commendably stalwart in stating that they are in political action to stay and will redouble their efforts in 1952. But inside the ranks of all these groups there is uncertainty and concern as to what changes each should make to improve its own performance and what is the best relationship with the Democratic Party for them to seek.

The CIO national convention just concluded did not debate political policy. The official convention line was to stand pat for more of the same. The resolutions on political action pinned labor’s hopes for a comeback in 1952 on “an even larger registration” than that of 1950, which would automatically it is presumed—“enlarge the liberal forces” in Congress. The resolution proposed no changes in strategy or policy and simply called for more money and effort to organize along the same lines.

Any soul-searching on the political role of the CIO will have to wait for the Executive Board meeting. The difference in views which existed at Chicago was neither clear enough nor sharp enough to have split the convention. But an open discussion might have helped to draw factional lines that have been threatening to form for some time.

Since the Communist bloc was finally disposed of at the Cleveland convention last year observers have been predicting a new factional formation in the CIO, with Walter Reuther emerging as the leader of a vaguely British-Labor Party kind of left. Whether or not he covets that role, Reuther has tried hard to keep the lines from forming and so far has succeeded. His potential opponents were clearly not anxious for a fight in Chicago, except for an extreme anti-Reuther fringe led by Joe Fisher, head of the Utility Workers’ Union, who is rabid against public-power projects like MVA and TVA and announced his intention of “smoking the socialists out.” The November elections raised delicate issues for the Reuther group. A number of his followers privately took an extremely critical view of the outcome. They suggested that the CIO should carefully review its program in the campaign and seriously re-examine its relations with the Democratic Party, whose policies they considered largely responsible for their setbacks. Not even the hotheads proposed that labor should start a third party of its own, but there was considerable sentiment in the convention for the CIO either to become more independent of the Democratic Party or to penetrate deeper into its policy-making machinery.

The Americans for Democratic Action are torn between those who would turn from a political role to one of planning and long-range thinking along the lines of a Fabian Society. Among those who still see planning without organized action in politics as too narrow a role for liberals, there is disagreement on the practical role liberals should play in the major parties or what degree of “independence” of the Democratic Party they should strive for.

We do not believe that the loss of 28 Democratic seats in the House and six in the Senate is cause for a major shift in the liberal position. As between the two major parties, only the Democratic stands for progressive principles. The idea of a third party remains as impractical and undesirable as we felt it to be in 1948. Liberals must continue to work primarily within the Democratic Party. They must learn how to be as liberal within the Democratic Party as they are outside. The tendency too often has been to knuckle under in Party affairs to supposedly superior political brains of old-line Democratic leaders. This has been especially true in New York City where the task of working with an Irish Catholic-dominated Democratic organization without accepting its dictates, has admittedly posed a stupendous problem. It compels liberals to function as an organized bloc within the Party to work before the primaries to insist on candidates of real stature and integrity, to always campaign on issues, and to work continuously to overthrow corrupt machines.

The best safeguard to the liberal position in Party matters would be to make the Party convention the real seat of authority in the Party. The convention could make democratic party control possible. If sessions were held every two years instead of every four, the convention could be developed into a national platform-making
organization for off-year as well as Presidential elections. By beginning work now, liberals could influence the Democratic convention of 1952 toward this end.

The principal political need on the left is education. Many of labor's political leaders are privately worried over the fact that so many of the union men they induced to go to the polls this year cast their votes for candidates organized labor was officially opposing. There have been CIO-AFL confidential talks about the problem, but the political chiefs will have difficulty getting the funds and the authority to educate union members between elections. In the AFL, too many powerful union heads are conservative Republicans. In the CIO, too few international unions really believe in broad education of their membership on subjects beyond the "pork chop" matters of wages and hours and working conditions. As a result, the political education needed to produce intelligent political action by labor is likely to be limited and timid. By joint appeal, liberal members of Congress might influence labor to emphasize education more heavily than is now planned.

ADA needs to carry on a different kind of education. Its members generally understand issues and vote correctly, but they need training in practical organization, in how to get new members and in how to appeal to non-intellectuals.

The political leaders of both labor and liberals must be prepared to withstand the drive that is sure to develop within their ranks and from some of their trusted friends in the Administration and in the Democratic Party hierarchy to softpedal "controversial" issues such as health insurance, the Brannan plan, the public development of power and civil rights. These cautious ones think of the PAC and the ADA as liabilities since those organizations replaced the Communist and the Progressive Party as major targets of Republican and newspaper abuse in many of this year's campaigns.

For the Left to temper its views to the right wing of the Democratic Party would be the road to liberal catastrophe. In spite of New Deal and Fair Deal reforms we still do not have either a depression-proof or an equitable economic system. Our civil liberties have rarely been in greater danger, and our minorities still suffer great injustices. Rather than a counsel of caution, the liberal order of the day should be one of advance if the Democratic Party is to be prevented from moving toward the right.

If the Truman Administration allows a Southerner to become Senate Majority Leader and the organization of the next Democratic Convention goes badly with regard to platform and rules, third party talk will surely revive. The main tasks for all the Left in the immediate future, however, are clear: To maintain its own integrity, to educate itself to understand the issues and operate effectively, and to organize itself strongly enough to become the leading spirit of the Democratic Party.

This is one early analysis of the problems of political action this election raised for liberals. We invite the fullest comments from our readers in what must be a continuing discussion.

THE WEEK

WAITING FOR CHINA

LAKE SUCCESS (WR Correspondent)

Six major activities occupied the United Nations last week. Listed roughly in order of importance, they were: Communist China. On the all-important question of the Korean War and allied problems, operations at Lake Success came nearly to a halt, pending the arrival of the nine-member Peking delegation to discuss China's charges of American "aggression" on Formosa. There was no expectation that real progress could be made in solving Far Eastern problems through formal proceedings. It was hoped, however, that private conferences between the Chinese Communists and the UN delegations from countries which have recognized their Government might throw some light on whether or not China and Russia want the Korean situation to degenerate into world war.

South Africa. The Union of South Africa has now shunted aside the United States as the scene of the world's worst relations between the white and other races. The special Political Committee of the UN Assembly has been discussing this matter, and in particular the South African plan to set up special zones for land ownership by whites, Negroes and Indians. The South Africans continue to insist that this is a domestic issue and were persuasive enough to make the UN Committee wind up by telling South Africa and India to continue to confer privately until next spring, even though there is no prospect of any real agreement.

Trygve Lie's Peace Plan. By an overwhelming vote of 51-5 the Assembly recommended that all UN bodies should study Trygve Lie's 20-year peace plan put forward some months ago. The Lie Plan would have the Security Council meet regularly and frequently to consider dangers to peace; would make another attempt at control of atomic weapons; and
would set up a special UN police force.

Political Refugees. The World Court has handed down a disturbing decision saying that no country can be permitted a unilateral decision on who is or is not a political refugee. If generally accepted it will curtail the "right of asylum" of a political figure who seeks sanctuary in a foreign embassy within the boundaries of his own country but should not affect the status of political refugees who escape across a border.

Point Four. The Assembly has adopted a significant study program on problems of effective aid to undeveloped areas of the world: National income, landlordism, irrigation for arid lands, obstacles to foreign investment and development of farm cooperatives. This is at least a start, and in the right place—the UN.

Eritrea. The compromise solution on the future of Eritrea that has been developed in the Special Political Committee of the Assembly is for Eritrea and Ethiopia to be joined in a federation, with the former given a substantial (but at present vague) degree of autonomy. Like all compromises, this one is wholly satisfactory to nobody; but it might provide a stopgap solution of the question for 10 or 20 years until the Eritreans are ready—as they certainly are not today—for complete self-government.

**Schumacher's Show**

The waning popularity of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his aloof Bonn regime was made clear November 19 when his Christian Democratic Union was badly beaten in the elections for Hesse and Württemberg-Baden which centered primarily over the question of Germany's role in European rearmament. Never loth to take up a popular cause, Kurt Schumacher led the Social Democrats in exploiting discontent over the role of a traditionally Catholic area. There has always been Protestant feeling against Catholic predominance in the federal Government; an intensification of it might relegate the CDU to the role of a traditionally Catholic Center party.

The international effects of the Adenauer shift in Germany are likely to be considerable. If French reluctance against German rearmament is finally overcome, Britain and the US may be faced with a German Government unable to discuss it. The French, in turn, are likely to view a Schumacher victory with a jaundiced eye. Adenauer's leanings have always been much more to the West than have the Socialist leader's, who has continually harped on the lost territories in the East. But each in their own way, the French and German reactions illustrate traditional fears and problems which will have to be overcome if the bolder European programs are to succeed.

**Aluminum Cutback**

The National Production Authority, which now controls the distribution of most scarce materials, has ordered a 35 percent reduction in the use of aluminum for civilian production—the first of many similar cutbacks affecting strategic metals likely to be ordered soon. Following this announcement Dewey Anderson, director of Public Affairs Institute, warned that federal officials responsible for adequate aluminum for mobilization must do more than cut back civilian use. "They must greatly expand production by backing new producers or we will be caught woefully short of this vital metal," he said in a letter to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and NPA Administrator William H. Harrison.

"Bigger capacity is the real answer, and it must be built under a sound plan," he said.

Anderson has studied this problem in the past, first as executive officer of the TNMC and later as secretary of the Senate Small Business Committee which conducted an extensive investigation of light metals. He points out that World War II brought two new giant producers of aluminum, the Reynolds Metals Company and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Company, into existence without increasing the overall amount of aluminum available and without reducing the price of metal previously maintained by Alcoa (Aluminum Company of America). "These two newcomers have traveled regularly, happily and profitably under Alcoa's price umbrella," Anderson said. "They have done nothing to increase aluminum use through lowered prices. They have been in competition really with the 17,000 independent fabricators . . . [and] consider themselves free to cut off or limit the supplies of these independents to favor their own fabricating plants. They have even done this with supplies they have withdrawn from the 375-million pound Government defense stockpile now wholly depleted."

To provide the needed supply of new
aluminum and to help rather than injure competition, Anderson recommended a five-point program that would include the following elements:

Bring in several new producers in addition to the Big Three.

In each contract for Government funds require that new producers turn over all or a major part of their production to independent fabricators or to the Government stockpile.

Make these new producers really independent of Alcoa by helping them obtain a bauxite supply and establish a Bayer plant that would be jointly owned and operated by all of them.

Obtain a large proportion of emergency aluminum requirements from Canadian sources at or below current prices and under conditions safeguarding our domestic industry.

Give the independent fabricators an early opportunity to get defense orders.

"If these new producers really compete in prices, as Kaiser and Reynolds were expected to do," Anderson said, "the savings to the economy would not be inconsiderable. On a national consumption of two billion pounds in 1935, a three cent per pound reduction would represent the interest on $2 billion worth of Government debt."

CONGRESS AND THE CENSUS

When the 82nd Congress convenes in January, President Truman will report the number of members of the House of Representatives to which each state is entitled. The 1950 Census, which recorded a 14.5 percent rise in the population since the 1940 census, will result in a reallocation of House seats and is sure to cause a political spat. Because of the shift in population, seven states will gain and nine will lose seats in the 435-member House to be elected in two years. And, of course, if statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is passed during the interim session, the total number of House seats will either be increased, or again reapportioned.

The size of the House is left up to Congress. The Constitution simply provides that whatever the total number of seats, they must be apportioned among the states according to population. In 1790, there were 105 members of the House. As new states were admitted to the Union and as the population increased, Congress added new seats rather than reapportioning the 105. However, when the size of the House reached 435, after the 1910 census was taken, Congress called a halt to any further increase and agreed to redistribute those seats among the states after each 10-year population count.

Under the Congressional Apportionment Act, Congress has 15 days after it receives the latest official census totals to enlarge the House membership by the necessary 14 seats or to reapportion on the basis of the present 435 members. California, which accounted for about one-fifth of the population growth of the entire United States, will gain seven House seats. It advanced from the fifth most populous state in 1940 to a position second only to New York in 1950.

Florida will gain two seats, and Maryland, Michigan, Texas, Virginia and Washington, one seat each.

If Congress does not enlarge House membership, New York will lose two seats but will still have the largest delegation with 43 members. Pennsylvania, which will lose three seats, will rank with California as second largest delegation with 30 Representatives. Missouri and Oklahoma stand to lose two seats apiece. Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee each lose one.

The real battle will begin in the states losing House seats if Congress decides to redistrict rather than enlarge the House. Governors and state legislatures will be notified to make the necessary changes in state districts in time for the 1952 elections. In states like New York and Pennsylvania, where Republican and Democratic factions often control certain districts, political parties will attempt to seek advantage for themselves in mapping out the new districts. If a state losing seats has not done its redistricting by the next Congressional election, all its Congressmen must be elected "at large" and that could spell disaster for the political party in the minority during the Presidential election year.

RACE TAG ON BLOOD

For decades it has been an established scientific fact, known to every freshman student in biology, that human blood is all alike, from whatever race it comes. There are classifications for blood, according to "type" or the presence or absence of the RH factor, but the color of one's skin has nothing to do with such classifications. In the past the Red Cross, more for political than medical reasons, dutifully tagged blood according to race—white, Negro, Oriental or any other. Last week, however, the national board of governors, meeting in Chicago, finally moved to eliminate the racial designation of donors in the Red Cross blood collecting program.

For years a blood donor's race has been noted on his medical history card. Negro organizations have charged that it is a form of racial discrimination. The question even arose before
Government loyalty board during the hearing of Dorothy Bailey, whose case is now pending before the Supreme Court. Judge Henry Edgerton of the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in his dissent, cited the following colloquy between a member of the Regional Loyalty Board and Miss Bailey to show that some loyalty boards are not aware that unconventional views do not always indicate disloyalty: "Mr. Blair: Did you ever write a letter to the Red Cross about the segregation of blood? Miss Bailey: I do not recall. Mr. Blair: What was your personal position about that? Miss Bailey: Well, the medical ... Mr. Blair: I am asking yours. Miss Bailey: I have no personal opinion."

It is gratifying that the Red Cross has finally moved to help clear up the blood myth.

PHONE STRIKE ENDS

The 11-day-old telephone strike ended last week with satisfactory gains for the 33,000 telephone equipment workers involved. Seventeen thousand CIO Western Electric workers obtained average wage increases of 11.3 cents an hour. The union had asked for 15 cents an hour over the former basic scale of $1.55 and $1.62. In Detroit 16,000 other members of the Communications Workers of America settled their separate controversy with the Michigan Bell Telephone Company, with the company agreeing to a $3-a-week raise for workers earning $78 or more, $4 for those who earn $50-$77 and $3 for those making $49 or less.

Major victory for the unions was an agreement to shorten the duration of the new contract. Both Western Electric and Michigan Bell had at first insisted on a two-year contract allowing wage reopening only after 18 months. The final agreement reduced this provision to 15 months. In addition, the contract provides wage progression payments as employees accumulate service and periodic merit raises for workers on long employment records. The union announced that the contract is the biggest and best negotiated this year in the Bell system.

THE RELUCTANT BANKERS

The Federal Reserve Board has issued a stiff "last warning" to the banks to curb the present record volume of inflationary credit or take the consequences in the form of tighter Government controls. Mixing mild words with implied threats, FRB Chairman Thomas B. McCabe wrote the System's 7,000 banks that "the sacrifice of some bank earnings at this time is a small price to pay for curtailing inflation. So far Government authorities have relied on bankers' self-discipline, but the figures show that their resistance to the lure of quick profits has not been very high.

Apologists for the banks point out that while the volume of commercial credit has risen very sharply, the total amount of outstanding obligations has risen only $1.3 billion. This means that the banks have been heavily unloading their holdings of Government securities for inflation-feeding business loans.

Stressing that the "persistent and unprecedented rise in bank loans has been the major factor in the country's increasing money supply," McCabe has again called on the banks to cease undercutting the Government's attempts to stabilize the dollar.

LETTER FROM INDIA

NEW DELHI

On the crisp afternoon of November 11, India spread the regal red carpet at Palam Airport in New Delhi to receive His Nepalese Majesty. The King that stepped down was in commoner's clothes, a fugitive breathing free air for the first time in 45 years. On November 3, the Indian Ambassador in Kathmandu, Nepalese capital, had put in a telephone call to Prime Minister Nehru in Delhi. The next day the "Incarnation of Vishnu," accompanied by his family and a number of tiffin boxes filled with jewels, left his palace "prison," ostensibly for a picnic. As their route passed the Indian Embassy, the party in a split second was inside the gates. For the first time in history, a foreign embassy gave asylum to a king on his own soil.

The ruling Ranas of Nepal had mis-calculated. The repeated visits to Kathmandu by the American ambassador and the British High Commissioner from Delhi had left Maharaja Mohan Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana, the hereditary Prime Minister, with the belief that Nepal could go over India's head. But when the test came, the Rana found both those countries following India's lead. A stern note was dispatched from Delhi, demanding the safe passage of the King, or else . . . ! The King's departure for India was a signal for public mourning in Kathmandu, and popular revolt on the Indo-Nepalese border.

Still under the impact of events in Tibet, Delhi oscillated between a sense of danger and a sense of opportunity in the period of turmoil that followed. The troops of Red China are still 450 miles northeast of Simla across the snow-capped mountains. And now that the "roof of the world" has blown away, there is great anxiety to save the ceiling.

The interplay of six forces will decide the outcome:

First, the ruling Ranas. About a century ago, this clan, descendants of an Indian Rajput family, effected a successful coup. They turned the King into only a spiritual head, made him a palace prisoner and began a system of hereditary prime ministership by which the office passes to the younger brother from the elder one. The Ranas have provided most of the generals in Nepal—as numerous as Kentucky Colonels in America. By protecting and glorifying their own blood-purity, they have kept power away from the "native" Gurkhas.

The ruling Ranas have been traditional friends of India, marrying among the Rajput families of this country. At present, they are estranged because their fugitive King has been given asylum and India has refused to recognize the "boy king" they have put on the throne in his place. But the Ranas are bound to be even less friendly to an eventually Red Tibet and an already Red China, so a compromise with India is not out of the question.

Second, the Dissident Ranas. Victims of periodic coups, palace revolutions and family feuds, these and their descendants live in India, where they have property worth one billion rupees. These "half-
castes" are the financial mainstay of the current revolt.

Third, His Majesty the King. A descendant of another Indian Rajput clan named "Shah," he is grateful for India's support, and prefers to be a "Constitutional head" to an "imprisoned head."

Fourth, the Nepali Congress. A composite body of Nepali democrats, disillusioned Gurkha soldiers, neo-Communist agitators, dissident Ranas and Indian sympathisers, this group operates from a base in India along the lines once followed by the Indian National Congress. They hope that India will back them to the full. The Delhi authorities dashed those hopes somewhat by confiscating 3,500,000 rupees their President was bringing to the fugitive King.

Fifth, the Gurkha troops. The loyalty of these renowned fighters with their famed Kukris holds the balance. Their oath of allegiance is to the King, but their bread and butter come from the ruling Ranas. The Gurkha troops form not too negligible a part of the Indian Army and of the British Army in Asia. However, the 100 percent Hindu Nepal has flatly refused Pakistan any troops.

Sixth, the Indian attitude. Even though still neutral between the Eastern and the Western blocs, India is apprehensive about Communist infiltration in and around the sub-continent. Only a stable regime in Nepal can give liberal-democratic India a stable buffer. The strong autocracy of the Ranas would make the people amenable to Communist appeals. On the other hand, it would take time for a Gurkha democracy to put down firm roots in that rocky soil—and this is the moment in Kathmandu!

Both sides have appealed to India, and possible compromises are in the Delhi air. Some of the alternatives are: an invitation to the Indian Army to stabilize the situation; the return of the King with enhanced powers, with India helping to frame a more democratic constitution and supervising its implementation; "accession" to India—in regard to the neighboring kingdoms of Bhutan and Sikkim, and a sharing of defense, communications and foreign policy.

Outside reactions to events in Nepal have underlined the trend toward greater cooperation between India, America and Britain that started with Korea. The "faithlessness" of Red China with respect to Tibet rankles in Delhi's bosom, and India is fast losing its color-blindness, fostered by centuries of friendship, and is beginning to see red for the yellow. For the first time in 2,000 years, India is facing the prospect of China as a rival, and as a result Delhi is on the eve of a re-orientation of its "external affairs."

K. L. SHRIPDHARANI

**OUTSIDE AMERICA**

**Europe lost the American elections.**

And for the European Left it was more than merely a defeat—the results of the voting, especially in terms of the makeup of the Senate, contain the makings of disaster.

"Setback for Europe," the title of Charles Ronson's editorial in the Paris Free Times, one of the best anti-Communist Left dailies on the continent, gives the keynote of editorial comment both in France and Britain, and in Right and Center as well as Left publications. He wrote:

"Let's not hesitate to face the fact: Europe's freedom of opinion and social democracy have suffered a crushing defeat. For with Robert Taft, champion of isolationism and anti-laborism, the two real winners—though they were not candidates—were McCarthy and MacArthur. It would be difficult and premature to predict the repercussions of the disasters (which may result from the election in domestic policy) on American policy in the world, that is on the future of peace. But the elections provide a lesson equally valid for the democratic parties of Europe... Truman might not have avoided political defeat if he had disavowed the "Caesar of the Pacific" by acts, if he had fought politically for Europe, if he had exposed the hysteric and witch-hunters to public contempt, and if he had proudly waved the Fair Deal banner; but he would surely have won morally a contest which he must now try to re-win.

The Paris Combat wrote...
EXCESS PROFITS TAX—PROS AND CONS

Only a few short weeks ago, an excess profits tax seemed almost certain of passage when Congress reconvened after its election recess. Today, the prospects for enactment of an excess profits tax, whether in this Congress or the new one, seem doubtful indeed. This change in outlook is due to more than the election results. It is due in large part to the extremely effective criticism which has been advanced, not only by conservative businessmen, but also by business moderates like the Committee for Economic Development, and outstanding economists like Sumner Slichter and Arthur Davies. The caliber of this opposition and the apparent logic and cogency of their arguments certainly warrant a reconsideration of the entire question.

Let us start out by recognizing that most businessmen do not dispute the necessity for higher taxes on corporate profits. No responsible business spokesman has taken such an untenable position. There is general recognition that the Government’s prospective deficit in fiscal 1952 (beginning July 1, 1951) will be in the range of $10-15 billion, depending chiefly on the rate of acceleration of military expenditures. Further, there is general agreement that since we face continued high level military outlays for years ahead, we must come as close as we possibly can to paying for them out of taxes as we go, if inflation and an unmanageable public debt are to be avoided. Enlightened businessmen recognize that a large part of the added tax burden will have to be borne by corporate enterprise, by virtue both of equity and ability to pay.

The issue, therefore, is not one of choice between an excess profits tax on corporations on the one hand and higher taxes on other segments of the economy (higher individual income taxes, manufacturers’ excise taxes, retail sales taxes) on the other. It is rather a question of how much more revenue should be raised by new taxes on corporate profits and what form these higher taxes on corporations should take. No matter what decision is made with respect to corporate profits, we shall have to impose new or larger taxes in other fields before very long.

How much more revenue should be derived from additional taxes on corporate profits? It would be less difficult to answer this question if we knew more about the course of defense expenditures in the next 12 to 18 months.

One needs only to examine the figures (See Table on page 12.) to see that corporate enterprise is capable of contributing substantially to the rapidly mounting costs of defense without serious hardship. The postwar period has been one of unparalleled prosperity for America’s corporations. By whatever criterion one chooses—profits before taxes, profits after taxes, dividends paid to stockholders, profits retained in the business or profits after taxes as a percentage of net worth—the figures are truly amazing. Profits at the present time fully justify the adjectives which have been used in recent weeks by business journals—“astronomical” and “out-of-this-world.”

One can best judge the overall effect which various proposals for increasing tax revenues from corporate profits would have by projecting the 1951 situation. It is estimated that in 1951 corporations will earn some $45 billion before taxes—a new record. At present tax rates—45 percent—some $20 billion would be taken in taxes, and profits after taxes would be approximately $25 billion. The Committee for Economic Development’s proposal to take an additional $3 billion in taxes would leave corporations with some $22 billion after taxes—about $1 billion in excess of the previous historical high attained in 1948. The Administration’s proposal to take an additional $4 billion would leave them with some $21 billion—just about equal to the previous historical high. The AFL’s proposal to take some $5 to $6 billion would leave corporations with $19 to $20 billion, and the CIO’s proposal to take some $6 to $7 billion would leave them with $18 to $19 billion—levels which may still be regarded as handsome in relation to previous experience and returns on investment.

In aggregate terms, American corporations could certainly pay an additional $6 to $7 billion without experiencing any real hardship. Within that aggregate, however, a great many corporations could suffer very real hardships indeed, depending on the kind and degree of the taxes imposed. It is precisely this question which is basically at issue in the current debate about the excess profits tax, as we see if we let the supporters and the opponents of the excess profits tax state the pros and cons in their own terms.

The Equity Argument

Pro: Under an excess profits tax, by far the largest share of additional taxes paid will come from the rela...
tively small number of corporations whose earnings have increased as a result of the defense effort. Most corporations will not be required to pay more taxes than they are paying now. By taxing away that part of corporate profits which is in excess of "normal," we shall be taxing in accordance with ability to pay, and we shall eliminate profiteering on the national emergency.

Cor: No formula or base period can be devised which will affect all corporations equitably. An excess profits tax will be particularly inequitable in its effect on new corporations which lack a base period of previous earnings; on companies which had depressed earnings during the assigned base period; on young and growing companies whose earnings were bound to expand in the absence of defense expenditures. Moreover, no one formula can apply equitably to corporations in different industries, different companies within the same industry, large and small companies. Finally, excess profits can best be recaptured by renegotiation of defense contracts, rather than by an excess profits tax.

Rebuttal: No tax can do more than rough justice. Most of the difficulties cited can be mitigated in whole or in large part by appropriate provisions in the law. So far as renegotiation is concerned, that process cannot recapture excess profits earned indirectly from the defense effort.

The Inflation Argument

Pro: An excess profits tax would be anti-inflationary, because when corporations know that they will be able to retain only a small part of the additional profits they might get by raising prices, the incentive to raise prices is considerably dampened.

Con: An excess profits tax is inflationary, because when virtually confiscatory taxes are imposed on profits in excess of a given amount, corporations are encouraged to spend money wastefully and extravagantly on such items as advertising, entertaining, travel, etc. They also lose interest in improving production techniques and reducing costs. Their resistance to higher wages is also weakened. All these effects are highly inflationary.

Rebuttal: The "confiscatory" nature of the excess profits tax is reduced by lowering the effective rate to a reasonable level like 75 percent. The extravagence argument has been considerably overdone. Corporations know they inevitably face the day when the emergency will be gone, and they will have to meet tough competition again. They simply cannot afford to fall into sloppy production techniques and permit costs to inflate. Corporations never raise wages unless they have to. Provision should be written into the law disallowing abnormally high outlays for certain categories of costs which lend themselves to such corporate abuse.

The Investment Argument

Pro: Corporations will have less money and less incentive to invest in plant and equipment for the production of luxury and non-essential goods, thus conserving scarce materials, manpower and facilities for the defense effort.

---

SELECTED DATA ON CORPORATE PROFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Profits Before Taxes</th>
<th>Profits After Taxes</th>
<th>Dividends Paid</th>
<th>Undivided Profits</th>
<th>Profits After Tax as Percent of Net Worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated.
*Annual Rate. Third Quarter Estimated.
Con: The tax would destroy the incentive and the ability of corporations to invest in plant and equipment for the expansion of production in precisely those industries where such incentive and ability are most needed. Profits tend to be highest where goods are in short supply, and prices rise in response to shortages. It is these very industries which would be hit hardest by an excess profits tax. While the profit motive cannot be permitted to guide expansion of industry in wartime, what we face is perhaps a very long period of partial mobilization, and normal economic incentives will work best in such a period.

Rebuttal: Adequate incentive to expand plant and equipment where necessary will be provided through accelerated amortization, as was done during the last war. Expansion loans can be extended by the Government, if necessary. The excess profits tax did not stifle the incentive or the ability of industry to expand during the last war and will not do so now.

The Administration Difficulty Argument

Pro: In order to raise large sums of money, you've got to go where the money is. The corporations, particularly those whose earnings have risen tremendously since Korea, have got it.

Con: An excess profits tax would be almost impossible to administer. Thousands of corporations will appeal for relief on the grounds of inequity or hardship. No administrative set-up can be devised that can settle these cases both equitably and promptly. Even today, five years after the termination of the last excess profits law, there are still 2,700 cases pending involving a far larger number of claims.

The Political Argument

Pro: Workers, consumers, "little" people generally, have identified the excess profits tax with the elimination of profiteering and a just sharing of the rearmament burden. Their morale will be adversely affected if such a tax is not enacted.

Con: The excess profits tax is just another "soak-the-rich" proposition which panders to popular ignorance and prejudice and is politically motivated.

The Alternative Tax Argument

Pro: In preference to an excess profits tax, we should impose a higher flat rate on all corporations. A defense surtax should be added to the current normal and surtax rate of 45 percent, bringing the total rate paid by all corporations to 50 or more percent. A rate of 57 percent, it is estimated, would raise an additional $4 billion, which is the amount the Administration proposes to raise by an excess profits rate of 75 percent on earnings in excess of 75 percent of those averaged in any three years of the 1946-49 period.

Con: A higher flat rate on all corporations would be decidedly unfair to the great majority of corporations which will not enjoy increased profits, or even as large profits during the defense period as they did before the emergency. Whereas an excess profits tax might work an inequity on a relatively small number of corporations which could apply for and obtain relief, a higher flat rate would impose inequities on most corporations which could not be ameliorated.

How are these arguments to be evaluated? To what conclusions do they lead? Obviously, the case is not a clear-cut or one-sided one. It is an issue which must be decided on balance, on the side that has the most weight. On balance, the argument favors the excess profits tax. Much of the criticism advanced today is pertinent to the excess profits tax of World War II. We need not, however, think of the tax in those terms exclusively. The experience gained—indeed, the very criticisms which are now offered in opposition to an excess profits tax—make it impossible to write a much better law than we wrote last time.

The recommendations submitted by the Treasury have already made considerable inroads in this direction. The recent hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee should result in even more.

The Treasury recommendations for a base period of 75 percent of the average earnings of any three years during the 1946-49 period, with an alternative base of about 10, 8 and 6 percent on invested capital (depending on the size of the corporation), should make the tax tolerable for most corporations. Further, the Treasury's recommendations with respect to minimum credits and allowances for borrowed capital, new capital and "growth" corporations should go a long way toward minimizing or eliminating the inequities which might otherwise be involved for many corporations. We might go beyond the Treasury's recommendations and consider whether new corporations, or new enterprises of established corporations, should not be exempted from the excess profits rate on their earnings. We might consider, too, whether additional credits against the excess profits tax rate should not be granted in certain industries on behalf of profits reinvested in plant and equipment (in such an event, of course, presently-planned accelerated amortization would have to be reconsidered too).

The current debate should be evaluated, not in terms of the excess profits tax we had during the last war, but in terms of an improved excess profits tax we are undoubtedly able to formulate now. Considered in these terms, a good deal of the cogency of the opposition's argument vanishes, and the case for an excess profits tax becomes relatively clear.
WHY ASIA FEARS THE WEST

The revolution that is tormenting Asia was aimed at economic misery and foreign rule. Today these two aspects of the revolution are in conflict with each other. Formerly, economic misery was blamed on the imperialist power, national independence would end it once and for all. Now, increasing misery is the responsibility of the new governments of Asia. They must turn to the imperialists for aid.

The need for aid starts with technical assistance to maintain the services established in colonial days, and to do all that the colonial powers failed to do. Health is only one problem. The health needs of the Asian village are analyzed in a recent survey by a private agency, the Cornell Health and Agriculture Service.

"Various doctors advised that the death rate for children was very high due in large part to malaria, infant diarrhea, typhoid and many other infections. Some of these infections are spread by the common housefly. In many villages visited it was noted that most of the children who were too small to fan off the flies had flies gathered on their faces and bodies, especially on areamos, where open sores appeared. One particularly significant aspect was the presence of flies crawling on nursing mothers and their infants during feeding."

"Flies were found to breed in the manure piles in the stables, in the human feces scattered throughout the villages and in the pads of manure which were being dried to be used as fuel."

This survey happens to describe conditions in Iran. But the same words would describe any one of four million villages throughout Asia and in all the underdeveloped areas where technical assistance is urgently needed today.

Asia's second need is for short-range economic aid, to start rehabilitation in war-torn areas, and to combat inflation. The most dangerous aspect of inflation is rising food prices. The immediate cause of rising food prices is speculation and hoarding. A million tons of rice and grain, held in warehouses throughout the region, and released by governments whenever speculation develops, would lower food prices and help to bring inflation under control.

"Asia's third need is for capital. She needs equipment to raise industrial production. She needs raw materials for use in plants now idle, or restricted to one shift, because of shortages caused by lack of foreign exchange. She needs consumers' goods to permit a diversion of domestic manpower to the expansion of industrial capacity without further reducing living standards. The need is urgent. "The economic situation in Southeast Asia," according to an Indian economist, N. V. Sovani, "has become so acute that without a bold and drastic attack on the situation there is almost a certainty that the whole area will go the way of China."

This bold attack must be led by the peoples of Asia. But it may never develop without the stimulus of foreign aid. Diplomats, civil servants, industrialists and labor leaders in Asia all insist, in public or in private, that foreign aid is necessary. Our Government agrees.

The Gray Report estimates that Western rearmament will substantially aid the economies of Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Ceylon. But it adds that India cannot survive without aid. Gray concludes that about $1.3 billion in loans and grants is needed each year for the underdeveloped areas. India alone needs $200 million a year for five years to maintain minimum safe standards of living.

Private enterprise is not going to invest one-tenth of these sums overseas when the average rate of profit is 15 percent at home. And it is not welcome. Asians are suspicious of private investment, fearing that it will strengthen the political power of their own irresponsible capitalists, and wanting to strengthen their own struggling governments instead. The solution they seek, as Sovani states, is "the reorientation of the Point Four program along the lines of the Marshall Plan."

Yet foreign aid means foreign interference. Technical assistance at once raises explosive religious, social and political issues. Short-range aid involves the West in domestic programs to combat inflation. Above all a Marshall Plan means a clear diminution of sovereignty. Courageous men in Asia understand this. Sovani adds, "In some respects the Plan will have to go much further than the Marshall Plan. It will be imperative for the US to give the capital equipment and the technical personnel, to provide the consumers' goods to ease the strain of absorption, to plan the program more directly than in Europe and to take a more active part in the actual execution of plans."

In addition, economic aid can succeed only if it is preceded by political and military settlements and by social reforms. The US, for example, is certainly not going to give up needed supplies to finance either a trade
war or a military conflict between India and Pakistan. Sovani concedes that in South Asia a wild arms race, and a drive to develop competitive light industries is forcing economic nationalism and a diversion of needed resources. He concludes that: “The US will have to combat these tendencies by a guarantee against mutual and outside aggression... A regional pact regarding the treatment of minorities will also help to ease growing tensions in these plural societies.”

For these reasons, revolt against misery in Asia ends in reliance on foreign governments for aid. There it clashes with the revolt against foreign rule. For this revolt is still boiling in Asia.

It may not express itself in open resentment of the former colonial powers. In fact in India, Pakistan and Ceylon there is a kind of patronizing sympathy for Great Britain as America’s newest colonial possession. There is no widespread hatred of Americans comparable to the feelings stirred up by Communists in industrial France and Northern Italy. But there are tensions that place limits on the help that Asians are willing to accept, even if aid is available.

These tensions cannot be overcome until they are understood. And mutual understanding, is hard to achieve. Subject peoples are trained to conceal their true feelings. And we are not famous for patience and discernment. An American accused of every crass and wicked motive tends to be so hurt and outraged by these charges that he fails to search for the true feelings that they serve to conceal.

I was helped, in Delhi, when after weeks spent with high-minded intellectuals I was visited by two reporters from a small Hindustani paper. I complained to them about Nehru’s sanctimonious attitude on Korea. They quickly interrupted me.

“You must never pay too much attention to what our leaders say,” they insisted. “You must ask why they say it.”

“Our leaders may express their own convictions,” they added. “But their words are significant only because they correspond to our unspoken desires. On Korea our leaders elevate to terms of morality and principle our sympathy for the North Koreans, our fear of becoming involved on your side, our belief that if Indian soldiers are to fight they should fight Pakistan.” They asked: “Is not your country the same at heart?”

For these reasons, an attempt to catalogue the underlying tensions between Asia and the West is a dangerous but worthwhile task. They seem to derive in part from the following fears, antipathies, misunderstandings and conflicts of interest.

The fear of loss of prestige. British Socialists after lifetimes spent in damning capitalism choke in defending capitalist America. Liberals in the US hate to admit that they flirted with Communism too long. In the same way the inertia of the national revolution in Asia is still strong. Men who rose to power by arousing ardent nationalism find it humiliating to admit that independence solves few problems, and to plead for aid from nations they thrust aside.

The fear of loss of sovereignty. National sovereignty, for most of Asia, is five years old or less. Naturally it is guarded with passion against all encroachments. No colonial power can regain politically the power that Asia has won by political action. But Asians fear that economic control may transfer to America the dominating role that the colonial powers lost.

Political leaders, in search of issues, work naturally on these fears, although at the same time they welcome pressures if they are applied on the right side. An example at Lucknow was the outspoken and engaging secretary of the Indian Socialist Party. By night he warned mass meetings to guard against the twin evils of Soviet and US imperialism. By day he insisted that US aid should be given to India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon but only on condition that they form a South Asian federation with free trade and a single armed force.

The fear of foreign involvement. The conflicts within Asia are more bitter than those between Asia and the USSR. The domestic problems of Asian governments are overwhelming. They are hard pressed in peace time. They know that like Nationalist China they will be destroyed by involvement in a Third World War. They can contribute little in wartime. They intend to keep out of the world war they see approaching. They believe, with good reason, that the West sees them as pawns rather than peoples, and is concerned not with their welfare but with their contribution to the welfare of the West. The Western nations may protest that the struggle against Communism is world-wide. The nations of Asia are unmoved. They are not anti-Communist. They are not finally committed, for democracy or against the police state. And lacking modern armies and stable economies they are certainly not going to provoke the USSR. They have not experienced direct pressures from the USSR. They have been subjected to direct pressures from the West. Those are the pressures they recognize and resist. Beyond these fears there are several sources of antipathy.

Psychological antipathy. The basis of nationalism is pride. In newly-formed nations pride is inflamed. Nothing wounds national pride more than to depend on the charity of another nation. For that reason anti-American feeling was strong in Britain in 1946. For
the same reason Asians resent having to lean on the US today. They prefer to believe that we are selfish and ruthless rather than to admit that they depend on our generosity and goodwill.

Economic antipathy. All those who thrive on superstition and misery in Asia fear the intrusion of a nation committed to science and modern technology. And with some reason. When the gears of a high speed industrial machine are meshed with those of a slowly turning economy the results are bound to be painful. For example, we assume that technical assistance is welcomed in Asia. On the contrary the Indonesians do not want it on the terms that it is offered. A press made for Detroit is useless in Malaya. In Pakistan and India wells are infested and roads are worn down, yet there is a high unemployment rate among graduates of MIT.

In addition, the tensions between have and have-nots are bitter and cause resentment of the US. In contrast Asians sympathize with Russia as a have-not nation.

Racial antipathy. Resentment against attitudes of white superiority is a natural and bitter feeling in Asia, perpetuated by the treatment of Indians and Moslems in Africa, and by continued prejudices of Westerners in Asia. It is not openly discussed. But every attack on the status of the Negro in America is fully reported throughout the press of Asia. Partly the emphasis on discrimination overseas represents a transfer of guilt. "Indignation at South Africa's policy of apartheid," as an article in the Indian magazine Thought declared, "has always been keenest with us than any concern at the age-old and continuing practice of untouchability in our own midst."

Cultural antipathy. The traditional line drawn between the mysticism of Asia and the materialism of the West is misleading. "The East in its great beginnings in India and China," as the Eastern Economist argues, "was scientific and rational; the West taking its religions from the East, was mystical and religious even in the thrones of the Renaissance." The US is an individualist rather than a materialist nation today, and the crying need of Asia is for a rise in material standards.

At the same time there are deepseated sources of cultural antipathy between Asia and the US. Nehru certainly feels that American culture is shallow, mechanistic and mass-produced. He distrusts a society in which the man of learning is held in such contempt, and the man of wealth can purchase political power with so much ease. He senses that Americans lack subtlety and the wisdom to handle the immense power thrust upon them.

The man of peace is still the great man of Asia. The way to peace is conciliation and deals made behind the scenes. Asians fear our apparent willingness to accept a Third World War. Above all they fear our methods of waging war. Survival has been the first objective of the individual in Asia. As long as the common man could shut himself in his house through wars and revolutions, it did not greatly matter which side in a succession of foreign and domestic tyrants oppressed him. The B29, blasting away the house itself, has given him a new sense of insecurity. The Communists, of course, have squeezed the last drop of political benefit from their mechanical inability to match the strategic air power of the West, and its atom bomb.

Beyond these antipathies are the misunderstandings concerning the West, and above all, the US. There is the quaint notion of the US hanging suspended in the 19th century, with Adam Smith in one hand and Herbert Spencer in the other, seeking to convert the world to laissez-faire capitalism. There is the ugly notion of the US as a country thirsting for war. There are three persistent illusions that lead Asians to believe that US aid can be taken for granted and public opinion in the West safely ignored.

The first illusion is sired by Marxism and teaches that since capitalist nations are bedevilled by falling profits, idle capacity and mass unemployment, they must export their capital to foreign nations gracious enough, or fool-hardy enough, to accept it.

The second illusion is sired by Hollywood, and teaches that the US is a huge storehouse of unlimited wealth where at the twist of a spigot goods pour out in such profusion that the most miserly nation would not begrudge giving peoples overseas all that they need.

The third illusion is sired by our Government and our press. It teaches Asia that the US is gripped by such an unreasoning hysteria that if any nation conjures up an apparition of Communism we shall insist that it accept a blank check on our limitless account.

There are other illusions in Asia that create dangerous optimism and destructive fear, just as false complacency is created in America by Asian diplomats who draw a Fiesanes veil across the crying needs of their peoples. Beyond these misunderstandings are genuine conflicts of interest between Asia and the West. They have been significant. Efforts to organize Asian neutrality, to keep the UN as an organization to which neutrals can safely belong by restricting its anti-aggression role, and to play balance-of-power politics by backing Communism as the weaker side in the world struggle, have run counter to legitimate Western aims. Now as Soviet pressures bear down on Asia the values that we share become far more important than the conflicts and fears that divide us. Our deepest antagonisms must become superficial in comparison to the overriding determination of all independent peoples not to be crushed in the Soviet mill.
A Pardon for Dewey

Anticipating that, sooner or later, the proper New York official will remember his oath of office and proceed against Candidate Dewey for his promise of a state job during the recent campaign to Lieutenant Governor Hanley, it is suggested that Governor Dewey grant an ant­icipatory pardon to Candidate Dewey. It might make it possible for Governor Dewey to take the oath to enforce the laws again with a clearer conscience. It will be remembered that Dewey sought to persuade the voters of New York that Hanley voluntarily led the drive organized by certain financial interests of Wall Street to "draft" Dewey to run again for Governor, while he took the chance of running for Senator against Herbert Lehman.

I wonder whether Governor Dewey thinks that a man who has committed a crime against the public interest should be prosecuted regardless of his rank? Or is it his view that, while lesser personages should be rigorously prosecuted for violating a law, the Governor of New York is immune? If a man can violate the law with impunity, then it would seem that we are not a Government of laws but one of men. The immunity thus far enjoyed by Candidate Dewey from Governor Dewey so far as the Hanley letter is concerned would seem to indicate that the Government of New York State is a one-man Government.

When confronted during the campaign with his moral lapse, this man, who apparently thinks that laws are made for others but not for himself, was clearly caught off guard. His stammering and evasive "explanation" explained nothing, except that even the self-confident Governor of New York, on occasion, can stammer and be evasive.

I carefully read the New York papers at the time of this episode and on through election day. I have yet to see any, even a weak, denial on the part of any of Dewey's supporters that the Hanley letter exposing the Dewey bribe was not true. Even the great and undeserved victory won by Dewey did not serve to cover this stain upon the escutcheon of the titular national leader of his party.

But indefensible as was this offer of a price to Hanley to withdraw as a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor, it was an act of civic virtue as compared with the behavior of certain newspapers in New York City that in times past have fought for political decency.

Excepting only the New York Post and Compass, every newspaper published in greater New York at-
A DOSSIER ON THE FBI: 1908 - 1950

by Alan Barth

It says a good deal about the current climate of opinion that one is tempted to praise Max Lowenthal's courage in writing a sober indictment of the FBI and to wonder at the hardihood of William Sloane Associates in publishing it. Anyone may disparage other agencies of the Government, the Department of State for example, and be hailed as a patriot for doing so. But the most significant fact about the FBI today is that disparagement of it is likely to be equated with disloyalty.

J. Edgar Hoover has long had the habit, as Mr. Lowenthal demonstrates, of answering criticism by impugning the character or motives of his critics. Thus, when a Detroit lawyer complained to the Senate Judiciary Committee about the treatment of his clients in the alien-deportation raids of 1920, Hoover promptly replied: "He is regarded as a Bolshevik leader. . . . His associates are persons who are active in radical circles." When the Bureau came under fire in 1940, its director told a radio audience that "Your FBI is respected throughout the world. . . ." His rejoinder to recent complaints that the FBI had tapped telephone wires illegally in the Coplon case was: "Statements have been made which are so untrue and legally unsound he has kept it, apparently, free from criticism or motives of his critics. Thus, authorization had been expressly rejected by the 60th Congress. . . .

For all its effectiveness, Mr. Lowenthal's method has limitations. It hampers him in developing and clarifying some of the salient points in his indictment. The impact of his book may be immeasurably diminished also because of its unevaluated facts—which is to say a great variety of data and opinions expressed by others—and to let them speak for themselves. They serve his purpose devastatingly. By selective reference to debates in Congress, Congressional hearings, official reports and contemporary newspapers, he has compiled a history of the Bureau from its illegitimate birth—it was created in 1908 by Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte after a requested authorization had been expressly rejected by the 60th Congress. . . .

The most extensive and perhaps the most valuable portion of Mr. Lowenthal's book is its account of the alien-deportation raids of 1920. Aliens of all shades of opinion—and a number of citizens as well—were rounded up indiscriminately and treated with an extraordinary combination of stupidity and sadism. They were arrested in meeting halls—to which some of them had been led by undercover agents acting as agents provocateurs; they were routed out of bed in the early hours of the morning by officers who had no warrants to enter; they were held incommunicado; they were terrorized in many instances into signing confessions the meaning of which they did not understand. The evil genius behind this ugly episode in American history was Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer. But Mr. Lowenthal makes it plain that J. Edgar Hoover, then chief of the General Intelligence Division of the Bureau of Investigation, bore a heavy responsibility for the actual conduct of the raids—a responsibility he has repeatedly disclaimed in recent years.

The story of the 1920 hysteria is illuminating because it shows how readily overzealous officials can be led to ignore the laws, the procedures and the civil liberties they are entrusted to uphold. It is a disappointment that Mr. Lowenthal did not analyze current FBI activities with anything like the same thoroughness. The Bureau is different today, and so is the situation in which it operates.

The United States recovered its sanity and repented in the early 1920s—in large measure because members of the bar, many of them pillars of conservatism, spoke out in protest and acted to defend the traditions of their calling. The contemporary threats to freedom have evoked no comparable response.
I. Datory loyalty oaths for all lawyers. Mr. Lowenthal, himself a lawyer, has written a book which, as a challenge to authority, does honor to his profession.

The problem presented by the FBI stems not from the character or intentions of the agency and its director but from the activities it has been authorized to undertake by Congress and the President. When Harlan Stone became Attorney General in 1924, he reorganized the Bureau of Investigation, named Hoover its director and laid down this rule about its functions:

The Bureau of Investigation is not concerned with political or other opinions of individuals. It is concerned only with the conduct of persons, and then only with such conduct as is forbidden by the laws of the United States. When a police system passes beyond these limits, it is dangerous to the proper administration of justice and to human liberty, which it should be our first concern to cherish.

The Bureau had passed beyond these limits under Attorney General Palmer. It passed beyond them again in 1939 when President Roosevelt authorized it to investigate espionage, sabotage and subversive activities. It passed still farther beyond when it was instructed to investigate the loyalty of federal employees.

In the course of these activities, it compiled great numbers of secret dossiers on American citizens who were guilty of no criminal conduct. It resorted to methods such as wiretapping and the use of anonymous informers which did violence to settled American traditions and which had a profoundly inhibiting effect on many law-abiding persons. The anxiety now experienced by great numbers of loyal Americans—the fear that they are being spied upon or that their telephones are tapped or that the voluntary associations they join may be called subversive—has a stultifying effect, whether or not the anxiety is justified, on the operation of the democratic process. When men fear that they may be under surveillance because of opinions or associations which a police

authority declares subversive, the atmosphere of reason. The appropriate tribunal would be an independent commission of universally respected private citizens. There is urgent need for such a commission to make an impartial study of internal security needs and of the relationship between national security and individual freedom.

Allen Barish, a member of the editorial staff of the Washington "Post," is the author of "The Loyalty of Free Men," to be published by Viking in January.

THE PROBLEM BEFORE US, by John Dos Passos (Houghton Mifflin; $3.75).

The problem presented by the FBI was one of form. Mr. Lowenthal's indictment is much too impressive to be dismissed. It ought to be brought to trial. Congress is now too consumed politically to bear it in an atmosphere of reason. The appropriate tribunal would be an independent commission of universally respected private citizens. There is urgent need for such a commission to make an impartial study of internal security needs and of the relationship between national security and individual freedom.

In essence the book consists of a series of brief sketches of personalities, situations, events chosen to suggest the nature of the hierarchical world in which we live. The author casts himself in the role of a "lecturer" and equips himself with an audience, including a farmer, a manufacturer, a "laborer," whose speaking compels a sharpening and elaboration of the "lectures." Part I, "The Preparation of a New Society," discusses Great Britain of the blitz and the Labour Government: "Ordeal by Fire" and "Ordeal by Government.

The upshot seems to be that one set of bosses has been substituted for another. Part II, "Principles of Power," contains glimpses of South America, an area teetering between dictatorship and government by consent. In Part III, "Dedicated to a Proposition," the "lecturer" returns home and reports on farms in Iowa and two corporate organizations: a mill company and the Rubber Workers International. And here he argues the proposition that increased participation is the solution.

The grand architecture of social systems is kept in the background; the focus is individual, episodic, personal. Barrow boys in Golden Square sell peaches on the move. Stopping, they would require a license to set up a stall: "It's a case of regulations." The cooperative manager at Evesham is plagued by surpluses: "In London cauliflowers are a chilling and here we give them away." Dr. Penido is a Brazilian health officer in the Vale do Rio Noce, where "a privy was a monstrous novelty five
George Orwell's writing and character can be described by a somewhat overworked idea: he was extremely "Hamletish," not in the sense that he was a morbid brooder—he was never that—but in the deeper sense of being able to see both sides of many questions with equal and therefore puzzling sympathy. He was an essentially paradoxical man. He was a person who saw through prejudice, but was never rid of his own.

It is doubtful that the sketches add up to much that we did not know before. Yet the book has great merit and interest as a piece of perceptive reporting—a sort of a sociological travelogue in first-rate English—on the anxieties, beliefs and hopes of real people scattered over the Western world. We have no means of knowing whether Dos Passos' random test boxings give a valid general picture of the societies he inspected. His vague prescriptions are based on faith, a faith which this reviewer shares, yet nevertheless a faith: "We've got to invent new methods for the participation of more people in the apparatus of industrial society."

Dos Passos' uncertainties are his strength. Unhampered by ideological blinders or by dogma, he gropes to understand, and he believes a solution can be found, although its precise form cannot be discerned. "An entire science of human behavior" lies ahead. In that science we may find the tools with which to build out of our runaway institutions a society which will be tolerably stable because it will offer participation to each individual man." And Dos Passos writes his own review: "About all a moderately observant man of letters with a certain amount of experience in a somewhat special sort of journalism can do to add his nickel's worth to these solutions is to set forth what he has seen and what in his opinion it means."

V. O. Key Jr., author of "Southern Politics," is a professor of Government at Yale University.

**DEATH IN THE FAMILY**

*The Trouble of One House*, by Brendan Gill (Doubleday; $3).

In *The Trouble of One House*, Mr. Gill has cast a clear and wise eye on the interplay of emotions, the sudden twists and wild proliferations of cause and effect in family relationships. The central force in this group is Elizabeth Rowan, a young mother of three children who is dying of cancer. She is a woman with a boundless capacity for loving, an effulgence of generosity and happiness which casts its glow on everyone around her.

A lesser writer would make of such love a balm for all wounds; Mr. Gill is too knowing to take a view so simple and false. Instead, we see Elizabeth's husband shrinking from its smothering warmth; her barren sister is driven by envy of it into a frenzy of nasty little plots to gain an ultimate triumph over Elizabeth, the control of her house and children. On the other hand, Miss Gately, the nurse attending the dying woman, is enough moved by Elizabeth's quality to start divesting herself of her own icy armor.

There are others in the novel—the children, the doctors in attendance, the priests—who all reflect Elizabeth's spirit and react variously to it. But Mr. Gill's matter does not stop there. The chain of inter-reactions goes on and on and the links are a series of brilliant scenes.
of his children giggling uncontrollably as they view their dead mother, vents his misery and bewilderment on his little son.

Not a false note is struck in this mature and honest novel. Although the book is beautifully contrived, there is no creak of machinery. Each person, down to the wry, engaging little son, is vivid, complex and always understandably motivated, and the style is consistently quiet and subtle. 

Kate Simon

Kate Simon has worked for the Book-of-the-Month Club and the Limited Editions Club. She is now a free-lance reviewer.

For want of space...

The editors offer these notes to describe briefly current books that may be of interest to their readers.


The Pulitzer Prize foreign correspondent, political commentator and critic of recent American foreign policy offers his program for world peace under American leadership. A world federation, including the Russians or “containing” the Russians, is his proposal.


A “reader’s” test of The Iliad, re-translated into colloquial English and cut “in the interest of action.”


The “Prophet of Our Day” in a popular biography that stresses Wells’s gifts of foresight and the “lesson” he offers for the future.


An exhaustive description of the theory, curriculum and teaching methods that comprise the “Chicago idea.” By past and present faculty members of the College of the University of Chicago.

The Purse and the Sword, by Elias Huxley. Cornell; $4.50.

A specialized history of the past 17 years in US Government affairs. By showing how Congress appropriates funds for the Military Establishment the author illuminates two touchy subjects: the relation between legislative bodies and administrative agencies and the relation between civil authority and military power.

MUSIC: Bing Comes to Town

THE OPENING NIGHT performance of the Metropolitan Opera’s sixty-sixth season on November 6 aroused a public interest such as the old yellow-brick building at Broadway and Thirty-ninth Street had not witnessed in many years. No single seats were sold for the opening, but nearly 3,500 patrons bought tickets in a compulsory package deal that also included, at a $60 top, the subsequent first nights of “Die Fledermaus” and “Fidelio.” It was not the opera—Verdi’s stirring but relatively little-known “Don Carlo,” revived after 28 years—that attracted so extensive a public.

This was the first performance presented by Rudolf Bing, who took over as general manager when Edward Johnson retired last spring after 15 years of steadily diminishing artistic returns.

Bing had kept his promise to renovate the stage at the Metropolitan. When the curtain rose on the first scene, in the cloister of the Spanish monastery of St. Just, it was instantly apparent that a new era had begun. Soaring Gothic arches, planned to make use of the full dimensions of the stage rather than to fit in a baggage car on tour, dwarfed the human figures on the stage and symbolized the vast power of the Catholic Church and the Inquisition, with which the opera deals. The lighting, instead of pouring a fixed glare upon the upper reaches of the setting at the expense of the people on stage level, was expressively focused on the monk whose solo begins the piece. Most remarkable of all, the Metropolitan now has a spotlight capable of following key figures around the stage. With this production, it sloughed off 25 years of sterile tradition and proclaimed itself a modern theatre.

The felicitous settings for “Don Carlo” were designed by Rolf Gerard, a craftsman from the legitimate theatre whom Bing engaged because he admired his work for Katherine Cornell’s production of “That Lady,” a piece concerned, like “Don Carlo,” with the triangular intrigue of Philip II, his son Don Carlos, and Elizabeth of Valois. Gerard also designed the rich costumes, deriving his values and color harmonies from El Greco. The visual ensemble was as tasteful and imaginative as the best to be seen on Broadway, but on a scale few Broadway productions have achieved since the demolition of the Hippodrome.

Bing had also persuaded Margaret Webster to stage and direct “Don Carlo.” This was her first operatic direction, and she is said to have felt some uncertainty about her ability to live up to what was expected of her. Paradoxically, a kind of staging she has never undertaken before turns out to be the kind she can do best. In her Shakespeare productions she has often failed to get to the bottom of the motivation and relationships of the characters, and has tended to rest a large part of her case on her skill with pageantry. In an opera performance, the stage director’s task consists precisely in making the pageant look as handsome and as reasonable as possible. Fine details of characterization—except in the case of a few extraordinary operatic actors—are more to be found in the nuances of the performers’ singing than in their bodily movement. The operatic stage director has no control whatever over the way lines are delivered; this falls to the conductor and the composer. Consequently Miss Webster’s defect as a Shakespeare director becomes her virtue as an operatic director, and I do not think any rėgisseur in the world could improve materially upon her clean, spacious, natural deployment of the people on the stage.
Almost no critic, when speaking officially, has a good word to say of Edmond Rostand's "Cyrano de Bergerac." It is grossly improbable and emotionally absurd, a play for the groundlings that reeks of grease paint, stale dust and mice in the upholstery. But just because of that sharp, exciting aroma, no one with a love for the theatre can resist a capable performance of "Cyrano"; it is the most completely theatrical play in the standard repertory, and addicts return year after year to gorge themselves on its staginess.

You would expect, then, that a screen version of this gascogne would suffer in the translation to another medium, and the current Stanley Kramer production, dragged from its native element, gasps a bit for life. Nevertheless, José Ferrer, this generation's Cyrano, turns in a bravura, gas-lit performance, and it is just possible to imagine yourself into the right environment. How this "faithful" picture will appeal to an audience raised on movies and with no theatre memories to fall back on, I cannot say; such observers may find it tame and miss the excitement of Tyrone Power and Orson Welles.

As inevitably happens in a production of Rostand's drama, Ferrer is a one-man show. But even so, he could have been given more able support, particularly by Mala Powers, the Roxane of this revival. No one would call Rostand's heroine a rewarding part, for it is virtuoso fencing, deft, witty and seemingly dangerous. Yet, as though she were the most prodigious interpreter of Wagner, in both song and action, the Metropolitan has known since the retirement of Friedich Schorr.

And so, in his first two productions, Bing has in large measure fulfilled his promise. He has provided an audience with performances that are not only historically interesting but are also of lasting value to the Metropolitan. As the Board of Education would say, "It is just possible to imagine yourself into the right environment." But I would have had it otherwise. With Ferrer's nose, the world has lost a new Lilliputian through one transcendent experience. Cyrano's nose was certainly a misfortune, but only in the black comedy that Ferrer wears is so alarmingly unstable that it distracts attention from Cyrano's personality and dwarfs the humanity that he must at times convey. I would have had it about five centimeters shorter. On the other hand, I would not spare a foot of the sword play; it is virtuoso fencing, deft, witty and seemingly dangerous.

MOVIES: Holiday Build-up

It may be frivolous to say so, but I thought that Ferrer's nose was too large. As I observed a couple of weeks ago, the screen is a more intimate, though less immediate, medium than the stage, and details are easily overstated. Cyrano's nose was certainly a misfortune, but only in the black comedy that Ferrer wears is so alarmingly unstable that it distracts attention from Cyrano's personality and dwarfs the humanity that he must at times convey. I would have had it about five centimeters shorter. On the other hand, I would not spare a foot of the sword play; it is virtuoso fencing, deft, witty and seemingly dangerous.

J. B. Priestley, the cosmopolitanist, is one of the great puppeteers of our times. A man of unfailing compassion and sufficient ego, he puts his beloved Lilliputians through one transcendent experience after another for the good of their souls and the satisfaction of his sense of what is fitting. He pulls the strings with such jolly good fellowship, to say nothing of ingenuity and skill, that only a churl will complain that human beings don't really behave so neatly. Priestley's stories always spin well and they dispense a feeling of convivial love for humanity, like a warm drink on a damp day.

Thus it is with "Last Holiday," a new British import starring Alec Guinness and written by Mr. Priestley. George Bird, salesman of farm implements, is under sentence of death by his doctor. His life is spent in a hospital, though relieved of temporal worries and worldly scruples, is able to work con-
Guinness plays the part of a diffident man, growing in authority as he burns his inhibitions behind him, with ingratiating and modest humor. He is an actor who studies to make the "business" of acting amusing in itself, and this is fun to watch, particularly in farce, if you don't have to see it too often. As usual in British pictures, the incidental characterizations are cleverly worked out, attractive portraits being contributed by Beatrice Campbell, Kay Walsh, Muriel George, Sidney James and one or two others whose names mean nothing in this country. "Last Holiday" is full of "yes, but's" that may come back later to annoy you, but they won't spoil your pleasure while the yarn is unreeling.

The two new French pictures might get by all right in a neighborhood theater in Paris, but you expect something more of films that have been carted all the way across the ocean.

"L'Affaire," starring Claude Dauphin and Anne Vernon, may be taken as a terrible warning to busy husbands. It concerns a seduction that comes so close to succeeding as makes only a technical difference and it is played out with the suave sensuality that is called "Continental" by people who live elsewhere. The principal actors are adept at that game: M. Dauphin, cast as a raviolii pianist, is an authentic boulevard specimen, and Mlle. Vernon, beautiful herself and beautifully turned out for the play, makes this travesty of a farce worth looking at in snatches. But the story is too thin to support even this couple's graceful frivolities.

Julien Duvivier's "The Sinners" is scarcely trivial but it is a surprisingly confused picture to have been written and directed by so estimable a craftsman. The action takes place in a girl's reformatory, the inmates of which are shockingly young for their prevailing offense. They are a racy crowd, good-humored in their shamelessness.
... about almost everything these days—about ballets and ballots, fiction and fission, prima donnas and presidents. We at the New Republic regard this as a healthy state of affairs. We've always dared to differ—violently at times—and to fight with courage and conviction for liberal ideas and ideals, even in the face of hostile reaction and inaction.

If you believe in this sort of honest, hard-hitting journalism, why not share the "New Republic" with your friends this Christmas.

- A gift subscription to NR is a regular reminder of your thoughtfulness ... gives your friends the same satisfaction and enlightenment that you get from your weekly reading of the New Republic.
- A gift subscription to NR is easy on your gift budget—thanks to special, money-saving Christmas rates.
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"Having the New Republic has made me feel that I'm part of the Washington scene, and has given me a real understanding of national and world events..." Mr. M.L.F., Chicago, Illinois
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Bill me later
TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Portland
SUBJECT: EDITORIAL
OREGON STATESMAN
SALEM, OREGON

DATE: December 13, 1950

AIR MAIL SPECIAL DELIVERY

Transmitted herewith is an editorial which appeared in the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oregon, on December 9, 1950.

I am advised that this editorial was written by Mr. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, Editor and Publisher of this paper. It is noted that this editorial deals with the book written by MAX LOWENTHAL concerning the FBI and that the editorial is complimentary to the Bureau.

For the Bureau's information, Mr. SPRAGUE is a former Governor of the State of Oregon and is now a member of the Northwest Regional Loyalty Board. He is friendly to the Bureau, and it is suggested that the Bureau might desire to write him a letter of appreciation.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
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Lowenthal and the FBI

Judging by the speeches and reprintied editorials in the Congressional Record the book by Max Lowenthal on the FBI has stirred up a hornet's nest. Our here we have heard little about it. In Washington senators and congressmen have leaped on Lowenthal with fury, and the Times-Herald and News have risen to the staunch defense of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. The book gets more attention in Maine Lowenthal is one of the few described as mentor to President Truman in Jonathan Daniels' new book, "The Man from Independence." Lowenthal sort of book Truman in hand and led him to the confines in Justice Department a bonus, which, in Daniels' estimation have Truman indoctrination in the Frankfurter brand of liberalism.

Some of the congressmen call Lowenthal a communist or at least a radical, and they denounce him in their defense of the FBI. Perhaps the most telling quote is from Morris Frank, New York lawyer famed as a defender of civil liberties who praises the FBI under Hoover.

The gist of Lowenthal's book is that the FBI is getting to be an OGPU or NKVD. Not. I read it we cannot comment directly on it. But our impression is that the FBI has become one of the odd modes of government. We do not pretend to render a complete loyalty data when it comes for the board. It doesn't want to be a public record. All the facts may have been gathered, but it has acted with great care will take no action. In a conference in the FBI headquarters but also as a civil responsibility in a...
Honorable Charles A. Sprague
President and Publisher
Oregon Statesman
Salem, Oregon

My dear Mr. Sprague:

Your interesting editorial entitled "Loewenthal and the FBI" which appeared in the Oregon Statesman on December 9, 1950, has come to my attention and I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your commendatory remarks concerning the FBI. I deeply appreciate the forthright and effective manner in which you have presented this matter to your readers.

On behalf of my associates and myself, may I extend the Season's Greetings and express our sincere good wishes for your happiness in the New Year.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
TO : Director, PHI
FROM : SAC, Birmingham
SUBJECT : NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL

I am enclosing herewith an editorial from the Birmingham Post
issue of Saturday, December 2, 1950. The Editor is Mr. JAMES E. MILLS.

MAX I. NENTHAL
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Unfair Book About G-Men

Mrs. Lownthial has written "The Federal
Service of Investigation," a book that attracted more
attention than, in our opinion, it deserves.

It is primarily a voluminous compilation
of all the criticisms publicly uttered against
the FBI since its creation, with no balancing
evaluation of the criticism, and with bias
and unfairness given to the FBI and its
members as if they were criminals.

Well-written, from the same source as the
Lownthial quotes is critical.

For instance, the book includes numerous
quotes from officials in the FBI, and
particularly from J. Edgar Hoover. Yet our
affidavit recollection is that J. Edgar
Hoover has always been a fair and
frank critic of those officials who have
given the other government agency or an
organization.

Altogether, it seems the FBI's good
name is not well served by the book. No
good reason that the confidence of all well
earned.

Mrs. Lownthial is a brilliant girl.

New York lawyer who has become
a Washington man has never made any
testimony about the matter.

Mr. Lownthial, and the name of
only those who work in the

One item of news interest is the

Mr. Lownthial's confirmation of the

From the paper's editorial section:

The FBI has been appointed head of the

The book does not reflect any credit on

On the contrary, it reflects no discredit on

The book can be dismissed as something

It is well known that the CIA was

The book is not a defense of the

The book is a mixture of

The book is an interpretation of

BIRMINGHAM POST-HERALD
BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA
DECEMBER 2, 1950
JAMES E. MILLS, EDITOR
Mr. James L. Miles
Editor
Birmingham Post-Herald
Birmingham, Alabama

Dear Mr. Miles:

I have read with great interest your excellent editorial entitled "Unfair Book About G-Men" which appeared in the December 2, 1950, issue of the Birmingham Post-Herald. I deeply appreciate your commendatory remarks concerning my associates and me in the work we are doing.

It is most reassuring to know that we have a friend such as you who has brought to the attention of your readers the truth about a book of this nature. I hope we will continue to perform our duties so as to merit the support and confidence of all law-abiding, loyal American citizens.

Sincerely yours,
J. Edgar Hoover

cc - Birmingham
ATTENTION SAC: Bureau 12-650

December 12, 1950
TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Miami
SUBJECT: Favorable Editorial
"Smearing A Success"
Prepared by Edwin D. Lambright
Editorial Director
Tampa Morning Tribune
Tampa, Florida
December 18, 1950

Enclosed is a copy of a very favorable editorial.
HAS been the universal way to provoke an intelligent comeback is to say anything against motherhood, the U. S. Senate on the FBI, President Truman
and that there is no evidence that he disparaged the Media. Author Max Lowenthal, as now
is he true in the rejection to his book attacking
the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Not that the FBI is immune to public
criticism—no official agency can possibly
enjoy that distinction. Yet the FBI has for
so long occupied an exceptional position
in the Federal Government that any attack
on it is generally and widely resented. That
is because the FBI has stood out as one gov-
ernmental agency that has been free of any
apparent taint of graft, improper influence,
self-interest, partisan prejudice, or favoritism—an agency that has gone steadily,
and fearlessly ahead in doing its duty
through crisis and emergency, through
changes of administration, and party con-
trol, and that has, in nearly every case,
succeeded in "getting its man" or its men
as the job happened to require.
Lowenthal, who has been characterized
as a "man of mystery," devotes his 599-page
book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation,
to what he claims to be a fair and thorough
study and analysis of the record of the FBI.
However, the purpose of the book cannot
be disguised. It is clearly an attempt to
mear the agency and its chief, J. Edgar
Hoover, in a premeditated effort to dis-
credit their achievements in the enforce-
ment of law and the protection of the nation
against subversive influences and activities.
"Slewing an established career is a
difficult business. The immediate response
to Lowenthal's book indicates the nation's
tirely neutral, bias of propaganda. Repres-
senting the FBI at least 11 years ago, I was
that an American who has chartered the map
of the U. S. and who has signed the orders
disguised which
strain on the
ation, the result of our own,
without the need of
We don't believe
however, if the
confidence. We are
in the FBI and its able, professional,
less chief, in maintaining
the guarding, of whom
made intermittently, has
been traced to the
reasons for inspecting
the allies of those
chiefs and
operations
squashed. The book of a
we feel are prudent to the FBI.
political contributions to
American, and
honesty, is efficient, and
purposes.
Perhaps the FBI is the first
targets of him,
that is spoken
not unfavorably, of
the book,
quarantine,
mainly,
and outcast.

Tampa Tribune
Tampa, Florida
December 18, 1950
Edwin D. Lambright
Editorial Director
Mr. Edwin D. Lambright
Editor
The Tampa Morning Tribune
Tampa, Florida
Dear Mr. Lambright:
Mr. Edwin D. Lambright  
Editor  
The Tampa Morning Tribune  
Tampa, Florida

Dear Mr. Lambright:

I have read your excellent editorial entitled "Smearing A Success" in the Tampa Tribune, December 18, 1950. We of the FBI are most grateful to you for your commendatory remarks, and we deeply appreciate your bringing this matter so effectively to your readers.

It is reassuring and very encouraging to know that we have a friend such as you. We hope we will be able to continue to perform our duties in a manner which will merit the faith and confidence of all law-abiding, loyal Americans.

Thank you for your fine job of reporting.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
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FBI/DOJ
December 18, 1950

Thank you so much for your letter of December 13, 1950, and I certainly do appreciate your interest in forwarding the Congressional Record containing the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers' speech in the House of Representatives on November 30, 1950.

I was deeply impressed by Congressman Rivers' extensive, factual and forthright presentation of the situation surrounding Mr. Lamephas' recent publication. It was indeed gratifying to all of us in the FBI, and I have previously communicated with Congressman Rivers in this regard. As you so well pointed out he did a magnificent job in laying open the real motive behind Lamephas' publication.

May I take the opportunity at this time to extend the Season's Greetings and to express every good wish for the New Year.

Sincerely,
J. Edgar Hoover

NOTE: Recent correspondence with has been on a cordial basis.

Mailed 2
DECEMBER 29, 1950
COMM. FBI
January 3, 1952

Honorable John G. Wodd
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Congressman:

Assistant Director Louis E. Nichols has brought to my attention the copy of the book review by Louis Naldman which you forwarded to him December 29, 1950.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in making this available to the Bureau and I have read it with a great deal of interest.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover.
MAX LOWENTHAL, a New York lawyer, has written a book about the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the investigative agency of our Federal Government. It was first established in 1908; in 1924, it was given its present name and J. Edgar Hoover took office as Director. Throughout its existence, the Bureau has been under the supervision and control of the Attorney-General.

As far as I am concerned, no branch of the government is sacrosanct or immune from criticism. The FBI and its Director should be no exception to the rule. But criticism must be fair. If the record is relied upon, it must be the whole record. If a branch of government is to be blamed for activities not properly performed or performed outside of authority, the blame should be laid not only to the one who performs the act, but also to the officials ultimately responsible, whether it be Congress, the President, a member of the cabinet, or anyone else.

The FBI is a relatively large organization, with approximately 4,500 special agents and nearly 5,000 clerical and administrative personnel. It has a budget for this fiscal year of $64,000,000. It investigates and prepares evidence in civil cases involving the Federal Government, in Federal criminal prosecutions and in the enforcement of Federal regulatory statutes, duties imposed upon it by Congressional act.

More recently, the FBI has been required to investigate the loyalty of Government employees and those who apply for Government or Federal jobs. Since World War II, a great deal of the Bureau's time has been taken up with the investigation of problems relating to national security. We cannot help but recall with great satisfaction the appearance at the recent trial of the 11 top Communists of FBI agents who had been placed within the Communist party. Only through these agents was the government supplied with the necessary direct evidence of the conspiratorial nature of the Communist party as a body dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence whenever such action was deemed propitious.

The American people will also recall with great satisfaction the thoroughness with which the FBI prepared the evidence in the case of Alger Hiss; who had risen meteorically in the State Department and other branches of the United States government service. These and similar activities of the FBI are imposed upon it by Congressional enactment. When directed against Nazis and Fascists, they did not incur the opposition of self-styled "liberals." But now that the FBI is using the same efficient methods and techniques in tracking down Communist espionage, disloyalty and treason, it has incurred the hostility not only of Communists and fellow-travelers, but of confused liberals as well. They raise the hue and cry that the FBI, under the direction of Mr. Hoover, is dangerously close to becoming an American thought police, a Gestapo, an MVD. This fear is also the central thesis of Mr. Lowenthal's book.

I know Max Lowenthal is not a Communist. His publishers say in their blurb that he has presented "an objective picture of the FBI." But this book can in no sense be regarded as a true biography or history of that organization. Even a friendly review in the New York Post, a newspaper which has defended Mr. Lowenthal, refers to the book as "an indictment of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover." The same description appears in a Post editorial.

John O'Donnell, in his Daily News column of November 24, seems to shatter Mr. Lowenthal's fears. "We thoroughly agree," says Mr. O'Donnell, "with Lowenthal's fundamental premise that any Federal police, operating with the power, secrecy and millions of the FBI, is a potential danger to the citizens of the Republic."
This is the kind of thing J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI have been fighting for years, and are still fighting. They have to fit their methods to the enemy's tactics and strategy, or they can't hope to win.

The dignified Herald Tribune devotes an editorial to the same theme. Under the title "Smearing the FBI," the Tribune says:

"Had the FBI been made the victim of an ordinary smear artist the results would have been deplorable enough. The attack made by Max Lowenthal in his newly published book is, however—by reason of its methods and circumstances—particularly obnoxious. This lengthy volume, with its outward pretense to authoritativeness and objectivity, could easily be mistaken for a factual guide to the course of the FBI during its forty-two years of existence. It is only when the text has been examined that the author's manner and aims become clear. Mr. Lowenthal has strung together an exhausting series of quotations from public records, inconclusive, tendentious and frequently out of context, designed to have the cumulative result of implying that the FBI has been ineffectual, prejudiced, concerned chiefly with notoriety for itself, and careless of the civil liberties of the citizens. The book's publication occurs at a time when the FBI's activities against Communist infiltration require—as indeed they merit—an unhesitating public confidence; and the whole venture was made the more disturbing by suggestions of White House encouragement."

The head of the New York Times Washington Bureau, Arthur Krock, comments on the book:

"Ever since FBI reports necessarily became part of the record on which tests of loyalty and security of government employees are decided, Mr. Hoover and his agency have come under increasing fire. Some citizens are sincerely alarmed over the relation of its activities to Constitutional

Of the 559 pages, 87 pages are devoted to "Source Notes," that is, to the authorities constituting the basis of Mr. Lowenthal's "indictment." In evaluating these authorities, Cabell Phillips, Washington correspondent for the Sunday edition of the New York Times, reviewing the book rather favorably in the Times, said:

"The bulk of this data appears to have come from the study of massive piles of documents, and some of the facts he has got wrong. For example, Mr. Hoover never conformed the A. Mitchell Palmer 'Red raids,' although it is implied in the book that he did.

Mr. Lowenthal suggests that the wire-tapping activities of the FBI are in contravention of a Supreme Court ruling. They are not. He says that the FBI's first break in one of its most celebrated-World War II cases came when one of the ring leaders was run down by a New York taxi. Actually, the G-men had been tailing this man's confederates for weeks before he was killed, and so on."

IN LIKE VEIN

Both a Journal-American columnist and a Herald Tribune reporter believe that the book will backfire. Louis Sobol of the Journal-American comments that "in attacking the FBI—and particularly its Director, J. Edgar Hoover—Mr. Lowenthal will discover—has discovered already, in fact—that our great national sleuthing organization and its energetic head have more friends and admirers than foes."

In like vein, Bert Andrews, chief of the Herald Tribune's Washington Bureau, writes that "a book written by a close friend of President Truman—a book which many believe was done with the hope of destroying J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—is having many effects that are just
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(62-25733-034)
December 28, 1950

Dear [Name],

I appreciate your interest in sending me the [redacted]. The Congressional reaction to Lowenthal's diatribe has indeed been most gratifying.

Sincerely,

[Name]

NOTE: Recent correspondence with Mr. [redacted] has been on a cordial basis. A letter was sent Mr. 12-18-50 acknowledging his letter of 12-13-50, with which he forwarded [redacted].
AUG 24 1951
C

62-25733-225
CHANGED TO
62-95177-1
Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file. One or more of the following statements, where indicated, explain this deletion.

Deletions were made pursuant to the exemptions indicated below with no segregable material available for release to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 552</th>
<th>Section 552a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)(1)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(2)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(4)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(5)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(6)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.

Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.

Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

For your information:

The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

XXX

X DELETED PAGE(S) X

X NO DUPLICATION FEE X

X FOR THIS PAGE X

XXXXXX

FBI/DOJ
December 26, 1950

Thank you very much for your letter of December 15, 1950, and the enclosed clipping. I deeply appreciate your commendatory remarks concerning this Bureau and my administration of its activities. It is gratifying to have your prayers for my welfare.

Enclosed is some material which I thought you might like to have concerning the book to which your clipping referred.

I hope that joy and happiness will attend you throughout the New Year.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
Director
January 24, 1951

Your letter postmarked December 20, 1950, together with enclosure, has been received.

I do want to thank you for your very commendatory remarks concerning my administration of the activities of the FBI and also your interest in bringing this to my attention.

I do hope that the efforts of all of us in the FBI will continue to merit your approval.

Inclosed is some material I thought you might like to have.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

John Edgar Hoover
Director

NOTE:

Enclosure

U.S. O. 14301:4401:3
Doddard Statement
Foe to Freedom
Unmasking the Communist Masquerade

JAN 3 1951

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
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Thank you very much for your letter of December 6, 1950, enclosing a copy of your letter to the [redacted] and a copy of the publication, itself.

You have done a superb job in pointing out the truth about Lowenthal and his book. It is most gratifying to know that you have taken the initiative in thus expressing your views on this matter.

I hope that my associates and I will always merit your faith and confidence in our work. I am enclosing some material which may be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

[Redacted]

Enclosure
Dondoro's statement concerning Max Lowenthal

(Note: The date on the document is written as 11/1, but appears to be a 11/4. The note indicates that the enclosure is continued on the attached page.)
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December 15, 1950

Dear [Name],

Your letter of November 24, 1950, has brought your comments concerning Lowenthal's book to my attention. I enjoyed reading your comments and thought you might like to review the enclosed material.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

Enclosure

Mr. Donder's Statement
My dear Sir:

I am very grateful to you for your kind letter of December 13, 1950. As you observe, surely these are times when we must make sure that an agency such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation is protected from those who would destroy it.

I am sure that Mr. Hoover would like to know the contents of your fine letter. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of sending him a copy thereof.

With kindest regards and best wishes for a happy Christmas, I am

Very respectfully,

Joseph R. Dryson
I have received a copy of a letter to you dated December 14, 1950, from the Honorable Joseph E. Bryan and he very thoughtfully brought to my attention your letter of December 13, 1950.

I am indeed grateful for your interest in commenting on the very timely statements which Congressman Bryan made recently on the floor of the House of Representatives concerning our organization.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

NOTE: A letter was forwarded to Congressman Bryan on December 2, 1950, expressing the appreciation for his remarks which appeared in the Congressional Record on November 30, 1950.
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FBI/DOJ
January 4, 1951

Dear [Name]

A copy of [redacted] has been brought to my attention by Assistant Special Agent in Charge R. J. Lally of our Baltimore Office.

I could not let the opportunity pass without expressing my sincere personal appreciation for your efforts on our behalf. Such action as yours is most effective in spotlighting the ulterior motive behind Max Lowenthal’s book. I must commend you for the very forthright manner in which you pointed out the inaccuracies, distortions and incompleteness of the publication. In this regard I am enclosing some material which I thought you might like to read.

I trust that our efforts will always merit your confidence and support.

Sincerely yours,

J. [Redacted]

CC: Baltimore
ATTENTION SAC: Reurlet 12-22-50

[Redacted]
TO: MR. NICHOLS
FROM: M. AMORES
DATE: December 9, 1960

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF MAX LOWENTHAL'S BOOK
"THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION"
By Harrison Smith
Winston-Salem, North Carolina,
Journal and Sentinel
December 3, 1950

The attached review was received without cover letter from the Charlotte Division. The review is very uncomplimentary of the Bureau.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW:

Smith begins by saying that there is no other Department of the Government which has received as much adulation and publicity over the past twenty years as the FBI.

He says that although there are five other "detective forces" in the Government, the FBI "under J. Edgar Hoover, has become of paramount importance. He is known to the public as our sure defense against wrongdoers and our only shield against the foreign enemies, spies, and saboteurs who are presumably plotting the downfall of our democratic way of life."

Smith, basing his observations on Lowenthal's book, says that the FBI, since its unorthodox birth, has been "regarded by legislators and thoughtful citizens everywhere with alarm and suspicion.

Smith continues: "If this fear is not to spread and put an end to the splendid achievements of the FBI in protecting us from criminals and law-breakers, then a thorough and fearless investigation from the highest Government sources must be instituted and carried out. Mr. Lowenthal's careful and restrained book has opened the way."

Smith then points out that only twice has the FBI been subjected to an official investigation by congressional groups and only then when the abuses of its power had led to a defiance of the provisions of the Bill of Rights in our Constitution.

Smith says that at last a "readable, solid, and thoroughly documented book on the history and growth of the FBI has been published..." Smith notes that this book will undoubtedly be widely...
Memorandum to Mr. Nichols
Re: Review of Max Lowenthal's Book
"The Federal Bureau of Investigation" December 9, 1950

Smith then goes on to say that the author is a distinguished, conservative lawyer who has served in the Government. He points out that Lowenthal has spent fifteen years examining the FBI and has documented his work from pertinent sources.

Smith points out that it would be difficult to name an author entering into a "difficult, and indeed a dangerous controversy, who has more carefully guarded himself against accusations of sensationalism and malice."

Smith points out that Lowenthal rarely expresses his own opinions and that it is obvious from examining the book that Lowenthal belongs to a large group of citizens who believe that a "secret Federal police" may become a menace to free Government.

In reviewing the book Smith points out that Mr. Hoover, who "knows well how to defend his organization against declamatory shouts," might find it difficult to ward off the "reasoned inferences contained in this book." Smith continues, "The record of the FBI in its most vital aspect stands against him (the Director), as do many of the inflammatory and exaggerated statements of its chief."

Smith then goes on to discuss the IWW, the bomb in Chicago and the so-called Palmer Raids.

In concluding his review, Smith points out that a new wave of criticism against the FBI began ten years ago in that there was concern about the extending range of the FBI's operation.

He concludes by stating, "The hundreds of thousands, or perhaps millions, of 'dossiers' of private citizens that have been collected and filed are most alarming."

Smith winds up with the following sentence: "In a time of future emergency and hysteria who but the silent and opinionless man could feel safe from a midnight arrest unless this agency can be checked and brought under the law which it has so often defied."
RELATIONSHIP WITH WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA, JOURNAL AND SENTINEL:

A review of the main file, 94-5-486, reflects that our relationship with the paper has been generally satisfactory. The following points are noted:

1. In July and August of 1950, we conducted tours for carriers of this paper.

2. On February 3, 1950, the Director wrote the editor and thanked him for a complimentary editorial regarding the Hiss Case.

3. In March of 1950, we furnished a statement to the paper over the Director's signature regarding "Better Books For You?"

4. In October of 1949, carriers from this paper were given tours of the Bureau.

5. On September 9, 1949, at the request of the paper, the Director sent a letter of greetings to the Newspaper Carriers of North Carolina.

6. In July of 1948, the Director wrote the editor and thanked him for a complimentary editorial on the Loyalty Program.

On May 19, 1947, the paper carried an editorial regarding the institution of the Loyalty Program. The editorial asked the question, whether or not it was necessary to spend twenty-four or twenty-five million dollars to remove Communists from the Federal payroll. The editorial said, "It might require that much (meaning twenty-four or twenty-five million dollars) if it is deemed necessary to employ thousands of special FBI or Gestapo agents, as it were, to tread on the heels of all Government workers..."

By letter dated June 9, 1947, the Director took issue with this statement, particularly with reference to the term "Gestapo." The paper in turn printed the Director's letter and said that Mr. Hoover was correct and that the paper had no intention of comparing the FBI with a Gestapo.
There are numerous other items in the file but these are the highlights.

The Winston-Salem Journal and Sentinel prints both a morning and evening paper. It is put out by the Piedmont Publishing Company; Gordon Gray is President and Publisher; Santford Martin is Editor. It has a combined daily circulation of 60,941.

HARRISON SMITH:

Smith, according to the attached review from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, is described as being connected with the Saturday Review of Literature. Who's Who for 1950-51 (page 2555) describes Smith as an Associate Editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. He has been connected with the publishing business in various capacities since 1911 and from 1915 to 1928 worked for the New York Tribune, both as a reporter and a foreign correspondent and in the latter capacity lived in Japan and Russia. From 1919-1928 he was an editor in the publishing house of Harcourt Brace and Company and from 1929-31 was Vice President of Cape and Smith. From 1931 to 1936 he served as President of Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, Inc., and from 1936 to 1938 was an editor in the publishing house of Doubleday Doran Company. He also served as Vice President of Durrell and Company (dates not indicated). He is a graduate of Yale University and lives in New York City.

In connection with our investigation of under the character "Espionage - J; Registration Act," Harrison Smith and a New York promoter named ..., caused Scribner's magazine to combine with the Commentator magazine, forming Scribner's Commentator. Smith acted as supervisory editors for approximately six months beginning in October, 1939. According to informants qualified (97-731-16, page 1)
Additional information contained in our files concerning Smith is set out below:

1. The Dies Committee reports classified the Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee as a Communist Party front. The reports reflect that on January 31, 1935, this Committee held a meeting at the New School for Social Research in New York City. On the letterhead of this organization dated in January, 1935, one Harrison Smith is listed as a sponsor. (61-7582-1298, page 1472)
No other important department of the United States government has received as much attention and publicity in the last 20 years as the Federal Police Organization now known throughout the world as the FBI.

Although there are at least five separate detective forces operating for various departments of the government, including the Treasury, the Post Office and the Department of Justice, the FBI, under its chief, J. Edgar Hoover, has become of paramount importance. Hoover is known to the public as our sure defense against wrong doers and our only shield against foreign enemies, spies, and saboteurs, who are presumably plotting the downfall of our democratic way of life.

At last a readable, solid, and thoroughly documented book on the history and growth of the FBI has been published which is certain to be widely read and which may lead to a thorough research into the value and the inherent dangers of its increasing activities.

The author of "The Federal Bureau of Investigation" is Max Lowenthal, a distinguished, conservative lawyer who has served the government for a quarter of a century as legal counsel for congressional and executive commissions. He has spent 18 years examining the FBI and has documented his work with quotations from pertinent sources, balancing attacks on the secret service with statements from its defenders, including excerpts from the speeches and writings of Hoover.

It would be difficult to name an author entering into a subject and indeed a dangerous controversy, who has more carefully guarded himself against accusations of sensationalism. Lowenthal, however, armed himself with his own opinions, as well as those of others who have written about the FBI.

The author has written "a menace to free government and free institutions. "Fear of the danger of the FBI became cumulative," writes Lowenthal. "There was the concern about its desire for extending the range of its operations for employing techniques providing espionage over private life as well as over numberless innocent persons, and for securing access to data obtained by the government in income tax and census returns."

The prospect of a secret police free from supervision and used as an instrument of oppression has terrified people during the intervening years.

The FBI, in contrast to the Gestapo, a national magazine declared, and statements of the same kind have appeared all through our press.

The hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of "doctors" of private citizens that have been collected and they are most alarming. In times of trouble the FBI and its agents are most effective.
The FBI — America's Secret Police?

By Harrison Smith

No other important department of the United States Government has received as much odium and publicity over the last twenty years as the Federal police organization now known throughout the world as the FBI. Although there are at least five separate investigative forces operating for various departments of the Government, including the Treasury, the Post Office and the Justice departments, the FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, has become of paramount importance. He is known to the public as our sure defense against wrongdoers and our only shield against the foreign enemies, spies, and saboteurs who are presumably plotting the downfall of our democratic way of life.

The radio and comic strip universalism of the early 1930s was the environment of the FBI's inception. At the same time, Attorney General Charles L. Faust appointed Hoover, a member of President Roosevelt's inner circle, who had served as legal counsel for congressional and executive commissions.

As Hoover has always insisted, the FBI is an independent, non-political body. It has spent 15 years examining the FBI and has documented its work with some of the most effective and powerful evidence of any investigation. Hoover's abilities as a detective and as a public speaker have been recognized by all who have worked with him. The FBI is a force that cannot be ignored.
Organization against declamatory specks about the rise of an American Gestapo: nevertheless, it may find it difficult to ward off the reasonable inferences contained in this book. The record of the FBI in its most vital aspect stands against him as many of the inflammatory and exaggerated statements of its chief.

In 1918 a bomb exploded at the Government building in Chicago, killing four people, and other outrages followed. The FBI announced that the Maverick labor organization, the IWW, was responsible, or more generally, "radicals," whose purpose was the overthrow of the Government of the United States. The resulting search for the criminals was a complete fiasco. Later a campaign against anarchists, Communists, and crackpots of all kinds was instigated. In the same year Congress enacted a sedition law for the deportment of aliens who held objectionable views on economic and political matters. It opened the door to deportation raids in which hundreds of bewildered and powerless men were held "incommu-

The yard of the criticism began. "Fear of the danger of the FBI became cumulative," writes Mr. Lowenthal. "There was the concern about its desire for extending the range of its operations, for employing techniques providing exposure over private life as well as over numberless innocent persons, and for securing access to data obtained by the Government in income tax and census returns."

The respect of a secret police free from supervision and used as an instrument of oppression has terrified people during the intervening years. "The FBI, unchecked and unbridled, could become an American Gestapo," a national magazine declared; similar statements have appeared time and time again in our newspapers. The hundreds of thousands or perhaps millions of "dossiers" of citizens, citizens that have been collected and filed are most alarming. In a time of future emergency, who will be able to decide the opinion which can be checked and brought under the law which it has often defied.
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FBI/DOJ
January 3, 1951

Mr. W. C. Bussing  
President  
The Evansville Press  
Evansville, Indiana  

Dear Mr. Bussing:

I read with considerable pleasure the editorial "Unfair Book About G-Men" which appeared in the December 6, 1950, issue of The Evansville Press.

I could not let the opportunity pass without expressing my sincere appreciation for the confidence you expressed in our organization, and the manner in which you characterized the recent book by Max Lowenthal. I am sure that your sentiments are shared by your many readers.

Sincerely yours,

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED.

DATE 9/22/51 BY 9/23/51

CC: Indianapolis  
ATTENTION SAC: Reurlet 12-18-50

62-25733  
DUPLICATE YELLOW

85 JAN 10 1951 62-25733
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THOUGHT WELL OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, CHIEF OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU
INVESTIGATION.

THAT WAS THE PRESIDENT'S ANSWER TO A NEWS CONFERENCE QUESTIONS
ABOUT A RECENT BOOK BY MAX LOWENTHAL WHICH CRITICIZED SOME OF THE
FBI'S ACTIVITIES.

BECAUSE LOWENTHAL WAS ONCE CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH MR. TRUMAN, THE
PUBLICATION OF THE BOOK GAVE FRESH IMPETUS TO REPORTS THAT THE
PRESIDENT WAS COOL TOWARD THE FBI CHIEF. LOWENTHAL SERVED AS
COUNSEL FOR A SENATE COMMITTEE HEADED BY MR. TRUMAN WHILE HE WAS A
SENATOR.

MR. TRUMAN WAS ASKED TODAY WHAT HE THOUGHT ABOUT THE BOOK, WHETHER
HE APPROVED OR DISAPPROVED OF IT.

HE REPLIED HE HADN'T READ IT AND COULDN'T ANSWER THE QUESTION.

SINCE J. EDGAR HOOVER IS STILL ON THE JOB, A REPORTER ASKED,
WOULD IT BE RIGHT TO FIGURE THAT THE PRESIDENT DID NOT SHARE ALL THE
AUTHOR'S ViewS?

MR. HOOVER HAS ALWAYS BEEN WELL THOUGHT OF BY ME, MR. TRUMAN
SAID.

CZ12PES

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 9/22/52 BY B42

MR 1-4-51
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FBI/DOJ
January 10, 1951

Dr. Ruth Alexander
New York Mirror
235 East 45th Street
New York 17, New York

Dear Dr. Alexander:

I read with considerable interest and pleasure your comments which appeared in the December 31, 1950, edition of the Los Angeles Examiner. Your comments on Max Lowenthal are particularly reassuring and will do much to present an accurate picture concerning one who has sought to discredit our organization. You were indeed most forthright in pointing out the reasons behind the unjustifiable attack against the FBI.

I trust that our efforts particularly in combating the menace which Communism presents to our democratic form of life will always merit your favorable comment.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

cc - New York

cc - Los Angeles

NOTE: Address per Who's Whos America 1951

RECEIVED-WITNESS ROOM

55 JAN 22 1951

BGC
Mr. Louis Nichols  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Nichols:

You will be interested in the enclosed quotation of Justice Jackson.

Would it be possible for you to compare the Lowenthal book with the attacks on the FBI made on a number of previous occasions by the National Lawyers Guild to see how they compare? Please note in this connection a demand for an investigation of the FBI in the National Lawyers Guild letter dated about June 20, 1949. Another request was made to President Truman about January 23, 1950.

If you do not find it expedient to make these comparisons, I should like to go over these documents myself.

Very sincerely,

Benjamin Mandel  
Director of Research
"Attorney General Jackson delivered a speech on May 7, 1961 before the American Judicature Society on the general subject of 'principles and techniques for guarding our freedoms.' . . . These are his words:

'And let me say to you that the enemies of America are not idle. They show up at Congressional hearings to oppose every move to strengthen our law enforcement; they show up in court actively to raise every legal difficulty to prevent convictions and to obstruct obtaining evidence; they propagate endlessly against investigative officials and agencies, against prosecution policies, against law enforcement itself.'

TO:  
- Director
- Mr. Ladd
- Mr. Clegg
- Mr. Glavin
- Mr. Harbo
- Mr. Nichols
- Mr. Rosen
- Mr. Tracy
- Mr. Belmont
- Mr. Mohr
- Mr. Sizoo
- Mr. Callahan
- Mr. Neece
- Miss Candy
- Personnel File Section
- Records Section

See Me
For Appropriate Action

Send File
Note and Return

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 9/24/50

Clyde Tolson
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January 8, 1951

Dear [Name],

Thank you very much for your letter of December 30, 1950, and the enclosed publication which you forwarded. It was thoughtful of you to think of me in this regard.

I shall let you know in the event I need additional copies of your work. I appreciate your offering them to me.

I enjoyed receiving your New Year Greetings, and I hope you too will have a happy and prosperous 1951.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

cc - Liaison Desk, with copy of incoming
Tom Donegan called me this afternoon and when advised that you were out of the office asked that you be advised that Newsweek Magazine will have a book review on Lowenthal's book which is critical of the book; that will also write a review which is critical of the book. He stated that will read the book over the weekend and that he has briefed both and on the background of Lowenthal, and he wants you to know that everyone there is doing what he can. He asked also to speak with Mr. Nichols.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HERIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 9/24/51 BY BILL
Dear [Name]

Thank you very much for your most welcome letter of January 9, 1951. It was thoughtful of you to write me your observations concerning the Loewenthal book. In this regard I thought you might like to review the enclosed material.

I deeply appreciate your expressions of confidence in my associates and me. I trust that we may always perform our duties in a manner which will merit your continued faith and approbation.

It was kind of you to extend greetings for the New Year, and I hope that you, too, will have a happy and successful 1951.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Donor Statement

15 OCT 1950

[Handwritten notes]

FEB 6 1951

COMM-FBI

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]
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FBI/DOJ
I was very pleased to receive your letter of January 20, 1951, and I am grateful for the opportunity of having the benefit of your additional comments concerning the Lowenthal book.

You may be assured, I am certainly in agreement with your observations.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

CC: New York, with copy of incoming.
Thank you very much for your most welcome letter of November 27, 1950. I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your offer to be of help in connection with the Lowenthal matter.

I know I can rely upon you to choose the right time and place to comment upon this compilation of innuendoes and distortions of fact. I most assuredly will keep you in mind and I will call upon you if a situation arises wherein you might be of assistance.

As of possible interest, I am enclosing some data which I thought you might like to review.

Sincerely,

J. Edgar Hoover

Enclosure

Dondero's Remarks before House of Representatives September 1, 1950.
☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.

☐ Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.

☐ Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

☐ For your information:

☐ The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:
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X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
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Your thoughtful letter of November 25, 1950, has been received, and I deeply appreciate your kind comments about this Bureau and my administration of it.

I hope my associates and I will always have your abiding faith and confidence.

I am enclosing some material which I thought you might like to review.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Enclosure

Congressman Dondero's statement concerning Max Lowenthal 931-50
CC: New York with copy of incoming.
Milwaukee with copy of incoming.

NOTE: Previous cordial correspondence has been had with
name per previous cordial correspondence.

81 FEB 26 1951
Dear Mr. Hoover:

I appreciate the kind words in your letter of November 24.

It had seemed to me that the substantial review space given the Lenzenthal book had served to give it unwarranted prominence and, perhaps, helped Lenzenthal to sell books. This space having been given, however, a few words of comment did not seem inappropriate.

I had considered, further, the possible advisability of preparing a point-by-point reply to the book, for inclusion in the "Congressional Record", but decided undecided because of the thought this might unnecessarily add to additional space.

Mr. Testan, Mr. Cool, and Dr. S. research for the Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, and will make a thorough analysis of the book to present its findings. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of my reply to Dr. Testan's note on this subject.

If you consider it advisable that a detailed rebuttal of the Lenzenthal allegations be made, I shall be very happy to undertake its preparation and presentation in the Record, or in a speech on the floor, with the cooperation of such members of the House as you might designate to assist.

In any event, it would be a pleasure to have your views as to whether further notice should be taken of the Lenzenthal book.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Exhibit]

Congress of the United States
Dear Ben:

I read with interest your comments on the Lowenthal book.

It had been my thought I might undertake such a refutation as you had in mind, in which case I should certainly want your advice.

I have not gone forward on this, so far, because I have considered the possibility such a reply might serve merely to add to the undue public notice already accorded this book. On the other hand, I have not ruled out the possible desirability of doing something more about it.

I intend to talk with the Chairman on several matters as soon as possible, and I shall discuss the other report you mentioned with him.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Burr P. Harrison.
My dear Congressman:

I read with considerable interest your letter of November 28, and I am thoroughly sympathetic with your viewpoint on the Lowenthal book; however, in view of widespread circulation and the attempts made by the publisher to provoke public discussion, I see no other way but to point out the inaccuracies contained in the book whenever possible.

I think that there is much merit to Mr. Mandel's position. I shall be only too glad to be of any assistance possible. If you have any questions on any of the Bureau's activities, if you will let us know we will be more than happy to furnish you with the facts.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely yours,
President, this book is evil, and it
wreaks havoc with our system of
crimes. Never in our history has
been so much dependence upon the
people. The elements threaten the
entire world, and we are now fighting
for our lives in Asia. We cannot
tell the day or the hour when this
tide may break. This menace oper-
ates beyond our comprehension.

President, the last one
alone, the community closes ranks
against this man. Most of the time
we are united, and society for
granted, every man knows in his heart
that he last to have to join together
for the future. This has been so all
throughout the ages, and the
people's greatest moment is now.
The man who betrays his trust to the
enemies, betrays his neighbors
and his neighbors know it.

President, our position in the
world is peculiar. The dynamic of
our government is supplied by private
enterprise. Our government is a represen-
tative-republic, based upon the written
Constitution, to which every citizen
swears allegiance. Every citizen has
a duty to support the government
and the Constitution that governs our
lives. The Constitution is the
law of the land, and it is our
responsibility to uphold it. Each
person is entitled to the protection
of the Constitution, and it is our
duty to defend it.

The Constitution is the
law of the land, and it is our
responsibility to defend it.

The people have a
right to liberty, to
believe what they
please, and to
express their
views freely.
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The public did not control the FBI, and it was not the public record. Let me be specific and say my point. I was intrigued by one reference in the book.

On page 320 the author says:

FBI practices were summarized up to 1940 by a Senate committee.

A review of the reports of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce accompanying Senate Resolution 194, does not even contain the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On page 5 of this report, in reciting the abuses referred to in Lowenthal's book, each sentence is preceded by the words "from police." Did the FBI commit the abuses?

Lowenthal's book admits that while the report did not specifically state that the FBI was "the police," the charges were directed against the Bureau, Chairman Burton H. Wheeler. In a press interview, he acknowledged that the report was "characterized by a parting shot at the FBI." The other FBI agents, including newspaper clippings at the time, were checked on only one test. The public record was how former Senator Whelan's statement was.

"There is no way to prove the FBI's actions, the FBI's actions, the FBI's actions." Wheeler's statement was made with the approval of the FBI agents.
Other than the above fact, I must state that if the rest of the book is not one-sided but balanced, then the publisher and the Board of Education are entitled to an equal report of the book. If the publisher fails to do so, I would support the views expressed in this book. If the publisher does not do so, I would support the views expressed in this book and the Board of Education.
HOOVER was appointed special assistant to the man who contributed one of the most
grimy and bloody pages to the history of the
United States: Mitchell Palmer, the G-man tyrant who was fond of calling himself
the Fighting Quaker. It was Palmer who
sweated the anti-Red drive of 1919-20.

In his day Palmer gained notoriety as the
police dictator of America. But the chief
and direct organiser of the violence and in-
humaneness against progressive leaders was
young J. Edgar Hoover.

Napoleon referred to the famous spy Schu-
meister as a man of destiny. This was Willi-
Strept's opinion of Edgar Hoover. At the
age of 26, his career was assured. He was
appointed Assistant Director of the Bureau of
Investigation, and very soon after was made
Director, it having by then been renamed
the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or FBI.

The special agents of the FBI are known
as G-men, which is short for "Government
men." It is Hoover who was responsible for
the appearance of the G-men in the United
States. His first measure as Director of the
FBI was to purge its staff. Gradually the
old and very heterogeneous personnel of the
Bureau, both as regards age and character
experience, was replaced by young men of
definite type, the kind usually employed
by gambling dens and saloons as bouncers.

The G-men are instructed in the techni-
calities of intelligence work as maintained by the FBI in Washington and
other centers, as well as at the National Police
Academy, where there are trained in such
arts and sciences as public speaking, psy-
chology, and sociology. These are the
agents who are specially trained to fight the labor
movement.

In addition to his special training as a
spy, every G-man is expected to master the
various arts of physical assault and the
keeping of every type of modern personal
weapon. The American Gestapo is taught how to attack strikers and are in-
toxicated with the science of maiming,
terrorism, and intimidation. Instruc-
tion in methods of search, detection, and
apprehension holds an important place in
the training of a G-man.

The special agent is the central figure in
the FBI. Eminent attention is paid to his
training, the fundamental purpose of which
is to turn him into a man hunter and man-
slaughterer automatron. His guidance must
be the one laid down by Ignaz Loyola
for the members of the Jesuit Order: he is
expected to be "as obedient as a corpse."

Hoover saw to it that his thugs were given
the broadest powers, or, rather, enjoyed un-
limited opportunities for the commission of
terrorism. In the celebrated Capper Reich
legislation considerably expanding the powers
of the FBI and its special agents, there
was no provision for controlling the arms of
agents. Hoover also saw to it that the
American that both before and after the war,
prompt in detecting and effectively stopping
the activities of Japanese and German spies.
Allowing German and Japanese spies to
operate with impunity in the United States,
Hoover endeavored, by distorted facts, to per-
uade the American that United States na-
tional security in 1919 and 1920 was
water-tight, and that he, the all-seeing Hoover,
and his special agents were fully up to their
job.

The object of Hoover and his underlings
in spreading this legend is to inflame the belief
that now, too, after the war, the FBI is
faithfully and honestly protecting the in-
terests of the American people. The fact of
the matter is that Hoover and his Bureau have
been engaged in a foul and deplorable work on a
triumphant scale, the purpose of which is to pre-
pare the way for a pitiless corporate war.

The FBI is actually the central operations
staff of the rabid campaign against every-
thing progressive in America. Planting gull
pigeons in progressive organizations, fram-
ing-baking, blackmail—all these are the common
everyday weapons of the FBI.

Hoover extended his activities into foreign
countries as well. In the years 1937-39 the
FBI set up an espionage and sabotage net-
work in Latin America which burst the
frontiers into every department of the govern-
ment service, into political parties, into
the economies of the countries con-
cerned. It is with the help of Hoover's agents
that coup d'etat, provocation, and sedition
are engineered in the Latin-American coun-
tries.

Since the close of 1942, in connection with
the war, the FBI has been given a
number of bureaus in foreign countries
and has been sent to the Far East. But Hoover
retained the right to maintain an inspection system in every American
country. The control in such countries
is exercised by American agents, who
are known as the local police in countries
where democracy is not the common
condition.
Current-day Americans are peace-loving and peace-minded. The nation is at peace in every corner of the world, with the exception of China, which is engaged in a pacific war. In this respect, the United States is fortunate, for it is not only at peace with the rest of the world, but it is also at peace within itself.

President Roosevelt is a man of peace. He believes in peace, and he is doing all in his power to secure peace. He has sent peace-keeping forces to China, and he has made peace offers to the other countries of the world. He is doing everything in his power to prevent war, and he is doing everything in his power to promote peace.

The only way to prevent war is to promote peace. The only way to promote peace is to create a world organization, such as the League of Nations, which shall have the power to prevent war. The League of Nations shall have the power to enforce peace, and it shall have the power to settle disputes.

The League of Nations shall have the power to enforce peace by the use of armed force, if necessary. It shall have the power to settle disputes by arbitration, conciliation, mediation, or other peaceful means. It shall have the power to prevent war by the use of economic sanctions, if necessary.
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One Washington opinion of the Lowellthal book was voiced by Rex Collier in the Evening Star. He noted that the publisher, William Sloane Associates, Inc., of New York, said the book with its "unased and profoundly conservative approach" would lead "to some startling conclusions." Mr. Collier said: "One conclusion of this reviewer is that this is the most non-objective book on the FBI ever published."

John Koets, in The Washington Daily News, noted that no one can ever do an inside job on the working of the FBI, because the FBI is a government agency. Mr. Koets asked:

"No evil can come from the FBI. It is not a good one. It is not a good one. The title of the book is not what it is. That is why it has been published." He will advance the theory that the FBI is an interesting book. But it is not a good one.

The title of the book is "The FBI, How Objective Can You Get?" It reads as follows:

The FBI, How Objective Can You Get? (By Rex Collier)

An interesting book is off the presses today. The author is Herk Lowenthal—his subject, the FBI. He is an interesting book. But it is not a good one.
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Lowenthal's record is one of attack on any American institution which stands 4-square for the American way of life. He has attacked railroad, banks, and a thoroughly fine American institution of Final Authority by its own standards. Even the cause of the railroad has felt his vengeance. The FDR is also considered an American institution, but Lowenthal has spared no name, however hallowed, in his attack. Cleverly, he does not make the charges himself, but is able to make the charges against the people themselves. To this writer, that is an object lesson on the FDR, not an objective charge. The New Republic has been a blackmailer. It comes, it must be objectively noted, from Max Lowenthal, whose own loyalty to his country has been challenged by the Senate. It should also be objectively noted that even Theodore Roosevelt's bitterest opponents called him a great American.

The FDR is an edging-congression-smashing conspiracy since 1968 the Attorneys General of the United States have been part of it. At any rate, Lowenthal lists them at the beginning of his book. By any objective standard, they are an honest roll of the American bar. Republicans and Democrats, Protestants and Catholic, rich and poor, conservatives and liberals, they are a cross-section of some of the most distinguished names in American history.

Of them, for example, we turn to the United States Supreme Court. Most Americans will be shocked by the information that conservative Republican George Wickersham, conservative southern Democrat James McReynolds, New England's great Harlan Stone, and Grover Cleveland as Attorneys General, either didn't know what was going on or were part of the same expanding conspiracy. It is a striking testimonial to careerism that the Supreme Court, of course, is not the Supreme Court.

Lowenthal's book virtually and factually charges that all these great Americans remain quislings or actively helped the enemy. The Congressional Record may throw some light on the book. At least Congressmen's opinions on that subject will be interesting.

The New York Times, November 20, 1936

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Elbridge Lewis, Jr.)

President Truman has a close personal friend and adviser who is credited with great influence in and around the White House. In fact, William J. Donovan. In his book, The Man of Violence, described this President's intimate as having influenced Mr. Donovan's thinking on more than one occasion.

The man is Max Lowenthal, and his intimacy with the President is something that takes a look at him. But Lowenthal has another reason, just as good, which we can work on today.

Lowenthal has written a book called the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It reveals a life-long conspiracy of disaster for the FBI, by inference of either allowing, permitting, or furthering the growth of the FBI at the expense of the liberties of the American people. Objective history appears to be strongly on the side of the statement, and not Max Lowenthal.

Lowenthal further says that all Congressmen do not share Congressmen's draconic opinion that no good American would care to be contaminated by Lowenthal's known presence. But a certain type of very dry American skeptic of Lowenthal appears from the record of his Senate to be House Un-American Activities Committee. The testimony: Mr. Lowenthal: "The number of people that I didn't know were members of the Communist Party is something that sometimes makes my hair stand on end," Mr. Roosevelt: "Ours, too."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Times-Herald of November 20, 1936]
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On the 1st page of the cover Lowenthal is described as "an avowed liberal" and as a conservative. So let's compare him to the publisher's version of one.

On pages 11 and 13, Kahn claims that theodore Roosevelt was more responsible for Mr. Truman's liberal thinking than any other American.

On page 16, Kahn includes a quote from the report of the Intelligence Coordinator of the Department of Justice, which states that "Lowenthal was an isolationist until 1931, when he was appointed to the Hoover Commission on Administrative Reorganization." The quote is attributed to the report's author, who was a close associate of Hoover.

On page 20, Kahn provides a close reading of the report, focusing on the relationship between Lowenthal and the FBI. Kahn argues that Lowenthal was opposed to the FBI's expansion of its powers, and that this opposition was shared by many members of Congress. Kahn cites a quote from a congressional hearing in 1934 where a member of Congress criticized the FBI's "uncontrolled growth." Kahn also notes that Lowenthal was one of the few members of Congress who regularly questioned the FBI's operations and policies.

On page 25, Kahn concludes his article with a discussion of Lowenthal's legacy. Kahn argues that Lowenthal's legacy is complex and continues to influence debates about the balance between national security and individual civil liberties. Kahn notes that Lowenthal's opposition to the FBI's expansion of its powers was a reflection of his broader concerns about the growth of government power and the erosion of civil liberties. Kahn concludes by suggesting that Lowenthal's legacy is one of a commitment to balance, even at the cost of being wrong about some important matters.
I saw my friend Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's Foreign Minister, in Prague last week, long before he came to his end. I know intimately the story of Gablek, I know how helpless democratic forces can be, if the Jews do not protect their people against the secret discipline, the abominably careful planning of the anti-Semites.

The Communists could never win an election in the United States. They do not expect to do so. A Commumist smirks the way the Ku Klux Klan can grow only by stealth in dark cells. J. Edgar Hoover was right when he said the OPA has the power to dictate to the Communist Party when the first public outcry was made against the Communists. Why move more of them underground? All that such an act could ever outlaw would be a name. The next day the same revolutionists would turn up under a new title.

Until Congress is wise enough to pass laws which force open organization of all mass movements, we shall have to protect ourselves against secretly organized attacks. We can bring one subversive outfit into the open by requiring all mass movements to report to the Government the essential facts about themselves—such as the names of all the leaders, the money they take in, and from whom it comes, the date of its creation, etc.

I suggest that the McCarran Act recently passed by Congress will not work because the FBI has become the first of the agencies of subversion, we must to start other organizations for the same purpose.

The requirement to disclose essential facts is a violation of privacy. The President's Committee on Organized Crime has recommended that such laws be passed: represented on the committees are members of the AIP and various minority groups. No decent organization has hesitated to identify itself: why should any other organization protect its members?

Even without such laws, the FBI has handled delicate problems well. On Pearl Harbor I did manage to advise the Attorney General of the basis for authorizing the arrest of some 14,000 persons. A few of the 14,000 became my clients. I defended them before hearing boards and was able to help, free some of them. In every case there were fair hearings, with every consideration being shown to the defense.

And although I was the lawyer for certain accused suspects, I must admit that Mr. Hoover had a justification in picking up my clients; there was sparse, and no injustice was done.

One Jewish refugee was picked up because the name of his family was prominent underground spies. But it was easy for me to produce conclusive evidence that the old fellow knew Gablek was a spy. He was set free—but the authorities had been right to bring him in for questioning.

Mr. Hoover has been severely criticized for not having allowed more subversives to be arrested. A real "smear" campaign has been launched against his work. Those who feared the Bureau—such as I once did—will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It involves documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

A real "smear" campaign has been launched against his work. Those who feared the Bureau—such as I once did—will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It involves documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

The present investigation program has created a misconception about the FBI's function as a report. Every American should understand that the FBI does not try Government employees. It merely serves various Governmental bodies as a reporting agency. When a reporting agency has the power to edit, it can make anyone appear a devil or a hero. But the FBI does not edit. It gathers the facts about a Federal employee and turns over its findings to the head of the department. And that is all it does, or can do, except that it is usually a clear and a safe suspect in his job when rumor is doing its best to get him fired. J. Edgar Hoover cannot find a single person. His reports do not even contain recommendations. The FBI simply reports the facts, unverified tips, rumors, gossip—everything.

It adds comments and evaluation of their accuracy, and there its responsibility ends. It is up to the heads of the administrative agencies to act.

It would be folly to ignore rumors, or even anonymous messages; an unsigned note was instrumental in sending the notorious German spy to a Federal penitentiary for thousands of less spectacular examples. To abandon that policy would be to assign to Hoover the task of the President, and the power, to screen the reports. I should be very much disturbed if police agencies were permitted to withhold evidence on the judgment of their professional. Far better the present system: the complete reports go to the responsible official; everything is in the dossier, with a careful comment on each item, whether it is a fact, probability, or rumor.

In my study of the FBI I have seen clear cases where lies were spread against it. For example, it has been said and printed repeatedly that agents in loyalty investigations demanded to know whether a suspect reads certain magazines or leftist magazines. This charge is a lie. Whenever hoarseness of a statement being made, Hoover calls for the facts and, invariably, everybody backs down. They hear it somewhere, they can't remember where. Directives to FBI agents specifically forbid such questions, unless the readiness to follow orders is to be tested.

Major General Bennett I. Meyers, former Army Intelligence officer, who contributed much of the information for this piece, adds: "The FBI is the most important and the most influential of all the Federal agencies, and it must be kept that way. This minority is being further reduced to completely and utterly destroyed. In 1939, only 260 employees were naturally of good standing. In 1939, only 260 employees were given their jobs back. One cannot be too careful. The FBI's work is to be continued.

A real "smear" campaign has been launched against Hoover's work. Those who feared the Bureau—such as I once did—will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It involves documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

Among liberals I am by no means alone in this opinion. A while ago Roger Baldwin, formerly director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote to J. Edgar Hoover:

"It seems to me that your Bureau has accomplished an exceedingly difficult task with rare judicial sense."
The book retails for $4.95 which would cover the cost of the publication. I have been publishing the book which was first published in 1936, and the sales have been good. The book is now out of print, and I am thinking of printing another edition. I have been in touch with a few publishers about the possibility of a new edition, but I have not yet decided to proceed. I am interested in hearing from anyone who might be interested in purchasing the book at the present time. I am also interested in any comments or suggestions you might have about the book. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, [Your Name]


Loewenthal's record is one of American Institution which has made many contributions to the world of arts. He has been honored with the highest recognition and has received a number of awards for his work. He is a respected figure in the art world and is known for his dedication to the cause of liberal democracy.

His friends boast of Loewenthal's staunchness in the face of adversity, and even more so when threatened with the harm of adversity. In the early thirties, he faced his enemy, Judge Edwin L. Morgan, who had been appointed to the bench by President Roosevelt.

Loewenthal was a man of great courage and determination. He refused to let his fear of loosing his position deter him from continuing to fight for what he believed in. He stood firm and fought for his principles. He was a man who never gave up, no matter how difficult the situation was.

In the end, Loewenthal's courage and determination paid off. He was able to stand against the odds and fight for what he believed in. He was a true example of how one can fight for their principles and come out on top.

In conclusion, Loewenthal's record as an American Institution is one of bravery and determination. He is a true hero and an inspiration to all who strive for what they believe in.
Mr. Speaker, saving America is everybody's job. Giving aid and comfort to our enemies at home and abroad should be anybody's shame.

That is all I have to say about Lowenthal, Mr. Speaker. I ask permission to insert various articles as a part of my statement here this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 20, 1960]

CIVIL LIBERTIES CHAMPIONS POINT OUT FBI RECORD OF INJUSTICE - VICTIMS BOOK CALLED RED AID

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Congressmen, Federal judges, and others have been receiving advance copies of a 350-page book aimed at portraying the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover as incompetent, a menace to civil liberties, and a Gestapo.

The volume, published today by William Sloane Associates of New York City, is entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." (By Frederick Woltman)

Mr. Lowenthal, a New York attorney, is a New York journalist who has held numerous public posts in the past and has been waging a one-man battle against the FBI for more than a decade.

In New York City, meanwhile, the book was being circulated today as vicious and thoroughly unfair by one of the Nation's foremost authorities on civil liberties. He is Morris L. Ernst, counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union.

"It will give great aid and comfort to the American Civil Liberties Union," Mr. Ernst said. According to Sloane Associates, Mr. Lowenthal has been collecting material for the book for 15 years and has documents it with care.

A spokesman for the FBI said today the author never had consulted the Bureau, either for basic information or for its answers to the many attacks quoted to discredit the FBI. A brief section on the American case of the stolen Government documents gives the impression that the FBI withheld papers from the prosecution. It neglects to mention the Tydings Senate subcommittee finding that the FBI handled the investigation with efficiency and thoroughness in keeping with the best traditions of that agency.

A spokesman for the FBI said today the author never had consulted the Bureau, either for basic information or for its answers to the many attacks quoted to discredit the FBI.

A brief section on the American case of the stolen Government documents gives the impression that the FBI withheld papers from the prosecution. It neglects to mention the fact that the Tydings Senate subcommittee found that the FBI handled the investigation with efficiency and thoroughness in keeping with the best traditions of that agency.

A spokesman for the FBI said today the author never had consulted the Bureau, either for basic information or for its answers to the many attacks quoted to discredit the FBI.

A brief section on the American case of the stolen Government documents gives the impression that the FBI withheld papers from the prosecution. It neglects to mention the fact that the Tydings Senate subcommittee found that the FBI handled the investigation with efficiency and thoroughness in keeping with the best traditions of that agency.

A spokesman for the FBI said today the author never had consulted the Bureau, either for basic information or for its answers to the many attacks quoted to discredit the FBI.

A brief section on the American case of the stolen Government documents gives the impression that the FBI withheld papers from the prosecution. It neglects to mention the fact that the Tydings Senate subcommittee found that the FBI handled the investigation with efficiency and thoroughness in keeping with the best traditions of that agency.
Harry Truman does not believe that.

The Communists have carried on a persistent campaign of disinformation and vilification of Hoover and the FBI. This organization is the one agency in the country that has attacked the Communists at every turn. Without the evidence of the FBI, the Communist Party, the conviction of the 11 Red leaders could never have been obtained. The stooges of the Kremlin want to discredit Hoover, destroy his prestige and be relieved of any effective check on their own activities more than anything else.

For politicians, the same criticism has been made of the State Department. They would like to depose Mr. Hoover, but to date he has not been able to do so. The storm of protest in Congress and among the public would be overwhelming.

Truman has no sympathy for the Communists. We are convinced of that. He is and has been, however, a very mistaken man in his judgment of the menace. The President is as much concerned for the security of the nation as any ordinary citizen. But he is also a stubborn man and would like to reduce his dislike of Edgar Hoover to action and remove him. We do not know whether or not Mr. Truman is prepared to act on this issue, which has been characterized by the press administration and its most avid supporters. It is evident that they look upon the late election returns of the Democratic party as an off-year protest. We believe they are mistaken.

The editorial in the New York Times on November 20, 1953, (Commentary by Paul: "Thought Control in the United States")

One of the distinguishing features of a fascistic state is the limitation of freedom of the press and the establishment of police control over thought. It was that way in Fascist Italy and in the Nazi Germany under Hitler. Today, these abominable characteristics of a police-state are appearing openly in the United States.

Control over the thought of the United States is the primary duty of Hoover and his G-men. Making use of the power of his administrative position, he has flooded the United States with thousands


Harold Iukes, using the words of the late Judge Oliver H. Oakes, called the practices of the FBI a "dirty business." The well-known progressive writer, a member of the Daily Worker, says that the FBI has become the instrument of the government for the suppression of dissent.

BOOMING SPREADS SPITE MANIA

You listeners probably know of cases where people were accused of disloyalty and were disbaled from their jobs on the basis of the evidence of the FBI. Not until they were able to clear themselves and to restore their good names, these people did not even know who was accusing them and what they were accused of.

Hoover's Pacifist hoodlums are spreading a spy mania. They are trying to intimidate the United States people and to close their mouths. By means of police spying and provocation they seek to destroy the will of the United States people to fight for peace and their rights and are trying to turn the people into doctile tools of the Imperialists whose tasks is to unleash a new world war. Peace and war cannot be separated.

Alongside the colossal expenditures for preparing a new war and for the arms drive, the ruling circles of the United States are appropriating huge sums for the facsimilation of the state apparatus. More than $200,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is used every year to maintain the secret service. The Morgue, Rockefeller and, du Pont are the pillars of the United States people to serve without a murmur as cannon fodder for their criminal adventurist policy.

Throughout the United States there is a growing movement of protest against Pesett and the FBI.
Mr. VELEDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELEDE. I compliment the distinguished gentleman for the fine dissertation he has made on the record of Max Lowenthal in this book. However, I am fearful lest our explanation of the fraud in which he was engaged when he wrote this book may further enrich his pocketbook by the sale of books. So I would like at this time to ask the American public to place a boycott against the book, Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Max Lowenthal. This gentleman has had his nose at the trough of the New Deal bureaucracy too long now, and I would regret very much to see him further enriched by the sale of this book.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I think it proper to take this occasion to compliment my distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee for this very beautiful and appropriate tribute to the American soldier.
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THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1949

Mr. Himes: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as I understand it, is the most efficient law enforcement agency we have. I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that in the last 12 years the FBI has stopped sabotage in this country and in bringing to the notice of the Department of Justice thousands of persons who have been engaged in criminal activities. The FBI is the most efficient law enforcement agency in the United States.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the FBI is the most efficient law enforcement agency in the United States. It is the responsibility of the FBI to protect the safety of the American people.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the FBI is the most efficient law enforcement agency in the United States. It is the responsibility of the FBI to protect the safety of the American people.
In the so-called Red raids of 1920, J. Edgar Hoover, then the Director of the FBI, raised his voice in protest against the raids. He believed the raids were unjustified and raised his concerns with the Attorney General. Hoover later became the first Director of the FBI, where he was known for his brilliant management of the Bureau.

During the 1930s, Hoover was involved in several legal proceedings related to the suppression of Communism. He was quoted as saying, "I wish to place the blame for these funds at the hands of the government."

In 1939, Hoover was appointed by President Roosevelt to manage the reorganization of the FBI. Hoover was known for his strict discipline and his efforts to maintain the integrity of the Bureau.

Hoover's tenure as FBI Director was marked by a series of controversies, including the Hoover Hearings held in 1944 to investigate his role in the raid of the Postal Bureau on May 6, 1943. The hearings revealed that Hoover was involved in the planning and execution of the raid.

After the hearings, Hoover's role in the raid was extensively investigated by the Senate Judiciary Committee and they failed to hold him responsible for the actions.

There is another source of information on Hoover's role in the raids. During that period, Hoover was often listed as the head of the Department of Justice, which oversaw the FBI. It appears that he was involved in the planning and execution of the raids.

During the 1930s, Hoover was often involved in legal proceedings related to the suppression of Communism. It appears that he was involved in the planning and execution of the raids.

I wish to place the blame for these raids on the government. I have no personal, direct knowledge of the role that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover played in the so-called New England raids. I am not aware of any involvement on his part in the suppression of Communism.

I believe that the Hoover Hearings held in 1944 were a complete miscarriage of justice. It appears that Hoover was involved in the planning and execution of the raids.

During the 1930s, Hoover was often involved in legal proceedings related to the suppression of Communism. It appears that he was involved in the planning and execution of the raids.

I wish to place the blame for these raids on the government. I have no personal, direct knowledge of the role that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover played in the so-called New England raids. I am not aware of any involvement on his part in the suppression of Communism.
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Your letter dated December 4, 1950, has been received, and I do want to extend my personal appreciation to the members of [redacted].

It is indeed encouraging to know that your faith and confidence in the FBI is unshaken by the unjustifiable attack directed against it in the recent publication by Max Lumenthal. Please extend to the members of [redacted] the thanks of all of us in the FBI, and I trust that our efforts will always merit their confidence and support.

In view of the discussion which took place at your recent meeting, I am enclosing some material which I thought you might bring to the attention of [redacted].

Sincerely yours,

Enclosure:
Excerpt from the Congressional Record, September 1, 1950.
Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.

Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.

Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

For your information:

The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

102-25733-256

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X DELETED PAGE(S) X
X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
X FOR THIS PAGE X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

FBI/DOJ
Dear Mr. Clarvoe:

The editorial entitled "An Unfair Book About the G-Men" which appeared in the December 1, 1950, edition of the San Francisco News has been brought to my attention, and I want you to know that I read it with a great deal of pleasure.

Your support in this matter is a source of extreme satisfaction to my associates and to me personally.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

cc - San Francisco

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREBY IS UNCLASSIFIED
About the G-Men

Max Lowenthal's book, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," has attracted more attention than, in our opinion, it deserves.

It is primarily a voluminous compilation of all the criticisms publicly uttered against the FBI since its creation, with no balancing evaluation of the criticism, and with little space or weight given to the FBI's solid accomplishments and to favorable comment from even the same sources Mr. Lowenthal quotes as critical.

For instance, the book includes numerous quotations from editorials in the Scripps-Howard Newspapers concerning isolated actions of the FBI—all critical. Nowhere do we find any favorable Scripps-Howard comment about the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover.

Yet our offhand recollection is that Scripps-Howard's editorial appraisals of the work of the FBI and of Mr. Hoover have been about 10-to-1 favorable. That's probably a better rating than these columns have given any other Government agency or human institution.

We cannot believe the FBI's good reputation will be damaged by this book. No other unit in the executive branch of the Government is as secure in the confidence of the public and of Congress. The same goes for its director, Mr. Hoover. And for the good reason that the confidence has been well-earned.

Washington over the last 30-odd years, in various official and unofficial capacities. He has never made any secret of his active dislike for Mr. Hoover and the whole G-Men setup. Only thing new is that he has written a book about it.

One item of news interest in the book is Mr. Lowenthal's confirmation of an oft-repeated rumor that President Truman rejected a suggestion from military advisers that Mr. Hoover be appointed head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). But that reflects no discredit on Mr. Hoover. To the contrary, the discrediting goes to Mr. Truman who missed an opportunity to make something of the CIA.

It is well known that the CIA, under a succession of administrators, has not been worth its salt—and we're not here downrating able Gen. Bedell Smith, present CIA chief, who has not been in office long enough to warm his seat.

But the obvious fact is that the CIA will never amount to anything until it gets a permanent chief of the caliber of Mr. Hoover and builds a staff of operatives of the G-Men caliber.
of captioned report has been reviewed by the Security Section.

Background:

The above copy contains a transcript of the testimony of the following individuals: Lee Pressman, August 29, 1950; Abraham George Silverman, August 31, 1950; Nathan Witt, September 1, 1950; Charles Kramer, September 1, 1950; John J. Abt, September 1, 1950; and Max Lowenthal, September 15, 1950.

Action:

The Bureau has Security Index cards on Pressman.

The New York Office has already been furnished with a transcript of the testimony of Pressman, Witt, Kramer, and Abt, after it was reviewed by the Security Section of the Bureau. In the case of Pressman, the Department has already been furnished a Bureau report reflecting the complete transcript of his testimony.

Action Being Taken:

EX-104 Additional copies of this report have just been obtained and a copy of same is being forwarded to the New York Office in order that that office will have a complete transcript of the testimony on Silverman and Lowenthal. The testimony of Lowenthal was recently reviewed by Crime Records Section in connection with the publication of the book on the FBI. This testimony was also reviewed in the Security Section.

The above is for your information. No further action is necessary.
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MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1950

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:50 a.m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.


Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; Donald T. Appell, and Courtney Owens, investigators; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and A. S. Peore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to call four witnesses who were subpoenaed for this morning, and ask that they be sworn in and then discharged until tomorrow morning. Their names are, Alex Leith—

Mr. Wood. Please answer to your names.

Mr. Tavenner. Alex Leith.

Mr. LEITH. My name is Alex Leith.

Mr. TAYLOR. Henry Fiering.

Mr. FIERING. My name is Henry Fiering.

Mr. TAYLOR. Winchard Dee.

Mr. DEE. My name is Winchard Dee.

Mr. TAYLOR. And Ben Riskin.

Mr. RISKIN. My name is Ben Riskin.

Mr. Wood. Come forward, please, gentlemen. Will you hold up your right hands, please. You and each of you solemnly swear that the evidence you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LEITH. I do.

Mr. FIERING. I do.

Mr. DEE. I do.

Mr. RISKIN. I do.

Mr. Wood. You are excused until 10 o'clock in the morning, gentlemen.

Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call at this time Mr. Lee Pressman.

Mr. Wood. Let us have order, please.
In the early 1930's, Mr. Chairman, as you may well recall, as well as other members of this committee, there was a very severe depression in our country. The future looked black for my generation just emerging from school. As a result, I joined a Communist group in Washington, D.C., in about 1934. My participation in this group extended for about a year, to the best of my recollection. I recall that about the latter part of 1935—the precise date I cannot recall, but it is a matter of public record—I left the Communist group and left Washington to enter the private practice of law in New York City. And at that time I discontinue any further participation in the Communist organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I state the following at this time:

There were three other persons in that group in addition to myself. They were all at the time with me in the Department of Agriculture, and all had been named before this committee by others.

I state to you that I am prepared, as I will indicate, to answer any question regarding my activities in the past up to the present, and possibly project my viewpoint into the future. It would be offensive to me, as it would be to practically all people, to have to name individuals with whom I have associated in the past.

What I have stated to you would indicate that I offer no additional information that this committee does not already have. However, that is a decision which this committee will have to make in regard to its questions to me and the directives you issue to me.

With all due respect, there may be others like myself who, out of deep convictions, will change their beliefs. If this committee assumes the position that those who do change their convictions and beliefs, as I have, must also be compelled to tell what I submit would be an offensive—offensive to one's own personal position, that might well be discouraging to other people to do what I have done. But, I repeat, that is a decision which this committee will have to make.

Now, I believe it of interest to comment that I have no knowledge regarding the political beliefs or affiliations of Alger His. And when I say I have no knowledge, I am not endeavoring to quibble with this committee. I appear here, as I necessarily must, as a lawyer. I am a lawyer. When one asks me for knowledge, knowledge to my mind is based on fact, and I have no facts. And bear in mind, sir, that as an attorney, to be asked to comment on a case now pending in court is an unusual experience for an attorney. Anything I say undoubtedly may have an impact on one way or another on that case, and for that reason I am trying to be very, very precise. I do, however, I can state as a matter of knowledge, that for the period of my participation in that group, which is the only basis on which I can say I have knowledge, Alger His was not a member of that group.

Now, those two statements of mine are based on knowledge, which encompasses facts within my possession. If I do not believe that this committee would want me to hazard conjectural surmise, that is not my function. You want from me, I assume, facts and nothing but facts.

Now, there has been a great deal of wild speculation, a great deal of unfortunate distortion, regarding my name as it arose in the course of previous testimony before this committee by a man named Chambers.
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Now, I think it would be in order, Mr. Chairman, for me again to
make one or two brief observations regarding present conditions which
have had a bearing on the position which I have taken.

A grave crisis confronts our Nation and all humanity today. The
warfare raging in Korea threatens to unleash a world conflict which
would destroy our civilization. All my life I have opposed aggression.
I therefore denounce the fighting initiated by the North Korean forces
in South Korea. The Communist Party and its forces in the labor
movement, as they have expressed themselves publicly, are the
supporters and apologists for an aggressive war. I vigorously oppose
this position. I desire to support the United Nations and my country.
It is my fervent hope that the United Nations can devise immediate
steps which can bring about a quick end to the present bloodshed and
assure world peace.

The onrush of frightful conflict between ideological forces today
threatens our destruction. We find the resurgence of naziism assisted
by the release of die-hard Nazis who were convicted of the most
horrible crimes. We are confronted by the driving aggressive
Communist attack. Our survival must be based upon the people's under-
standing of the true meaning and worth of American democracy and
their determination to fight for its preservation and full enjoyment.

Each individual, Mr. Chairman, must constantly peer into his own
consciousness to evaluate his convictions upon which to base his faith
and creed. The position that I have taken today was not taken haphazardly.
It was taken after careful and due consideration and deliberation. The
people who I have represented today, Mr. Chairman, stems from very
profound convictions. There may be questions in people's minds regarding
the position I have taken. I can only say that I state as a matter of
fact that the position I have assumed stems from a profound
sincerity on my part.

I deeply appreciate that within our democratic way of life, when past
beliefs prove false, when a human being finds that he has made
mistakes, there is the opportunity for change and to contribute in what-
ever way possible toward the dignity and well-being of man and the
preservation of peace for all humanity.

Those are my observations which express my knowledge of my
activities of the past and my present viewpoint. If you have questions
of me, Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavor the best I can to answer the
questions.

Mr. Wood, before members of the committee are given an opportu-
nity to ask questions, Mr. Counsel do you have questions to ask?

Mr. Tavenner. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pressman, what is your present address?

Mr. Pressman. 225 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. Tavenner. That is your residential address?

Mr. Pressman. My office address.

Mr. Tavenner. What is your residential address?

Mr. Pressman. Is there need for that, Mr. Chairman, to be in
the record?

Mr. Tavenner. You have furnished the committee with a state-
ment of your employment since 1936 when you were appointed as
general counsel for the CIO, but will you go back and give us a state-
ment of...
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winter of 1935, that I resigned from both of those positions, left Washington and the Government service, and returned to New York to reopen the private practice of law. I became a partner in a law firm in New York City.

In June 1938 I was asked by Mr. John Lewis, then chairman of the Committee for Industrial Organization, if I would become general counsel for the Steelworkers Organizing Committee, et al. I believe, June 15, 1936. I said yes, and from that time until June 1938 I was in the private practice of law in New York and acting part time as counsel for the Steelworkers Organizing Committee as one of my clients.

In 1938, I moved to Washington and acted as full-time general counsel for the CIO and the Steelworkers Organizing Committee.

Mr. Tavener. If I understood you correctly, you came to Washington in the spring of 1935?

Mr. Pressman. Sometime around May or June. I forget the exact month.

Mr. Tavener. Where did you reside in Washington?

Mr. Pressman. I believe it was 3000 Connecticut Avenue, my first residence here.

Mr. Nixon. Right opposite the zoo?

Mr. Pressman. That is right, a large apartment house there.

Mr. Nixon. Weren't you on the second or third floor there?

Mr. Pressman. That is correct. Were you my neighbor, Mr. Congressman?

Mr. Nixon. I just know Washington.

Mr. Tavener. When did you leave your employment as general counsel for the AAA, will you state the reason for your change?

Mr. Pressman. When I left what, sir?

Mr. Tavener. You were general counsel or assistant general counsel of the AAA. When you left that employment and went to be general counsel of FERA and then Works Progress Administration, what was your reason for making that change, and what were the circumstances surrounding it?

Mr. Pressman. Mr. Counsel, you know very well I had no reason. That change was forced upon me. At that time, as is well known, Mr. Wallace, who was Secretary of Agriculture, asked for the resignation of Jerome Frank, who was general counsel of Triple A, along with several assistants of Mr. Jerome Frank. I was among them. My resignation was submitted. Immediately thereafter Mr. Harry Hopkins asked if I would accept employment as general counsel of FERA and I accepted.

Mr. Tavener. What were the circumstances surrounding your leaving the Government service in the winter of 1935?

Mr. Pressman. I had decided that I had, to my way of thinking, sufficient experience in Washington and in the Federal service, and I wanted to return to the private practice of law.

Mr. Tavener. Was your resignation in any way suggested by a superior?

Mr. Pressman. Absolutely not.

Mr. Tavener. Or was it a purely voluntary act on your part?
Mr. Parisseaux. Your point is that the three people you refer to were in the Department of Agriculture, not in the Communist Party. That is up to you to decide. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to outdo you. I think we have a very important question involved here, and it is up to the committee to decide which is the question to ask the witnesses about. The committee's objective is to find out what is going on in the United States, and you oppose what you have indicated that you believe the Government is doing. Mr. Warren. As I understand Mr. Pressman's position, he is fearful that his name would be brought up, not by the Government, but by the people who have been investigated. Mr. Pressman has been investigated, and it is only proper that his name should be brought up by the Government.
Mr. Case. You said Harold Ware recruited you into the Communist Party. Was he an employee of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. Pressman. No.

Mr. Case. Was he a member of the group?

Mr. Pressman. We did not consider him a member of the group.

Mr. Case. But you knew he was a Communist?

Mr. Pressman. I assume so. He recruited me into the party.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions, Mr. Nixon?

Mr. Nixon. Yes. I think it is important to develop this point for this reason: I think that we are certainly quibbling over whether or not Mr. Pressman should be required to give the names of the members of this group. I don't think the committee should set a precedent that when an individual comes in as Mr. Pressman does—and we appreciate his coming—he can come in and answer only those questions he determines he should answer. I think he should be required to answer the question before him about others in or out of the Government who were members. I think it is extremely important that he answer the question, and that the precedent that would be set if he is not required to answer would be a very bad one.

Just so there will be absolute clarity of the record, as I understand, the records of this committee show that the three members of the group who were in the Department of Agriculture were John Aht, Nathan Witt, and Henry Collins.

Mr. Pressman. Henry Collins, to my knowledge, was never an employee of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Nixon. Then for that reason you should answer the question.

Mr. Pressman. Your records are wrong.

Mr. Nixon. You yourself said you wanted to clear up distortions about yourself, and I assume other individuals, in the files of this committee. Apparently the files of the committee are wrong in respect to Mr. Collins. Obviously Mr. Aht and Mr. Witt are two of the members of the group. I think you should name the other one. Nathan Witt and John Aht are two. That I am sure of myself. I think Mr. Pressman should clear up who is the third one.

Mr. Wood. You say the record of this committee, if it includes Collins, is wrong?

Mr. Pressman. I think your own record will show that Mr. Collins was an employee of the National Recovery Administration and not of the triple A.

Mr. Wood. I will ask you to name the other employee of the Department of Agriculture who was a member of the group.

Mr. Pressman. The third person among the individuals who have been named as members of this group who was an employee of the Department of Agriculture when I was in 1934 was Charles Kramer.

Mr. Wood. Charles who?

Mr. Pressman. Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r. He was employed by the Department of Agriculture at the time I was.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions on that point?

Mr. Case. You say Henry Collins at that time was an employee of another branch of the Government?

Mr. Pressman. Are you stating a fact or asking me a question?

Mr. Case. I am asking you that question.

Mr. Pressman. I take that from your own record.
Mr. Pressman. I think it is advisable to explain that situation
did not. He was not a member of my group.
Mr. Wood. Did you first meet Peters?
Mr. Pressman. I just knew that it was an individual. Let me
I was not. I have not been told by any other
I cannot state of my own knowledge
Mr. Pressman. That is correct.
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Mr. Wood. You know who delivered it?
Mr. Moulder. As a group?
Mr. Tavenner. Where were those meetings held?
Mr. Pressman. Usually at our respective homes; sometimes at
someplace other than our respective homes; maybe once or twice
elsewhere. The incident would not stand out in my recollection
particularly.
Mr. Tavenner. To whom did you pay your Communist Party
dues?
Mr. Pressman. Usually the person who came and delivered our
literature would accept our dues.
Mr. Tavenner. Did you pay dues only twice during that year?
Mr. Pressman. No. Harold Ware would come down more
frequently, obviously.
Mr. Tavenner. Then who were the persons to whom you paid
your Communist Party dues?
Mr. Pressman. I have just stated, Harold Ware, and Peters on
the occasion he came down.
Mr. Tavenner. Where there any others?
Mr. Pressman. No.
Mr. Tavenner. Were any of the other employees of AAA members
of that group before you joined, or did they join after you?
Mr. Pressman. Mr. Counsel, I have attempted, as I was preparing
for this meeting, to refresh my recollection, and, frankly I cannot state
accurately just what the order of precedence was, how it occurred.
I believe others may have joined the party before I did. In any event,
there was a period of time between the others and myself.
My recollection is we all appeared about the same time.
Mr. Tavenner. Did you recruit any of those members in the
organization?
Mr. Pressman. I did not.
Mr. Tavenner. Did you endeavor to recruit any of those members
in the organization?
Mr. Pressman. I did not endeavor to recruit any of those
individuals, and have not endeavored to recruit any individual into
the party from 1932 to date.
Mr. Tavenner. Who were the officials of this group or cell to which
you belonged?
Mr. Pressman. We had no officials. It was just a group.
Mr. Tavenner. Was there not a leader of that group, or someone
in charge?
Mr. Pressman. There was absolutely no leader. We were a group.
However, it may not be true that a more colorful story for me to talk about
leaders, but giving you facts, this is precisely what occurred; we were
a group. If there was a task to perform, one individual would be
assigned to that task, such as receiving literature. If there were dues
to be collected, an individual would be assigned to the task of collect-
ing dues. It would be left to the discretion of an individual to call
the next meeting and arrange whether it would be at my home or at
the home of another member. That is the way it worked out during
the period I was in the group.
(Rev. Francis E. Walter left the hearing room.)
Mr. Tavenner. You spoke of assignments being given to various
ones to do certain jobs. Who made the assignments?
Mr. Pressman. The members of our group, or by volunteering.
One would say, "I will do this or that," or we agreed to do this or that,