



Congressional Record

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD – HOUSE
March 3, 1960 (Pages 4393 – 4407)

UNCERTAIN TRUMPETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain relevant material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of our colleague who is about to address us, I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include some editorial comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the 14th chapter, 8th verse, of First Corinthians asks, “For, if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?”

We live today in an uncertain world—a world of uncertain peoples, pursuing uncertain courses. None is qualified to say that this proposal is absolutely right, nor that absolutely wrong, and the regiments of good and evil are called to their places in the struggle by uncertain trumpets.

Controversy appears the order of the day, and in the heat of conflict it is sometimes impossible to determine who carries the standard of right and who the banner of evil.

But, Mr. Speaker, it appears our lot to live in and with controversy, and to maintain silence when confronted with what appears to be wrong is only to compound a grievous affront against truth. One has but the light of conscience to direct his actions and words, and this lamp the gentleman from California proposes to follow today wherever it may lead him. Abraham Lincoln, in his reflections on duty, said, in part:

I do the very best I know how—the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won’t amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

In what I propose to say today, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that some will accuse me of ranging myself against the angels, for I shall speak of some whom I consider to be “uncertain trumpets” in an hour that calls for the truest tone and the most vibrant notes if we Americans are to surmount the threats, that encompass us as a people, and which may affect our very survival in the nuclear age.

One of the most violent of the ‘controversies to erupt during recent months grew out of certain statements respecting the infiltration of Communist influence into a segment of the American Protestant church. These statements were included in an Air Force Training Manual, designed to be used in the security instruction of Air Force Reserve non-commissioned officers. Other statements in the subject manual have also been criticized, but it is not my purpose today to discuss these, but to confine myself to those allegations protested against by spokesmen for the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S. In the National Council of Churches are a number of Protestant denominations, including some of the greatest of American church institutions. The National Council states that it is the spokesman for, and

represents 38,000,000 communicants in the member churches. The matter of representation I shall discuss at greater length hereafter.

On page 15-14 of the Air Reserve Training Manual, NR45-0050, the following statements appear in the chapter titled "Security Investigations and Clearances." Under a subtitle, "Communism In Religion," and continuing for approximately five pages, the authors of the manual set forth what they consider to be documented evidence of infiltration by Communists into some church activities in the United States. It would appear that most of the information contained in the manual on the general subject was drawn from governmental sources, although in some instances the source of the material quoted was several times removed from the original. I shall not quote the entire text of the "Communism in Religion" section at this time; but, under unanimous consent, I include the material at this point in the RECORD, to the end that Members may have access to the exact quotes used in the original text. I should add that the textbook has been withdrawn by the Department of the Air Force, and is presently under study, preliminary to revision.

COMMUNISM IN RELIGION

From a variety of authoritative sources, there appears to be overwhelming evidence of Communist antireligious activity in the United States through the infiltration of fellow-travelers into churches and educational institutions.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A officially sponsored the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Of the 95 persons who served in this project, 30 have been affiliated with pro-Communist fronts, projects, and publications.

In its own brochure, the National Council of Churches listed the names of the Revision Committee and the Advisory Board. Among these were Walter Russell Bowie of Grace Church, New York; Henry J. Cadbury of Harvard University; George Dahl of Yale University; Frederick C. Grant of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary; and Leroy Waterman of the University of Michigan. All of these men were affiliated, for example, with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties- (NFCL).

The House Committee on Un-American Activities said of the NFCL: "There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties * * * is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." Former Attorney General Francis Biddle described the NFCL thus: "Part of what Lenin called the 'solar system of organizations,' ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program."

Not only were these men affiliated with the NFCL, but many similar Communist fronts or enterprises—Walter Russell Bowie with a total of 29; Henry J. Cadbury and George Dahl, 13; Frederick C. Grant, 8; and Leroy Waterman, 25. Among the other fronts with which these individuals were variously members were: The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born; and the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder. Many more similar activities could be named if space permitted, with the names of the other religious leaders involved who also participated in the Bible revision mentioned.

Fleming James of the University of the South was a member of the Bible Revision Committee and also a signer of an appeal for amnesty for 11 Communist Party leaders, These leaders had been convicted for conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by violence and had been sentenced to 5 years in prison.

Dr. E. Stanley Jones, a Christian missionary of one of the leading Protestant denominations, is considered in the circles of the National Council of Churches to be one of the outstanding Christian missionaries in the world. Nevertheless, he has consistently urged a collectivist form of government for America and praised the Soviet slave state as superior to the American system. In his book, "The Choice Before Us," Dr. Jones wrote: "The statement communism loses sight of the individual in the mass is obviously not true of a theory that culminates in the words: 'To each according to his needs, and from each according to his ability.' The fact is as someone has said, 'communism is the only political - theory that really holds the Christian position of the absolute equality of every individual.' " Dr. Jones should explain to some of those who have suffered in Red slave labor camps what he means by "equality of every individual."

In comparing nazism, fascism, communism, and capitalism, Dr. Jones wrote: "Of all these supreme

things, capitalism seems to have the cheapest and most tawdry goal.” Dr. Jones further gave us a clear idea of his opinion of communism when he wrote: “When the Western World was floundering in an unjust and competitive order, and the church was bound up with it and was part of that order, God reached out and put His hand on the Russian Communists to produce a more just order.”

Dr. Harry F. Ward, long a recognized leader - in the National Council of Churches, was a professor of Christian ethics at Union Theological Seminary in New York City for some 25 years, during which time he influenced thousands of theological students. Dr. Ward was identified by Louis Francis Budenz (an ex-Communist) before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as a member of the Communist Party. Ex-Communist Leonard Patterson testified that Dr. Ward, himself, Earl Browder, and others were assigned to a top policymaking body of the Communist Party. Ex-Communist Manning Johnson - referred to Dr. Ward as the “Red dean of the Communist Party in the religious field.” To show the thinking of Dr. Ward, in a radio broadcast on May 21, 1946, he stated: “the Soviet Union is progressing and growing up economically and politically since the time of the Czars, while capitalist society is starving and going down.” Neither Dr. Ward nor his works have been repudiated by the Union Theological Seminary, an Interdenominational seminary highly rated in national council circles.

A word about Louis Budenz, who testified concerning Dr. Ward, is in order at this point. Budenz was for many years an active Communist and a former labor editor of the Daily Worker. After turning against communism, he wrote these books: “This Is My Story,” 1946; “Men Without Faces,” 1950; “The Cry Is Peace,” 1952; “The Techniques of Communism,” 1953; and “Ex-Red,” 1954. Since 1946 he has been a professor of economics at Fordham University.

Herbert A. Philbrick, author of “I Led Three Lives,” for 9 years an undercover agent for the FBI, said in a speech before the Daughters of the American Revolution, April 18, 1956: “We are losing the fight with communism * * * there are more names of ministers than any other profession on the list of Communist supporters in this country. * * * Protest this to your religious leaders. * * * ‘If their name is on the list, demand that they withdraw from it or kick them out of your church organization.’”

COMMUNISM AND RELIGION IN RED CHINA AND NORTH KOREA

Rev. Shih-ping Wang, East Asia director of the Baptist Evangelization Society International, appearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee in March 1959, described at some length the commune system recently instituted in Red China. “This system has hurt the churches,” he said, “because it has given the government much more complete control of the people and all worship has been forbidden in the communes”. Concerning the system of communes, the Reverend Shih-ping Wang stated:

“The family unit is broken up. Husbands and wives are separated into different barracks. The children are taken away from the parents and placed in government-run nurseries. Husbands and wives may meet only once a week for 2 hours—they have, no other contact. Because these places of meeting are few, couples must stand in line at the special rooms waiting their turn. After they have finished, they must report to the commune group leader to tell the date and time and ‘how long they stayed together. They must also report what they said and did together. The parents may see their children once a week and when they see them they cannot show affection toward their children. The idea is to have the children and the family sever their affection and direct it toward the state. Names are taken away from the children, and they are given numbers. There is no individual identity. The basic unit of social life in the commune is the commune itself.”

Reverend Wang was questioned further by the interrogator for the House Un-American Activities Committee: “Do families try to meet at other times between the approved once-a-week meetings?” In reply, Reverend Wang stated: “They cannot meet because they are not consigned to the same place and do not have freedom to travel. They come to work in a group, eat in a group, work in a group, and return in a group. There is no opportunity for individuals to get away and see their families. Husbands and wives are placed on different communes. Travel between, communes is only possible if the traveler has a pass. There is no contact between the once-a-week meetings;”

The commune system, the Reverend Wang continued, is destroying morality in Red China: “There is

no morality because the love of the family is taken away. There is no honesty and respect among men or between men. There is no human dignity; they are all like animals. There is no guilt associated with the murder of individuals for the improvement of the state. In Communist Party circles, a woman must submit herself to any party member who desires her favors. If the woman refuses a party member, she may be thrown into jail or stripped and nailed to a wall until she dies. Another punishment is to cut the breasts off the woman who refuses.”

Concerning the religious activities and beliefs of the Communists, the Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng stated to the same House committee:

“At best they preach modernism: Christ the model for all humanity. They take away the divinity of Christ and point out He was a good carpenter, a good example for the working people to follow. At the worst they substitute Lenin the father, Stalin the son, and Mao Tse-tung the holy ghost, for the Triune God of the Christians. They have completely changed the Christian faith. Where Christian teachings fit in with Communist aims, they are retained. Where they do not, they are eliminated.”

In similar vein, the Reverend Tsin-tsai Liu testified: “With respect to the Bible * * * they teach that Jesus was a laborer, a carpenter’s son, a proletariat and because he was from the working class and wanted to establish a working class, the rich people (the Pharisees) crucified him because he was a revolutionist, or as the Communists say, a Communist, and that is the way they teach it.”

Reverend Liu stated that the Communists were friendly when they first took over China in 1949, but began wholesale persecutions of Protestant churches in 1950. Christian leaders were placed under house arrest. In addition, Christians had to be “reeducated” by attending confession classes to reveal their past associations and beliefs. After the Christian ministers and leaders were arrested, they were replaced with Communists.

The Communists confiscated the churches and then rented them back to the people at fantastic rentals. When the people could not pay these rentals, the churches were closed. “The only churches that were ‘allowed’ to remain open were Communist-run churches that serve as showcases for visitors,” said the Reverend Liu. Furthermore, Reverend Liu did not believe that these churches would ever be closed by the Communists because “they are a good means of spreading ‘propaganda and reeducating the people. Also, the churches give them an appearance of a dignified civilization.”

The foregoing hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities were published in an official Government bulletin on March 26, 1959, and doubtless released previously to the Nation’s press. Nevertheless, a United Press International News dispatch of May 7, 1959, said, “A distinguished American theologian has some stern words to offer on the problem of communism and Christianity.” The distinguished theologian was none other than Dr. John’ A. Mackay, retiring president of Princeton Theological Seminary. The news dispatch went on to say: “Dr. John Mackay * * * charged that America is turning its back on untold thousands of Christians in Red China. Dr. Mackay called for the recognition of Red China * * * backing a resolution that had been adopted at the General Assembly of the * * * Church meeting at Indianapolis. In, Mackay told the delegates that while Red China had done some terrible things, so had the United States.”

Dr. Billy James Hargis, an evangelist and head of the Christian Crusade, Tulsa, Okla., commented on the foregoing as follows:

“Here is a typical example of the twisted and deceiving play on words used by left-wing clergymen in their attempts to disguise their blatant support of important Communist conspiracy objectives. Let’s analyze Dr. Mackay’s charge that America is turning its back on untold thousands of Christians in Red China.’ This charge is merely a continuation of a propaganda campaign Dr. Mackay has been carrying on in behalf of the Red Chinese slavemasters for years. He called for recognition of Red China and its admission to the UN back in December 1949. On December 10, 1956, he spoke before 400 religious executives in Indianapolis, Ind., and called for the sending of a delegation of American church leaders to Red China to ‘reestablish contact with colleagues there.’ * * *

“Dr. Mackay and other apologists for communism in the churches would have us to believe that there is actually freedom of religion in Red China and other Communist conspiracy held nations. They refuse to face the documented and indisputable facts about the Communist conspiracy’s takeover of churches in Communist nations, and how the Communists are utilizing these churches to promote the cause of atheistic

communism. Now let us remember one thing—that is, that Dr. Mackay is not speaking of the suffering, persecuted Christians of China who have been tortured, sent to slave camps and denied the right to worship God. (Many were killed) Dr. Mackay is speaking of the so-called Christian leaders who were intimidated into cooperating with communism by converting their churches into tools for promoting Communist propaganda and objectives. He is speaking of the phony pastors placed in the churches by Communist leaders.”

The resolution to admit Red China to the United Nations mentioned above is the same Resolution that prompted the editorial of June 3, 1959, discussed earlier.

In North Korea, the practices of communism and its attacks on religion are much the same as in Red China. Instead of the system of communes, North Koreans are governed under what is referred to as an “agricultural association system.” In operation, it is quite similar to the commune system.

Concerning religion, Mr. Kyung Rai Kim, a deacon in the Hung Chun Presbyterian Church in Seoul, testified before the same hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities mentioned above. He stated “There are no true Christian Churches in Northern Korea; * * * persecution since 1945, intensified since the Korea War has closed the churches in North Korea. There are churches, but they are Communist-run churches.” Upon being asked by the interrogator for the House committee as to how the disintegration of Christian churches was being accomplished, Mr. Kim said: “Through brainwashing of the younger people; through the replacing of Christian values with Communist values; through the agricultural association system which makes the individual completely dependant upon the state for his food and existence.

From all of the foregoing, you can judge for yourself how much you must be alert, and how carefully you must evaluate any conversation, speech, article, sermon, or book which you may have occasion to hear or read if the subject touches adversely upon any aspect of the American way of life—our religions, our morals, our social lives, or our political and economic institutions. We believe in the dignity of man—of the right of every individual to choose his manner of living, worship, his occupation, in short, everything that he does, so long as the rights of other individuals are respected. In contrast, the Communists believe the state to be supreme—in individual lives, in family life, in morals, in religion, in government, and in the economics of making a living.

These statements were vigorously protested by spokesmen for the National Council of Churches as being defamatory, and a demand was made for the withdrawal of the manual, repudiation by the Air Force of the statements contained in it, and an apology by the Department of Defense to the national council. The Department of Defense and of the Air Force promptly acceded to the demand, without, so far as I know, making any effort to check the truth of the allegations. As I have said, the Air Force has assured the council that the revised version of the manual will not contain this material.

The Departments involved may have believed that by repudiation and apology the controversy would be resolved, but in taking precipitous action to still the tumult, the military poured high-octane fuel on an issue that has for many years divided clergy and laity in a score of church institutions throughout the country. The resultant explosion was destined to rock the land and inundate all of the participants in the affair under a sea of editorial comment, letters and telegrams.

That this area of our national life is a most difficult one in which a layman can tread, none will deny. Our greatness as a nation has always rested upon the firm faith of the American people in the existence of a Supreme Being. To commence a session of the Congress without first invoking the help and guidance of Heaven, would bring down upon all of us, and rightly, the condemnation of the people we represent. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, we can proceed on the sound premise that all of us—the men who comprise the board of the National Council, the Secretaries of Defense and Air Force, and the membership of the Congress, share with the American people a deep and profound faith in God and in divine justice.

The same issue was in controversy 7 years ago, following a speech by the gentleman from California who is now addressing the House. At that time I made several statements respecting the activities of some churchmen in Communist-front and pro-Communist organizations and publications. A bishop of the Methodist Church in the Washington area, on whose most recent activity I shall comment later, protested the speech in question, and later appeared voluntarily before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a daylong hearing designed to explore the allegations made, and to answer other questions

bearing on his purported support of Red causes. A collateral result of the hearing was that the gentleman from California found himself with a minister for an opponent in the next election. I will say no more on that point, except note that the minister, whom I hold high personal regard, is presently performing his duties to his congregation, while I again bring the pitcher to the well. In this connection it should be added that this is probably the last time the gentleman will be seen and heard the well of the House on this particular subject, inasmuch as he does not intend to be a candidate for Congress next November. And, Mr. Speaker, if some are inclined to attribute my willingness to engage in the controversy to that fact, I shall be content to rest on the judgment of my colleagues in the House as to the extent I have been willing to express my honest convictions for over 13 years.

I am in no manner qualified to discuss or debate the questions of theology, which are inherent in the present controversy. It is not to these points that my discussion is directed, Whether modernists are correct in their interpretations of Holy Writ, or whether those who are more fundamental in their approach are the bearers of true faith, do not profess to know. My only concern is when any of them appear to further the designs of Soviet aggression participation in organizations or movements directed, manipulated, or participated in by Communist functionaries.

I have heard it said that a great fish could not have swallowed Jonah, because the physical facts of the anatomy of the greatest of the denizens of the deep are such as to preclude getting Jonah in the belly of the whale, to say nothing of getting him out again. I suppose that I am a fundamentalist in this instance because I am firmly convinced that Almighty who could put the sun, the moon, the stars, and the planets in precise rotation, would not have a great deal of trouble in getting Jonah in and out of a fish. In any event, Mr. Speaker I am a Christian, born and reared in the shadow of a church spire, and one thing I do believe is that if there is a personification of Satan today, it is atheist communism, promulgated and forwarded by agents of the world conspiracy.

I believe that the substance of the statements made in the Air Force Manual are correct—that Communists have used church figures to forward the realization of Communist goals. I do not contend that the men who have permitted themselves to be so used are Communists, or Communist sympathizers, but I would point out that a loaded gun is dangerous in the hands of a 5-year-old child as it is in the hands of a hardened criminal. Actually, the child probably represents the greater menace, because he does not know what a lethal weapon he holds. By the same token, a minister having lent the prestige of his high calling and his title to Communist manipulation, renders to the Communist purpose a greater measure of gentility and respectability than could any dedicated member of the Communist conspiracy. People do not expect to find men of the cloth in the company of Communist, and when such an association is disclosed, the result is one of shock and bewilderment.

Communists have attempted to infiltrate every aspect of our national life. It is to the credit of the overwhelming majority of Protestant churchmen that this insidious effort has been repulsed in large part. But one must be truly blind to the facts and realities of life to contend, as do the spokesmen for the National Council of Churches, that there has been no infiltration at all, or that a few clergymen have not been duped into pulling red chestnuts out of the Communist fire.

On one basic premise there can be no substantial disagreement as between honest and fair men in the clergy and in the laity, The international Communist movement, at every level, views the church in every land as the greatest single obstacle confronting it in its unremitting effort to dominate the world and the minds of men. Where Communist Governments have found it possible to do so, they have closed the churches and persecuted the clergy. Where it was expedient to do so only for the period of time required to raise a godless generation, the Communists have contented themselves with the exercise of a strict control over churches and congregations. In other lands, including our own, the tactic has been that of infiltration rather than frontal attack. The Communists have sought to associate themselves in movements and activities, which were and are, by their very nature, appealing to churches and to churchmen. These Communist activities are supported, in major part, by non-Communists and simple dupes, who seldom equate a course parallel to Communist doctrine with any possible direction from within the sponsoring group.

More deadly in effect than a known Communist agent is the non-Communist who seeks blindly the good effect without adjusting his bifocals to look over and beyond the immediate and professed goal to the

ultimate Communist objective of a world in which religious faith will play no part, and have no role.

Where ministers have joined in common purpose with Communist agents, history records a tragic list of instances in which God lost a battle. Whether He loses a war—at least during the lifetime of our children—will depend upon a much more intelligent appraisal of contemporary events by some who appear willingly to have linked arms with Communists in making common purpose with their mortal and avowed foes.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go to the record for an example in point. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in executive session, was taking the testimony of an ordained minister in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. The hearing was conducted in 1951, and the witness in that hearing is today the head of a great church in Los Angeles. A forum, conducted in the church headed by the witness, has for years been a sounding board for Communist propaganda, and dozens of identified Communists have appeared as honored guests. The minister, when questioned as to the presence in his church of Communist speakers, declined to answer any questions on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. He likewise refused to answer as to his own membership in, and activities on behalf of, the Communist conspiracy,

Case II is that of a Methodist minister, identified under oath by three witnesses as a member of the Communist Party. I have not been able to determine whether the clergyman in question is still an ordained minister in the Methodist church, although the records indicate that within the past several years he occupied a pulpit in a Methodist church in California.

It is not only fallacious but dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to sweep this controversy under the carpet, or like the ostrich, simply stick our heads in the sand and pretend that what threatens us does not exist at all. Communism is not going to go away, nor are the agents of the conspiracy going to disappear into nothingness like the last vestiges of a nightmare. When spokesmen for the National Council of Churches protest any mention in any training manual of the threat of infiltration, they do a great disservice to public understanding of Communist tactics and techniques.

Communists and ministers share several things in common. Both have faith—the one in Divine Providence, and the other in the eventual victory of world communism. Both are dedicated—the minister to his high calling—the Communist to the spread of the Marxian philosophy. Both have a purpose—one to guide, minister and counsel those who look to him as a servant of God—and the other, the complete eradication of man's faith in spiritual values. So great a gap exists between the two extremes that it is inconceivable to me that one could be found in the company of the other at any time, to say nothing of becoming the center of a national controversy because of alleged cooperation.

The Congress of the United States and the men who comprise that body, share with a number of liberal churchmen a deep and real concern over the plight of millions of our fellow humans. Since 1948, the Congress has appropriated billions of dollars in an effort to alleviate suffering, hunger, privation, and disease. But members of the House Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations do not find it necessary to meet with, or associate themselves with, known Communist agents in their deliberations on courses of action to be pursued. Nor do the Members of Congress sign every petition laid on their desks, or lend the prestige of their names to organizations without investigating the nature of the petition or the makeup of the organization, which seeks their support. One can be for peace without associating oneself with those whose dedication to peace is always suspect. One can fight for civil rights without joining in the effort with those whose hands are red with the blood of slaughtered men, women, and children. One can appeal for justice for the Rosenbergs, Sobells, and Chessmans of our day, without the sponsorship of organizations, the leaders of which have never protested the persecution of the Christian church abroad, nor the violent antisemitism practiced in the Soviet Union.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, asserting that it is the spokesman for 38 million Protestant members of affiliated churches, protests that it is an affront to these millions of Americans to even suggest that any church has been infiltrated by the Communist philosophy. Does the National Council seriously suggest, in the first instance, that it can truly make any claim to representation of this vast number of church members? I doubt it. If there is any Member of the House who would presume to say that he speaks for all of the people he is elected to represent, I should like to meet him. Representation, whether it be in the National Council of Churches or on the board of directors of General

Motors, is in large part a matter of conjecture on the part of those who put out the figures. On the basis of the number of letters received in the House Committee on Un-American Activities during the past week, I would suggest that the National Council of Churches scale down their own estimate by some hundreds, at least. No group or individual in this country, be it the national chamber of commerce, the AFL-CIO, the American Legion, or the National Council of Churches, has any right to state categorically that it speaks for anything other than a majority of its membership, and only then after a painstaking effort to determine, by plebiscite or otherwise, the temper of the people who are arbitrarily ranged by remote spokesmen for or against any given proposal. It would be interesting to know just what the majority of American ministers, and the great body of American Protestants, really think with respect to the allegations made in the controversial Air Force manual. I, for one, do not propose to take the unsupported word of those who protest so strongly, although I believe as firmly in their right to protest as I do in my own privilege of disagreement. Until some more adequate evidence is produced to demonstrate the oneness of American Protestants with the National Council of Churches in this matter, the spokesmen for the council must be regarded as uncertain trumpets.

The statement being made today by the gentleman from California will, I am confident, be deliberately interpreted in some quarters and by some individuals for their own reasons, as an attack upon churches generally. This is the usual defense of those, who, when confronted with some embarrassing situation, promptly identify themselves with the group of which they are a part, and seek to identify their own acts with those of the group. Innocence by association has frequently been the plea of those who were by no means innocent. Thus it is that the fellow-traveling labor leader will protest any investigation of his personal activities is an attempt to intimidate and “smear” the labor movement. The educator, whose activities for and on behalf of the Communist movement results in bringing him under the scrutiny of Government agencies, frequently proclaims that the committee or agency is launching an attack on education, and that academic freedom is threatened.

Inquiry with respect to individuals in a movement is entirely proper, as distinguished from an investigation of the entire movement itself. No American, high or low, can be held to be unaccountable to anyone for his actions, and as the robes of a judge offer no protection to him for conduct unbecoming a jurist, neither are the robes of a churchman designed to insure him immunity for actions contrary to the national safety or the general welfare. It is important that this distinction be made and that it be understood by all Americans of whatever station or calling.

My distinguished colleague, Representative GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, made his point clear in his statement before the House Committee on Un-American Activities a week ago, at which time Secretary of the Air Force Sharp was before the committee for questioning on the Air Force Manual. On that occasion Mr. SCHERER said:

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just one more observation. I have been a member of this Committee on Un-American Activities for the past 8 years. Every time we have inquired into the attempts of Communists or Communist-front-operatives to worm their way into the churches, the committee has been bitterly attacked and charged with investigating religion—with opposing churches—with interfering with religious freedom in violation of the Constitution.

In connection with this current inquiry, these same charges are again being made by some people. I feel, therefore, it is necessary and timely that I point out a few facts which show conclusively that these accusations are completely false and that just the opposite is the truth.

In 1953 and 1954 this committee conducted some rather lengthy hearings, as I recall. Among others, we heard evidence from individuals who had been in the Soviet Union in the early days when the Communists began their unremitting assault upon the church. The testimony showed conclusively that the Communist apparatus early came to the conclusion that if communism was to succeed throughout the world, it would be necessary to destroy or neutralize the great religions of the world.

The Communists knew, and so stated, that it was the church that was one of the greatest obstacles to the eventual takeover of the peoples of the earth by the Communists. The Communists concluded that before people would or could accept the ideology of communism, religion, which they called the opiate of the people and which they said controlled the mass mind, had to be eliminated or neutralized.

The Communists first attempted a frontal assault on the church; they harassed, persecuted, and

imprisoned the clergy. Church properties were confiscated, and destroyed. The Communist hierarchy, however, soon learned that the frontal assault had failed; that religion and morality were so embedded in the minds and souls of men that this outward assault on the church would not accomplish the objective.

They then realized that they must begin the long and tedious process of infiltration and gradually neutralize the religious doctrines of the churches from within by subtle propaganda and other devices.

Since the Communists understood that religion was the greatest obstacle to the success of the Communist cause, this committee consequently has always recognized and pointed out that our religious institutions are the free world's greatest bulwark against atheistic, godless communism. We have, therefore, urged the growth and strengthening of our religious institutions. All that the committee, by its work in this field has ever tried to do, is to point out so all may know and understand this basic Communist policy. The committee has tried to show why the church and religion are the focal point of assault by the Communists.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has uncovered the techniques used by the Communist apparatus to infiltrate and destroy the church. It has done this so that the church itself could be fully aware of the Communist offensive against it; so that church leaders could understand that our religious institutions were in the frontline of this battle; so that with this knowledge the church would be better enabled to foresee and combat this indirect, subtle, and diabolical attack upon it.

It should be obvious to all from the testimony before our committee that some people in our church organizations, whose loyalty both to this country and the church is unquestioned, have not, and still do not, understand the nature and objectives of the Communists, as I have just pointed out. It is unfortunate that some of these good people have been taken in. It is deplorable that many of this group bitterly resent and interpret as an attack upon the church, any efforts by this committee to bring to light the nature and techniques of the Communist attempt to infiltrate the church.

If what I have said is true, and I assure you it is, instead of bitterly resenting this committee, these good people should join hand in hand with us in what I believe is, and should be, a mutual objective, namely, to better understand the nature of the Communist techniques and objectives insofar as religion and the church are concerned and to strengthen our religious institutions so that they can become an even greater bulwark against the most deadly enemy, not only of free men, but also of the church itself.

I am in full accord with the remarks of Mr. SCHERER, and I would recommend that some politically misguided, though possibly well-intentioned clergymen, read them and ponder upon them. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made the same point when he said:

“I confess to a real apprehension so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the gospel to promote their evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism.”

Precisely, Mr. Speaker, what do those of us who are concerned about this matter mean when we say that certain members of the clergy cooperate with the Communists? Let me give a case in point, and one of recent vintage.

On January 31, 1960, in the city of Washington, D.C., a meeting was held at the Asbury Methodist Church. The rally, sponsored by an organization called the Volunteer Civil Rights Commission, attracted a crowd of 1,500 persons to hear the experiences of a number of colored citizens from the South who had been denied the right to vote in elections in their own States. The program was titled “The Voteless Speak,” a “Report From the South,” and on the surface, at least, the meeting had a high moral purpose and held a great appeal for those interested in the plight of the southern Negro. I wonder how many of those in attendance would have gone had they known that a convicted Communist agent would be on the platform, and that the president of a Communist-front organization, named as such by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate, would deliver the closing statement, I wish it were possible to say in any honesty that the eight clergymen listed on the program as participants in the affair, had no knowledge of the extent to which the Communists had interested themselves in the meeting. However, the local press had reported some days in advance of the meeting protests regarding the rally, and had so alerted Washington generally that the pastor of the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church refused to grant permission to hold the rally in his church.

What were eight Christian ministers doing on the same platform with longtime spokesmen for Communist causes? Were these clergymen, including two bishops, one a former head of the National

Council of Churches, unaware that it was their participation in the rally that served to draw 1,500 persons to the meeting? It is this sort of performance by men who are presumed to be responsible that causes a collective shaking of millions of American heads when the facts are made known. Seeking to obtain the vote for disenfranchised Negroes is an entirely proper undertaking, and one which is presently occupying the attention of the United States Senate on an around-the-clock basis, but I am confident that any Communist who attempted to enter the Senate cloakroom for the purpose of conferring with a Senator on the question would be ejected promptly if his identity were known.

For some unaccountable reason, the name of Carl Braden, convicted Communist, was not listed on the official rally program, although advance news stories had indicated that he would be in attendance, and much of the controversy in advance of the meeting had centered on his participation. Braden was cited in 1958 for contempt of Congress growing out of his refusal to answer questions as to his Communist activities. He was convicted and his most recent appeal was rejected by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in December of 1959. Braden, as a Communist, has no respect for religion, nor for those clerics willing to join with him in a public meeting and a common effort. Through testimony given the committee by former Negro Communists, it is quite likely that he has no real concern for the welfare of the Negro people. Braden's concern is the success of the Communist plan of conquest, and a study of his record in support of the Communist apparatus should indicate to any fair man that he is subversive. These facts could have been ascertained by the sponsors of the rally in question had they been at all alert to the purposes for which they were to be used.

Aubrey W. Williams, president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, wound up the rally with a closing statement. The SCEF is successor organization to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, last cited by the House committee as a Communist-front organization in 1947. The citation reads as follows:

SOUTHEAN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

1. Cited as a Communist-front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, H. Rept. No. 1311 on the CIO Political Action Committee, March 29, 1944, P. 147.)

2. Cited as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States." (Committee on Un-American Activities, H. Rept. No. 592 on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, June 16, 1947.)

In an effort to escape the onus attaching to the name of the previous organization, a new name for the group was taken several years ago, to wit, the Southern Conference Educational Fund, one of the sponsors of the Asbury Church rally.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there is a widespread concern being voiced by American Protestants? It is not surprising to me that they are asking some very pointed questions regarding the activities of some who profess to speak for them at the highest levels of church affairs.

Permit me to quote, Mr. Speaker, in light of the claims to representation of 38 million Protestants in this country, made by a spokesman for the National Council of Churches, from a few of the many telegrams and letters received this week in the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

From a Lutheran minister in Metropolitan Detroit:

An investigation is long overdue. The National Council of Churches does not speak for us nor do we believe they speak for any sizable number of Protestants.

From an Episcopal minister in North Carolina:

A thorough exposure is long overdue. This last venture of theirs in withdrawing the Air Force manual gives us an undreamed of opportunity in bringing them to the attention of our Nation. Use it I pray.

From a minister in California:

*I have watched creeping communism for many years * * * as an Air Force officer * * * as a minister watching our churches being subverted. * * * God bless you in the work you are doing.*

From a minister in Montana:

*Enroll my name as one emphatically opposed to the withdrawal or editing of the Air Force manual. * * * Strength to your arm, Mr. WALTER.*

From a Baptist minister in Michigan:

Don't backtrack, and don't apologize, because many of us are deeply concerned over the infiltration into our churches of those who are seeking to undermine our democracy.

From a Baptist minister in Washington, D.C.:

I am appalled by the pressure and attack by the National Council of Churches against the Air Force manual, and I hereby request a full-fledged investigation regarding the truth of communism infiltrating our churches and religion.

From a Church of the Brethren minister in Pennsylvania:

*They (the National Council of Churches) claim to speak for 38 million of church members * * * this claim may well be questioned. Certainly they do not speak for the entire membership of my denomination * * * which has joined up with the council * * * We hope there will * * * be a thorough investigation * * * we congratulate you.*

From a Presbyterian minister in Indiana:

*I am speaking for myself only, but I can say that it is the opinion of the members of this church as well, that you have taken the right stand for truth and the security of our Nation. * * * Do all in your power to uncover the truth of Communist infiltration of our churches.*

From a Methodist minister in Washington, D.C.:

*This (the National Council of Churches) is this group which recently recommended the recognition of Communist China by the U.N. * * * I and many other ministers and laymen do not recognize such an organization as our voice.*

From a Lutheran minister in Washington, D.C.:

*Sir: Unless the National Council of Churches publicly revokes the World Study Conference's * * * resolutions, adopted in November 1958 at Cleveland—resolutions which are basically un-Christian and politically naive * * * I do not see where the church has the right to require to be looked upon in a more favorable light in the present communism-in-religion controversy.*

From a Lutheran minister in Chicago:

Don't let them scare you. The prayers of thousands of sincere, loyal Americans are with you.

From a Presbyterian minister in Florida:

*Your firm stand re AF Manual and communism in the churches most heartening. * * * Please pursue investigation.*

From a Baptist minister in California:

*Let's get at the truth of the allegations. Let's have a sane, intelligent showdown, without fear or favor. * * * Let the chips fall where they may. No churchman of any group ought to fear truth.*

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing excerpts are but a sampling, and a small one, of what some American ministers think of the present controversy. The excerpts of the letters and telegrams which I have inserted

above were addressed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] in his capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the personal references are directed to him. As of last night, Mr. Speaker, 1,403 letters and telegrams had reached the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the subject of the Air Force Manual, and the allegations of Communist infiltration of American churches. Of this number 40 writers supported the position of the National Council of Churches in that group's protests, while 1,363 of the communications urged a full-scale investigation of alleged infiltration by Communists into church institutions.

The serious view of the matter taken by some ministers is best reflected in a UPI news item, bearing a Lima, Ohio, dateline, March 1, 1960:

Lima, Ohio.—The Reverend Frank R. Hamblen says "The gradual infiltration of subversive affiliations in the National Council of Churches" is one reason for his decision to resign from his pastorate June 1.

Hamblen, pastor of Lima's West High Evangelical United Brethren Church (EUB) for 11 years, said, "My conscience will not let me continue to pastor a church affiliated with the National Council of Churches."

Hamblen said he would remain in the pulpit until the EUB conference can act on his resignation, which means loss of his pension and security rights.

"Gradual infiltration of subversives" is Reverend Hamblen's phrase, and it constitutes a serious charge which cannot be disregarded. This is not a layman speaking about an Air Force Manual, but a minister who appears to have reached the limit of his endurance. Will the council demand an apology from Reverend Hamblen and caution him as they did the Air Force not to suggest again that any Communist infiltration exists in any American church?

The mail from laymen on this subject has been even less restrained than that received from ministers. I have selected a few at random, making every effort to separate those received from fundamentalists because of basic theological differences existing between the National Council of Churches and the American Council of Churches. I believe that the letters and telegrams I have selected as samples of protest are from members of churches affiliated with the National Council.

From Seattle, Wash.—writer identifies self as member of Presbyterian Church, NCC:

*We commend you for the committee action regarding Air Force manual * * * both on information that should be available and on Communist infiltration.*

From Minneapolis, Minn.—telegram— signed by 14 persons:
As members of the Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, and Episcopal Churches we urge that you uphold truth of facts that Communists have infiltrated many churches. Denial of these facts aids communism. Americans need to realize and deal with this situation. Grateful for your stand.

Post card from Seattle, Wash.:

*I am a Methodist and daughter of a Methodist minister. * * * My husband and I are behind you in your fight—do not apologize to anyone * * * if there is guilt it should be exposed.*

From Chattanooga, Tenn.—telegram:
Congratulations on your stand concerning Air Force manual. You are right. We are proud of you. Do not apologize. Gratified at your courage.

From Oklahoma—telegram:

I joined Methodist Church in 1911. On official board since 1921. Don't apologize to anybody.

From Indiana:

*Do not be intimidated. * * * (I am) a retired disgusted Methodist.*

From South Carolina:

They (National Council of Churches) say they represent millions of church members. I am a Methodist, probably the most liberal of all on a national basis, but I believe that you have a responsibility to point out these things when they appear.

From Pennsylvania:

*We are Episcopalians. * * * The National Council of Churches does not speak for us in their political and economic views, and the assertion that they speak for 38 million Protestants * * * is certainly a misstatement * * * we urge an investigation.*

From Florida:

*My husband and I are members of the Episcopal Church * * * we know what you say is true * * * Thank God for someone who has the courage to stand up for what is right.*

From New Jersey:

*I am a Protestant (Episcopalian). * * * I support you to the utmost. * * * Do not, I beg of you, apologize.*

From New York:

*I am a member of the Congregational Church * * * the Federal Council of Churches does not represent me in any way, shape or manner.*

From Pennsylvania:

*As an Episcopalian, I repudiate * * * these National Council of Churches officials * * * none has the right to speak for all of the members of their respective denominations.*

From Indiana:

*Thank God there are still men like you left in our country. * * * I am a member of a church (United Church of Christ) having membership in the National Council of Churches. It is ridiculous to believe that "they speak for us." * * * Our prayers are with you. * * * Please don't let anyone turn you aside from a long overdue investigation of Communist infiltration into our churches.*

From Los Angeles, Calif:

*I am an Episcopalian. * * * Don't apologize now or ever to the National Council of Churches. * * * We thoroughly approve of your stand and thank you for your courage.*

From Illinois:

*I should like to go on record as favoring an investigation of Communist infiltration into * * * churches. I am a member of the Methodist Church, but want no part of the activity of leaders in the NCC who profess to speak for the rank-and-file church people.*

From Texas:

While I hope the charges against our churches and the National Council of Churches will not be found true, I have, from the study I have made, reached the sad conclusion that they are true.

From Virginia:

*As a member of the Methodist Church. I want to commend you and urge that you continue your investigation. * * * The authors of the Air Force manual should be praised by grateful Americans rather than reprimanded by the Air Force.*

From California:

*This organization is composed of lay members of the Methodist Church. * * * We congratulate you*

on your work.

From Delaware:

I am a Presbyterian of long standing. I hope that through your efforts sleeping Protestants will be awakened.

From Pennsylvania:

*As a dues payer, trustee and longtime member of the United Presbyterian Church, I wish to advise * * * the leaders of the National Council of Churches are not speaking for me. * * * Keep after them.*

From Virginia:

I am a member of a church affiliated with the NCC, but I do not recognize the statements and policies of this body as representative of either my political or religious beliefs.

From Ohio:

As one who is an Episcopalian, but who has been sickened and distressed by the association of a section of our clergy with leftwing activities, I wish to thank you and congratulate you on your stand in the Air Force controversy.

From North Carolina:

*The Southern Presbyterian Church, of which I am a member, belongs to the National Council of Churches * * * their claim that they have any authority to speak for me and the 800,000 members of our church is a farce * * * they are only speaking for themselves.*

From North Carolina—writer identifies himself as an Episcopalian:

*It is nonsense to infer that any criticism of a portion of the clergy is an attack on Protestantism or the church. * * * I wish you and your committee continued tenure and success.*

From Delaware:

*We * * * congratulate and thank you for taking a firm stand on behalf of the truth of the statements in the Air Force manual regarding Communist influence in our churches. * * * We have been active, loyal members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. for many years (and, as such, members of the National Council of Churches). * * * Investigate.*

From Florida:

*As a Presbyterian, I resent this action on the part of our church leaders. * * * More power to you in your efforts * * * may God bless you.*

From Pennsylvania:

*I am writing to commend you for the stand you have taken regarding the question of Communist infiltration. * * * I am an Episcopalian and regret our church's affiliation with the National Council. They certainly do not represent me.*

These excerpts, Mr. Speaker, represent a very small sample of the protest that has been generated by the instant controversy. I do not consider the expressions to be those of the crackpot fringe, but rather an expression of indignation and frustration welling up from the vitals of America * * * from the prairies, the mountains and the bayous. These are American Protestants bespeaking their concern over a very grave matter, and I join my concern with theirs.

During the next few years, Mr. Speaker, the future of this land will have been determined. Either we will win the struggle for the hearts and the minds of men, or we will, as a people, join other silent and prostrate millions. If we fail, there will be no church, no devotions, no religious solace, unless we and our children can meet in prayer and devotion under the threat of the penalty faced by the early Christians. The Communists are after your church, and they intend, if they can, to silence the Word of God. It' is not

possible to find the “spirit of Camp David” on this, score, and those who seek common ground with agents of the international conspiracy are doomed to failure.

Mr. ‘Speaker,’ under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the testimony’s of eyewitness to the persecution of the church by Communists in front of and behind the Iron Curtain together with the opening remarks of Chairman WALTER on the Air Force manual hearing:

OPENING STATEMENT, HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, ON ISSUES PRESENTED BY AIR RESERVE CENTER TRAINING MANUAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1960

Some few weeks ago, this committee began hearings on the subject of Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups. In opening those hearings, I stated:

“I know that this committee’s investigation in this area will probably precipitate a barrage from the Communist press and from Communist sympathizers characterizing our work as an investigation of youth. The Communists know as well as we do that the overwhelming majority of the young people of this Nation are of unquestioned patriotism and dedication to all that is good and noble in our society. But by equating an investigation of Communist activities among youth with an investigation of youth itself, the Communists and their sympathizers hope to becloud the issues. This, of course, is an old trick, which the Communists repeatedly use. When this committee investigates Communist activities in defense plants, the smokescreen that the Communists use is that we are investigating organized labor. When we investigate Communist activities in an educational institution, it is protested by the Communists that we are investigating education. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the American people readily see through this fraud, and it shall not dissuade us from our task.”

Although the only witnesses who were subpoenaed for those hearings on communist activities and propaganda among youth groups were hard-core members of the Communist Party who had been identified as such under oath, the Communist and pro-Communist press of this country followed the course which I predicted on the day on which the hearings were opened. Typical of the reaction which I anticipated was a statement of one columnist that the Committee on Un-American Activities was now engaged in intimidating children. An editorial in the Washington Post proclaimed that the Committee on Un-American Activities “aims to stigmatize as subversive a healthy curiosity and youthful hope that peace can be promoted by letting young people of the world rub elbows and minds.” With reference to the hard core, identified Communists who were subpoenaed before this committee, the Washington Post editorial stated: “The House Committee on Un-American Activities has now used its subpoena power to hail before it five young men and women who had the temerity to attend one or another of the youth festivals held at Moscow, Warsaw, and Vienna.”

Based on extensive experience as chairman of this committee, I now predict that the instant hearings will be publicized as an investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities of religion; that we on this committee are concerned about religious beliefs or theology, or that certain ministers of the gospel must be subversive because they advocate tenets with which the committee does not concur. Again I say, as I said when we were investigating Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups, that this diversionary tactic will not dissuade us from our task. We thoroughly expect attack by Communists, pro-Communists, dupes, ‘and misguided liberals who would use the facade of religion to mask Communist activities. We on this committee are as proud of our enemies as we are of our friends.

In the military stalemates between the forces of freedom and international communism, the chief arena of conflict has now shifted from the military to the nonmilitary. The enemy’s threat, however, becomes even more dangerous because it is more difficult to detect and engage in combat. His arsenal includes weapons of internal subversion, espionage, sabotage, propaganda, and economic and political warfare. His objection remains the same: destruction of all free societies, conquest of the world, and enslavement of mankind. The battlefields are every institution and organization of society including the home, the church, the school, and every agency of our Government.

During the past summer, a 2-week national strategy seminar for 200 carefully selected Reserve officers from all over the Nation was held at the National War College in Washington with the

endorsement of the Department of Defense and with the assistance of the Reserve Officers Association, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Institute for American Strategy.

The officers who attended this seminar did not study military science. They did not listen to lectures on military strategy, tactics, weapons development, and other subjects usually associated with the Armed Forces. Rather, the major theme of this seminar, at which a score of the country's top authorities on communism lectured, was "fourth dimensional warfare," or, as it is sometimes called, political warfare—combat aimed at destroying an enemy by nonmilitary means. This is a combat science, which has been developed by the Communists to its highest degree in the history of civilization.

An implication of this seminar—and a point previously made by many experts—is that this country could be conquered by Communists without a shot being fired; that the military know-how and capabilities of our Armed Forces, our tremendous array of weapons, and the huge sums spent to develop them might never be used in a final defense effort to prevent the enslavement of the American people. In this struggle between freedom and the forces of slavery, the Congress of the United States has charged the Committee on Un-American Activities with the responsibility for maintaining continuing surveillance over the agitational and propaganda activities, within this Nation, of the international Communist conspiracy. It has also charged it with continually reviewing the administration and operation of our security laws for the purpose of recommending such revisions as are necessary to cope with the ever-changing Communist threat.

Recently the Secretary of the Air Force, Dudley C. Sharp, was quoted in the press as "categorically repudiating" the Air Reserve Center Training Manual as representing Air Force views. Much of this manual deals with problems of Communist infiltration and subversion. Indeed, on the sections dealing with this subject, there appear numerous quotations derived from hearings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in which are presented authoritative statements by experts on each of several facets of the subject.

Since it appears that the "categorical repudiation" of the Air Reserve Training Center Manual by the Secretary of the Air Force stemmed largely because of statements in the manual respecting "infiltration of fellow travelers into churches" (see manual, page 15—14), all God-fearing, freedom-loving people would do well to pause and reflect on the irresolute opposition of atheistic communism to religion.

Here are the words of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"Communism is secularism on the march. It is the mortal foe of all the world's religions, which acknowledge the existence of God. Either the faith of our fathers will triumph or communism will engulf us. In this land of ours the two cannot live side by side.

"Nowhere among the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States, Russia, Red China or in any other part of the world will you find one who loves and believes in God. God is truth. Communists hate truth and, therefore, they hate the church.

"One of the leading slogans of the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917 was: 'Religion is the opium of the people.'

"This was first uttered by Karl Marx, the founder of communism, in 1843. Lenin, now resurrected by the Kremlin as the Communist idol and guide of the present and future, restated it in 1905. And last year, Nikita Khrushchev, the present head of the Russian Communist Party, publicly proclaimed that Communists have not changed their opinion on religion and said:

"'We remain the atheists that we have always been; we are doing all we can to liberate those people who are still under the spell of this religious opiate.'"

Sworn testimony from religious leaders who have escaped from Communist regimes amply demonstrates the intensity of the warfare which communism is waging against the churches,

I am inserting, as an appendix to my remarks, excerpts from typical testimony on this issue.

What of Communist infiltration in church groups in the United States?

Incidental to investigations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in our pursuit of Communists, at least a dozen persons who have been identified as members of the Communist Party have also professed to be ministers of the Gospel. In addition, several undercover operatives of the FBI who have served in the Communist Party have testified under oath respecting the directives under which they and other members of the Communist Party operated with respect to penetration of church groups.

I am likewise inserting in the Appendix to my remarks excerpts from sworn testimony on this subject. How successful have Communists been in their attempts to penetrate church groups?

Although this question is not subject to precise qualitative or quantitative analysis, it is a fact, however, supported by the record that the Communists have duped large numbers of the clergy as well as lay leaders or the churches into supporting Communist fronts and causes which masquerade behind deceitful facades of humanitarianism. This is not to say that these persons are necessarily consciously supporting Communist enterprises but the net result is, for all practical purposes, the same.

Some 2 or 3 years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities held consultations with three prominent clergymen of the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, respectively, on the subject, "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism." These clergymen, Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, and Dr. Daniel A. Poling, clearly exposed the fallacies of this devilish force. In the course of the consultation, Dr. Fineberg was asked this question: "Have the religious forces of the world, in your judgment, been as vigorous in opposition to the spread of communism as they might have been?" He replied, "Too few religious leaders have accepted the responsibility of refuting Communist propaganda. Like most Americans, clergymen have been against communism without studying it and without effort to expose its fallacies."

In my judgment, much good, can come from an objective inquiry into the reasons why the Secretary of the Air Force repudiated the Air Reserve Training Center Manual, which in part dealt with this very problem. Without apology, therefore, and with firm determination that we will pursue this subject matter honestly, fairly, and sincerely, with end in view of developing the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, we are opening our inquiry today by receiving the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, Dudley C. Sharp.

APPENDIX TO OPENING STATEMENT, HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT,
PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON UNAMERICAN ACTIVITIES, ON ISSUES
PRESENTED BY AIR RESERVE CENTER TRAINING MANUAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 25, 1960

Father Theodoric Joseph Zubek, a Franciscan priest who escaped from Slovakia, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities in December 1959 as follows:

"Male religious orders and congregations were suppressed in April 1950. There were over 700 male religious priests and brothers living in 137 monasteries and were subjected to Communist-sponsored reeducation. If they complied with this brainwashing and took the oath of loyalty, they were sent to parishes and churches as diocesan priests. If they remained unyielding, they were sent to forced labor camps, and later in 1957, released to manual work. Clerics and religious brothers, if they did not want to leave the religious life, went also through the forced labor camps, and eventually to manual work on their own. A similar fate met the female religious congregations. There were 3,548 religious sisters in Slovakia, living in 210 convents. The convents were suppressed in August 1950, and the sisters were forced to leave the religious life. If they refused, they were sent to work without any salary in forced labor camps, collective farms, or various state plants.

"The Communist control can be said to be twofold: public control and secret control of activities of the church. By public control, I mean the antichurch laws of 1949.

"Besides, they have secret control of the church. Spies attend every ceremony. They trail priests and bishops wherever they go."

* * * * *

Concerning Communist persecution of church groups in Red China, Rev. Peter Chu Pong, general secretary of the Hong Kong International Christian Leadership, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities in March 1959 as follows:

"They (the Communists) formed an indoctrination class in the assembly hall of our church. For 2 weeks they worked on the members of my church, brainwashing them into accusing me of being an imperialist agent and a running dog of the missionaries. * * *

"From morning to night they taught my church members all about communism. They indoctrinated

our people along three major points: (1) They entirely denied there is a living God which exists in this universe. They told the people the whole universe was created through evolution; (2) they denied Lord Jesus and His salvation. They told the people that Jesus Christ was just a common carpenter, that the people had crucified him because he wanted to lead the people in counterrevolution work; (3) they told the people that Christianity is a religious instrument of the foreign imperialists to poison our Chinese people and sell them into slavery.

“They held an accusation meeting to accuse me, my wife, and the elders and deacons in our church of being imperialists. They tied our hands with long rope and forced us to kneel on the platform in our church assembly hall with signs around our necks, which said ‘Guilty Crime.’ They slapped our faces, kicked our bodies, and poured cold water on our heads. They made my children stand and watch. If they cried, the Communists beat them. They wanted me to confess that I was an imperialist agent and reveal the amounts of money I was supposed to have received from the missionaries. They wanted me to tell what kind of guns and radios the missionaries had given to me. They accused me of helping 12 missionaries escape from Nanking before the Communists came. They wanted me to reject Christ, give up my church, and admit that the only God was Mao Tse-tung, head of the Communist government.

“If I had confessed they would have killed me immediately. They were going to put me into prison anyway.”

* * * * *

Under date of October 20, 1959, Moisselle Clinger, former undercover agent for the FBI, who served in the Communist Party, testified as follows:

“Question. What was the practice of the Communist Party during the period of your membership with regard to assigning people to work in mass organizations?”

“Mrs. CLINGER. Almost everyone was assigned to some type of a mass organization. Now, there may have been something that they were interested in. I mean, they were all in some group that they may have belonged to, but if you didn’t belong, you were told where or what to join. I remember the churches. There was one period where they felt it was quite necessary that different people join different churches.

* * * * *

“Question. Now, if you will recall other assignments, you spoke of assignments in church work, Do you know of anyone who received such an assignment who was known to you personally to be a member of the Communist Party?”

“Mrs. CLINGER. Yes. The same O. E. Burrell, I know, did quite a bit. I know that he belonged to the church in Santa Monica, and to me this was kind of an odd thing, and to many of the old-timers in the Communist Party it was kind of earth shaking to have to go into a church. I noticed it was mostly the younger—I wouldn’t say younger—I mean the newer, members that they were able to do this with. I noticed it was not the older members, longstanding members who were too interested in taking on this task of going into the churches to work.

“I know my husband was asked to join a church, and I frowned on this, so that he was not pushed to go ahead with this.”

* * * * *

A few months ago Mrs. Dorothy Healey, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, reported in a convention speech respecting the activities of the Communists of southern California, in part, as follows:

“* * * Communists * * * are working in community organizations, fraternal organizations or churches. * * *

“A further expression of the way to develop and consolidate the antimonopoly alliance is through our participation in activating the program of the people’s organizations to which we belong.”

* * * * *

Marion Miller, former undercover agent for the FBI, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on October 21, 1959, as follows:

“These people carry out this Communist propaganda and the work of the party no matter where they are because this is their duty, to promote communism wherever they are, whatever time it might be. They

live and breathe as Communists, and in whatever organization they go into, I can't emphasize this too strongly, whether in a trade union or in a fraternal organization, or in a religious group, in a church, wherever it may be. The duty of a Communist is to carry out the Communist program."

* * * * *

Miss Carol Bayme, San Diego native and resident, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities in public session on April 21, 1954. She became a Communist sympathizer late in 1948, and joined the Communist Party early in 1949. She testified that she probably was dropped from party rolls sometime in 1951 at her request, and that she made an effort to rejoin the party in February 1954. She testified as follows:

"Question. Were you given instructions at any time by the Communist Party as to the attitude that should be taken by Communists toward religion or toward religious groups?

"Miss BAYME. Toward religious groups. I can answer that. I was instructed not too long ago, in hopes of assisting the FBI, when I tried to get back into the party, I was instructed that I would have to join a church youth group, or a church, and become active in the work.

"Question. You were told if you came back—

"Miss BAYME. In order to get back into the party I would have to get into a church group and work within it and try to influence it."

* * * * *

Rev. Joseph S. Nowak appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities in public session on March 25, 1954. He was born in Lwow, Poland, on, October 17, 1903, and was brought to the United States by his parents in June 1906.

In the course of his testimony, Reverend Nowak admitted that in 1946 he formally joined the Community Party. In discussing his associations with the Communist Party and its members, he testified that from 1934, upon his graduation from the Union Theological Seminary, until 1942, he was in charge of a small mission, St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, in Baltimore, Md. 'He testified that, while not a member of the Communist Party, he held an office in a Communist-front organization, the American League Against War and Fascism, knowing that its leaders were officials in the Communist Party:

"Question. Were you' a member of the Communist Party while you were on your assignment in Baltimore?

"Mr. Nowak. No, sir; I was not.

"Question. Although you were not a member of the Communist Party while you were in Baltimore, did you collaborate with functionaries of the Communist Party while you were there—

"Mr. NOWAK. I worked together—

"Question. And worked with the Communist Party?

"Mr. NOWAK. I worked together with them; yes.

"Question. Knowingly?

"Mr. NOWAK. As an official of the American League Against War and Fascism; yes, and also knowingly. I know that they were officials in 'the party.'"

* * * * *

Herbert A. Philbrick was a member of the Communist Party as an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Following are excerpts from his testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on July 23, 1951:

"Question. You have testified that you were active in various youth organizations in your church work. Did you continue to be active in your church work after joining the Young Communist League?

"Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did. First of all, of course, I wanted to continue because I wanted to maintain my contacts with some healthy minded individuals; but beyond that, and to my good fortune, I was instructed by the party to continue my contacts and to continue my affiliations in all my normal groups.

"These Instructions were also given to other members of my cell. * * *

"Question, Who gave you those instructions?

"Mr. PHILBRICK. I recall that in a discussion at the apartment of Dave Bennett we were given those instructions. I was also given those same instructions by Fanny Hartman and by Alice Gordon.

"Question. Was Dave Bennett known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. PHILBRICK. He was known to me long before I actually became a formal member myself. * * *

“Question. From the instructions which you received from the Communist Party, did it appear, or were you led to believe, that in the field of religious activity the Communist Party was incompatible with any religious belief?”

“Mr. PHILBRICK. Absolutely. We were taught that the socialistic theories of Marx had nothing to do with the idealistic superstitions of religious organizations.”

* * * * *

Earl Reno, former high-ranking official of the Communist Party, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 25, 1954, as follows:

“Question. In the performance of the work of the Communist Party through the American League Against War and Fascism, and through the Ethiopian Defense Committee, did you utilize at any time the services of any ministers or any members of the ministry?”

“Mr. RENO. ‘Yes. We had two ministers who were particularly active in the American League Against War and Fascism and the Ethiopian Defense Committee, Rev. Joséph Nowak and Rev. Jack Hutchison. * * *

“These two young ministers came there, said they had recently come from the Union Theological Seminary in New York, that they had been students of Harry Ward and intimated that they had some previous contact with the Communist Party and wanted to know in what way they could work. * * *

“They were assigned to churches in Baltimore; that they had previously done some work in conjunction with the Communist Party, I believe, in New York and wanted to know in what way they could do cooperative work while in the period they were in Baltimore. * * *

“Then, in the meantime, I had had discussions with Leonard Patterson about the possibility of their working in the Ethiopian Defense Committee, and at the second meeting with them I suggested they work both with the American League Against War and Fascism and the Ethiopian Defense Committee, and they did. They became members of these two organizations and participated. * * *

“Question. Did they advise you at any time that they were not members of the Communist Party?”

“Mr. RENO. No. There were times when they asked the advisability of joining the Communist Party, which I advised them against, and at one point Dr. Albert Blumberg came and said one minister had asked the probability of leaving the church, joining the Communist Party. I said, ‘This is ridiculous.’ * * * Dr. Albert Blumberg came to me to discuss the possibility of Reverend Hutchison joining the Communist Party, and at that time I said I didn’t think it was wise and I thought it was rather ridiculous, and as long as I was in Baltimore I would not have accepted membership application from either of them.

“Question. Why?”

“Mr. RENO. I didn’t feel a minister belonged in the Communist Party. * * * If a minister were identified as a member of the Communist Party, his use in the Communist Party at that time would have been nil. In my own words, an unemployed minister of the Communist Party has no value.

“Second, I felt ideologically the training for the ministry inevitably comes in conflict with the ideological training of the Communist, that if they did join they would inevitably come in conflict with it and, therefore, they would be of much more use not being members of the Communist Party than if they were members.

“Question. You mean use to the Communist Party?”

“Mr. RENO. That’s right.

“Question. I gather in your position as a functionary of the Communist Party it was your feeling you could put ministers to a much better use if they were not members or the party than if they became members of the Communist Party?”

“Mr. RENO. That is correct.”

* * * * *

Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider, a native of California, appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in public hearings in June and July 1955. She had served 17 months as a control-tower operator in the WAVES during 1944 and 1945; attended San Diego State Teachers College in the following few years, receiving a bachelor’s degree in sociology and economics; worked for Deputy Sheriff Robert Newsom from February 1951 to August 1951, when she became an undercover operative for the F.B.I. At their request she joined the Communist Party in the summer of 1951. Most of her Communist Party work was done in San Diego, some in Los Angeles, and Sacramento and a little in Chicago. Her major party assignment was to become chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum. Other assignments included membership on the county central committee of the Independent Progressive Party; service as secretary of the State Independent Progressive Party Convention in Chicago in 1952; and as secretary of the women’s division of the Independent Progressive Party,

In her testimony on June 27, 1955, Mrs. Schneider stated that the Communists, recognizing the universal

desire for peace, felt that attaching the word ‘peace’ to their efforts would aid in getting the use of churches to meet in, “we could involve other people and active church people.” She testified that she had been given literature to take the ministers of the two churches she attended in an effort to make them more active in the peace movement.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and while I may be criticized for going to the Good Book for a second text, I would like to quote just one line which I think is apropos to the present controversy and to the uncertain trumpet. The First Psalm, in part, says:

Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Air Force Manual statements on infiltration were substantially correct. There has been and there presently is, a fraternization of Communists and clergy which has served to lend gentility to the unremitting Communist attack against this Nation and against the word of God. That so few ministers have lent the prestige of their high calling to such an unholy combine is a source of great satisfaction to all Americans. That a few have been duped by the Communists is a matter of national concern.

The National Council of Churches has a tremendous potential for good. The men who comprise the board can be a potent force in the struggle against human indignity and human slavery—but not in concert with those who would destroy us—and them. I have no quarrel with any man who has devoted his life to the service of God—to the contrary, I admire and respect him and am prepared to follow him in pursuit of the great moral truths enunciated beside the Sea of Galilee. But I cannot and I will not follow the notes of an uncertain trumpet to the destruction of all that I hold worthwhile.

Millions of Americans are seeking the church today, not to listen to political lectures by those who know nothing of politics, but to hear anew the clear charges laid upon man by his Creator—to obtain strength and solace—to be inspired by God’s word—to face the Monday after the sermon with courage and faith. The average churchgoer does not need political advice from any remote source. He has his own ideas about the recognition of Red China, social security and labor laws, and he probably knows as much about these things as do those who comprise the governing body of the National Council of Churches or any other ecclesiastical body of any church.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, how many American Protestants favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations? If the past expressions in the Congress on this question are at all accurate, very few Americans of any faith look with favor on the proposal. Yet, in 1958 the National Council of Churches, professing, I suppose, to speak for 38 million American churchgoers, went on record, and, by a unanimous vote, in favor of the admission of Red China. It is certain that one dissenting Protestant was the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, himself a former chairman of the National Council of Churches, and subsequently one of the most effective spokesmen against any recognition of the Communist regime in China.

Disturbed by this arbitrary action on the part of the National Council, the Committee of One Million Against Admission of Red China, and, parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of that committee, took a poll of 45,000 Protestant clergymen from every State in the Union on the question of recognition. The returns of the poll indicated that church members were 10 to 1 in opposition to the stand taken by the National Council of Churches. It would appear that the relationship of the council to its member churches in this case was a matter of too much policy at the top of the pyramid and too little liaison with the base. If the Members of this House maintained that kind of rapport with their constituencies, we should and would all be turned out to pasture in the next election.

I would be derelict, Mr. Speaker, if I did not at this time express my respect for, and affection to, the chairman of our committee. Of all of the difficult jobs to be carried on in the Congress, his is probably the most difficult. Not only is he a man of character and deep conviction, but one whose courage to do the right as he is given to see the right, is not exceeded in the Congress or anywhere else. His prompt action in calling Secretary Sharp before the committee for a full inquiry into the matter of the statements contained in the manual, demonstrated a measure of this courage. When he was convinced, together with others on the committee, that the Air Force had been hasty in repudiating the statements and apologizing to the National Council of Churches, he said so, and in terms which permitted no misunderstanding in any quarter, called upon by spokesmen for the National Council to apologize to that organization he replied as he should, extending an invitation to the spokesmen for the Council to come before the House committee for an exploration of the entire subject. He did not back water, he did not apologize, but expressed himself as satisfied that the statements contained in the manual were substantially correct.

I am a Republican, Mr. Speaker, and, I hope, a good one. Certainly I have tried for 13 years to follow the dictates of my conscience, without descending to personal vilification or demagogery. But, for my part, and

this may be heresy of a high order down in the Republican National Committee, I would be as content if FRANCIS WALTER remained in the Congress of the United States until he is 90, and longer if he wished to stay. This country is safer today—its people more alert to the dangers which confront us—because the gentleman from Pennsylvania is chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the matter of the present controversy, there is no division between those of us who serve on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We Republicans on the committee intend to uphold the chairman in the course of action upon which he has embarked. We believe with him and with our Democratic colleagues, that there has been Communist infiltration into some of our churches, and that a few of the many thousands of American ministers have been beguiled into channels grooved out for them by the Communist conspiracy.

The gentleman from California has taken the floor today, not in an effort to divide Americans on this important issue, but to inform the House of some of the facts in the case which will be important to them in their assessment of the charges and countercharges which have been hurled during the last 10 days.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, these facts appear to me to be self-evident:

First. The charges in the Air Force manual are correct to the extent that they allege Communist efforts to infiltrate American churches.

Second. Some American clergymen have given direct support to Communist causes.

Third. Other clergymen have been duped into support of Communist-front activities.

Fourth. The Air Force should not retreat from the basic premise that infiltration by Communists into American churches is a continuing effort.

Fifth. The National Council of Churches of Christ in America, in protesting the statements contained in the Air Force manual, have run counter to the sentiment of many Protestants in the country, members of NCC church affiliates.

Sixth. Individual churchmen who participate in Communist-directed activities should enjoy no immunity from **proper** investigation.

Seventh. No investigation should be contemplated respecting a church organization, as distinguished from investigation of individuals.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield, first of all so that I may associate myself with the completely merited tribute, which he has paid to the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I know that the gentleman reflects the sentiment of all of the members of that committee in this tribute. I want to take the liberty of adding my own word of commendation to the gentleman from California, himself the ranking minority member of the committee, for he has matched, in his own devotion in that very difficult assignment, the dedication of the chairman of that committee. It is a matter of grievous regret to me that he is not going to be in the House next year or with the committee next year. I could not permit this opportunity to pass without paying tribute to him and to confirm what he has said and what I had occasion to say, both to the committee and on this floor only 2 or 3 weeks ago in connection with an investigation of Communist activities in the youth movement, that in their service to the country there are neither Democrats nor Republicans on the committee. I commend the gentleman for the statement he has made here today. It is my one great concern that there have been pressures continuing on the Air Force, in effect, to delete any reference to Communist infiltration wherever it might occur.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman for his very gracious words.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I wish to echo the sentiment of the gentleman from Michigan just expressed. I consider the statement of the gentleman from California to be not only very eloquent but devastating. I hope that we may all have copies of the statement to use because I consider the statement a classic, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Gentleman from California said one thing I do not believe any of us like, that is, he would not be with the House next year. If the gentleman could be induced to change his mind about that, it would be the best news many of us, if we happen to be here, could get. As I understand the gentleman's statement, the criticism of the position he takes is based upon the assumption that no one in the organization to which he makes reference could possibly be mistaken?

Mr. JACKSON. That is substantially the position. They do not want even a suggestion, that any church

organization could in any way have been infiltrated by Communist doctrines or by Communist persuasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, if that be true, if it applied to the folks that attend the churches, there would not be any need for churches or ministers either.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. As I understand the gentleman's statement, he made reference at one point that he had excerpts in his statement from laymen, in churches, and also from ministers in churches, two sets of messages. The gentleman said he did not have time to read those in his statement. Could he summarize those for the Members?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall be happy to. As of this morning the House Committee on Un-American Activities had received some 1,400-odd communications relative to the controversy over the Air Force Manual. More than 1,400 supported the allegations in the manual and all were very strong in their representation that this matter is an important one and a proper one to be looked into.

Mr. AVERY. Has there been any response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, that perhaps the persons casting this reflection might appear before his committee and make a further clarification if they wish to do so? Has there been a formal response to the invitation of the chairman?

Mr. JACKSON. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. The gentleman has done an extremely commendable job in outlining this subject for the Members of the House and for the American people. I join my colleagues in their regret that the gentleman from California has decided not to become a Member of the 87th Congress. This will be a great loss to the membership here and to the people of America who depend on persons of the gentleman's character to defend their rights.

The gentleman mentioned Congressman SCHERER, of Ohio, and some of his remarks that you have included in the RECORD. In discussing this matter with Congressman SCHERER the other day when the subject was brought up, it was mentioned that a lot of persons who have deplored the practice of book burning would like to engage now in the practice of manual burning.

The issue here is not who is responsible for the remarks that appeared in the manual, but what is the truth. I think that our distinguished colleague from California has demonstrated quite clearly what the truth is, and I would like to again, individually and as a member of the official board of Bexley Methodist Church, associate myself with his remarks. I certainly do not feel that I nor any member of the congregation with which I am associated would care to be represented by those mentioned who profess to speak for 38 million Protestants across this Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman. Of all the people in this land whose dedication is to truth, those who should be the last in protesting an inquiry in the area of Communist efforts, are the spokesmen for the National Council of Churches. Truth is the ultimate goal they pursue. If these charges are true, let us get them out in the open. If they are not true, let us have a positive establishment of that fact. In any case, this matter should be resolved, because it is a divisive controversy in its present form, which serves to separate churchman from churchman, laity from laity, but it will never be resolved until such time as it is gone into in detail and we find out to what extent Communist influences are at work and to what extent they have been able to infiltrate American church institutions, if at all. If they have not, let the record show it affirmatively. If they have, and the abundance of testimony presently available would indicate that they have, let us make such determination, and then let the churches themselves go to work and get rid of the Communist termites.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I have just been rereading this week a document which was prepared and published in 1933, which outlined in great detail Communist activities and infiltration in the field of organized labor and of labor unions. The significant point about this document is that it was prepared by and submitted to the President of the United States over the name of the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green. Now, he apparently did not feel that he was acting contrary to the good name or the interests of the American Federation of Labor when he contributed this exposé of the Communist enemies of organized labor.

Mr. JACKSON. It is entirely fallacious for anyone in labor, education, and the churches or in any other walk of American life to contend in the first instance that he is above inquiry. Secondly, it is equally

fallacious to contend that when an individual in a group is investigated, you are investigating the organization of which he is a member. This is an important distinction, which should be borne in mind. No one has ever suggested an investigation of the Baptist Church, or the Catholic Church, or the Episcopal Church, or of the Methodist Church, nor would anyone in his right mind make such a suggestion. But, to contend that a Communist or Communist sympathizer is entirely at liberty to operate within a church group and that by some alchemy he is exempt from any investigation is, as I say, fallacious and dangerous.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate your remarks very much, particularly, as I noted the gentleman's point, that whatever is the truth, let us get that out in the open. One thing that disturbed me about this controversy—and I thought perhaps the gentleman could throw light on it—was the quotation out of context from the manual about the right of Americans to know certain things. I forget the exact language, but that was the general import. Then I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania quote it in context, and in one of our national magazines I saw the full text. I have not seen the manual itself. But what disturbs me, and my question is this, Does the gentleman know who it was who started quoting that phrase out of context? It has been repeated constantly, and certainly those of us who are interested in honest public debate and controversy abhor this business of quoting out of context. Does the gentleman know where it started, or who started this quoting out of context?

Mr. JACKSON. I cannot enlighten the gentleman as to the individual or individuals who took the sentence out of context. As I said in my preliminary remarks I did not go to the point of these other matters.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, the primary point was the one the gentleman discussed.

Mr. JACKSON. I will say to the gentleman that my reading of the freedom of information paragraphs was entirely different; that is, I obtained an entirely different impression of what the author intended than I did from the line or two lines which appeared in the press.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly did, too.

Mr. JACKSON. The author is dealing with secret information; this is the whole point of his discussion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Secret information is not public information. Certainly I do not think it is unwise to deny a citizen who is not cleared for secret information access to it. I think the Defense agencies would be more than a little stupid if they let anyone have secret information who was not entitled to have it in the course of his duties. Freedom is not absolute and none of us enjoys absolute freedom. To contend that secret information should be given willy-nilly, to whomever wants it, is of course foolish, as the author of the manual stated.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman that taking that sentence out of context meant that the public, in reading it, did not know what the author had in mind, which was very obvious, I think, to anyone reading it in context; that is, that he was discussing classified information. The thing that disturbs me, and the reason I asked the gentleman to yield, is this. The gentleman made the point of this search for truth.

I certainly agree with him. The churches should have, and in my judgment do have that as their main objective. This is also true of our educational institutions. They should be the last ones to quote out of context and to use improper procedures of debate, which is really a falsification—that is, to quote out of context is deliberately falsifying. So that although it is a collateral point, it does disturb me, because it was immediately picked up. I heard it repeated in church myself last Sunday by a minister who, I should have thought, if he was a scholar and dedicated to the pursuit of truth, would have checked to find out whether he was quoting out of context or not. Apparently he did not take the trouble to find out. I have seen newspapers around the country quoting this phrase out of context and, of course, there is a special responsibility on their part to find out whether an item given them is being quoted out of context.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on that point I would ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the full text on the freedom of information matter presently under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter is as follows:)

ESPIONAGE

How the United States lost its most valuable secrets concerning the means for constructing an atomic bomb has been discussed in lesson 12. The principals in these exploits, as you will recall, were David Green-glass, Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, and Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. These spies operated, it should be remembered, while the United States and Russia were allies in World War II.

More recent than World War II is the espionage case of Kim Suim. Many of our soldiers who

fought in Korea will never forget this beautiful Oriental girl. She had studied in a missionary school, spoke perfect English, and had wit and good looks, which made her a favorite with American occupation forces in Korea after World War II. Kim Suim had only one major fault— she was a Communist agent.

Kim Suim operated for more than 4 years. During that time she gathered information for the Reds and sent them equipment which later was responsible for the deaths of many Americans who trusted her. Her popularity was so great, in fact, that first reports of her treason were met with incredulity and laughter. But no one laughed in 1950 when she was tried by the South Korean Government and executed.

Sometimes we hear loyal Americans remark that security precautions are useless anyway, that the newspapers are always printing information about our latest secret weapons. If security is so useless, why do they suppose our potential enemies go to the trouble of recruiting and training a large force of espionage agents?

When a newspaper prints some so-called secret data, it merely means that the Government no longer considers that particular data secret—it does not mean we have no secrets left. Or it could mean that clever newspapermen took pieces of unclassified information which they were authorized to have, put them together, and came up with the right answer. However, because such accounts may have given the correct information does not mean that the information is no longer classified. Newspapers are not official—and until the Government declassifies security information, it remains classified.

Another rather foolish remark often heard is that Americans have a right to know what's going on. Most people realize the foolhardiness of such a suggestion. If a football team should start telling the other side the plays it planned to use, their opponents would sweep them off the field. It's the same in war—hot or cold; if we tell our secrets, we are likely to be beaten, and beaten badly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In that same connection, may I read just one question and one answer from the hearing of last week after this material which the gentleman has just asked permission to insert in the RECORD was read. The chairman asked Secretary Sharp.

Mr. Secretary, the whole import of that language is that the military is entitled to protect secrets, is it not?

And the Secretary replied:

Yes; I would think so; yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I think when one understands that this matter went to the point of secret information, information not generally made available except to those who are given clearance to have it, it becomes entirely logical, which is to say that it is foolish for the American people to believe that they may have such classified information, information which deals with matters affecting our national welfare and our national safety. But in order to make this clear the phraseology should be taken in the context in which it was written and not out of context as it was used.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman, in addition to the other matters upon which he has received congratulations, should receive them for exposing to public view a somewhat new technique our enemies have adopted, namely, the one he specifically mentioned of innocence by association.

Along that line there appears to be another new technique coming into use. That is the purchase of paid newspaper advertising to put across their line, I do not know much about it, but I read a story recently of a full-page ad in several newspapers purportedly an example of this. I hope that the gentleman from California or some other member of his Committee On Un-American Activities will at some future time take the opportunity to advise us on this—a new cold war technique.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am inserting the following report:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

On February 11, 1960, Mr. James Wine, associate general secretary of the National Council of Churches, wrote a letter to Mr. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Department of Defense, protesting against remarks in an Air Force instruction manual. Mr. Wine demanded that the Department of Defense repudiate the manual, withdraw it from use, recall all distributed copies—and give the national council a complete explanation. The Air Force ordered withdrawal of the manual that same day—February 11—and both Mr. Gates, Secretary of Defense, and Dudley Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force, expressed regrets to the national council that the manual had ever been issued.

None of this got into the news until February 17, 1960, when Mr. James Wine released to the press a copy of the February 11 letter of protest.

The Air Force Manual in question was issued by the training command headquarters of the Continental Air Command at Lackland Air Base, Tex. A total of 6,100 copies were printed. Of these 3,290 had been distributed to Reserve training centers of the Air Force throughout the United States. The National Council of Churches complaint was against a section of the Air Force Manual, which, under the heading “Communism in Religion,” said:

“From a variety of authoritative sources, there appears to be overwhelming evidence of Communist antireligious activity in the United States through infiltration of fellow travelers into churches and educational institutions.

“The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. officially sponsored the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Of the 95 persons who served in this project, 30 have been affiliated with pro-Communist fronts, projects, and publications.”

As soon as the National Council of Churches forced this issue into the open, Pentagon officials issued public apologies. News stories characterized the officials variously as “appalled,” “stunned,” “startled,” and “shocked,” at this “attack on the Churches of America” in an Air Force manual.

Liberals of both parties in Congress made impassioned statements for the press. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH (Republican, Connecticut) said the manual was an “unjustified and outrageous” reflection upon “the great body of American clergymen” and that its issuance was “inexcusably stupid.” Congressman JOHN E. MOSS (Democrat, California) chairman of the House Government Information Subcommittee; Congressman MELVIN PRICE (Democrat, Illinois), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Military Manpower; Congressman FRANK KOWALSKY (Democrat, Connecticut), member of the Armed Services Committee; Congressman CARL VINSON (Democrat, Georgia), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, among those who made statements comparable to that of Senator BUSH, all of them demanding or promising full-scale investigations.

At least one Member of Congress, however, spoke calmly and factually about the controversy. Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat, Pennsylvania), chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, criticized the Air Force for withdrawing the manual without even trying to find out about the accuracy of the charges of Communist infiltration into churches. Congressman WALTER said he had examined the Air Force Manual. He said that 30 of the 95 persons who prepared the National Council of Churches Revised Standard Version of the Bible do have Communist front affiliations. Congressman WALTER said that if Air Force officials had looked into the charges which the manual made, they would have found that the manual is correct in what it says.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

The most interesting thing revealed by this controversy is the double standard of liberalism. Roscoe Drummond’s syndicated article of February 21, 1960 (New York Herald Tribune service), begins by saying,

“The US Air Force has committed an awful offense against the United States * * * of its training manuals for Reserves to be used to try to smear the Protestant churches with undocumented, unproved, raise charges that the clergy are knee deep with Communists and fellow travelers.”

Mr. Drummond characterizes the issuance of the Air Force manual variously as an “evil, pernicious, dangerous thing”; as “poisonous”; as “meat ax, guilt-by-association accusations”; as “mean” and “false.” Drummond then falsely implies that even the late Senator Joseph McCarthy had been outraged (in 1953) by charges that Communists had infiltrated American churches; and he falsely implies that the House Committee on Un-American Activities belittles charges of Communist

infiltration into religious institutions.

Near the end of his column, Roscoe Drummond says:

“What is needed is to find out who wrote this stuff, who had anything to do with clearing it at every level, where it was distributed, and what assurance there is that it won’t happen again.”

What Mr. Drummond here demands is exactly what he and all others of his kind were denouncing as “smear” and “book burning” in 1953, 1954.

In 1953, the late Senator McCarthy, looking into operations of the Government’s oversea information agency, discovered that a large number of books in the agency’s over-sea libraries (libraries created and maintained with tax money for the ostensible purpose of helping our struggle against communism) were written by Communists and Communist-fronters, falsely putting communism in a favorable light. Demanding that the pro-Communist books be removed from our Government’s “anti-Communist” libraries, Senator McCarthy tried “to find out who wrote this stuff, who had anything to do with clearing it at every level, where it was distributed, and what assurance * * * that it won’t happen again.”

In 1954, Senator McCarthy, investigating Communist infiltration into the Army (particularly at Fort Monmouth), discovered that Irving Peress had been given a promotion in rank after the Army had been informed of Peress’ Communist connections. Senator McCarthy wanted to find out “who had anything to do with clearing” this thing “at every level.” He sought assurances that such a thing wouldn’t happen again.

But in 1953 and 1954, Roscoe Drummond and all other McCarthy-hating anti-anti-Communists (including President Eisenhower) accused McCarthy of character assassination and “book burning.”

THE OTHER SIDE

In 1953 and 1954, anti-Communists never did find out who was responsible at- every level for putting pro-Communist books in our oversea libraries and- for promoting Peress after- his Communist connections were known.

In 1960, the Nation knew precisely who prepared the controversial section in the Air Force manual, long before liberals had quit making headlines with their demands for an investigation.

The “Communism in Religion” section of the Air Force manual was written by Homer H. Hyde, 54 years old, who has worked for 18 years as an educational specialist at the Lackland Air Force Base. He is a member of Grace Baptist Temple at San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Hyde says:

“I would welcome a complete and full-scale investigation into all aspects of Communist activities in the United States, especially the infiltration into our churches and religious activities.

“From the records I have examined, I’m fully convinced the greatest danger to our way of life is the insidious infiltration of Communists into various phases of American life, and particularly in the churches.

“The Communists are using our churches because people tend to believe what they hear from the pulpit as gospel truth.”

The statement that 30 of the 95 men who produced the National Council of Churches’ Revised Standard Version of the Bible have Communist-front records: Mr. Hyde got this information from a pamphlet published by Circuit Riders, Inc., 18 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. M. G. Lowman, executive secretary of Circuit Riders, says:

“Apparently, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense have ignored the public records of 9,000 clergymen whose names appear from 1 to about 200 times each, in public print, supporting Communist and pro-Communist causes.

“Once these amazing facts were called to their attention by Homer H. Hyde, in the Air Force officer manual, both the Air Force Command and the Secretary of Defense proposed a great book burning of the offending manual to placate the outraged National Council of Churches of Christ in America.

“The public should know that both the U.S. Air Force and the Department of Defense now have copies of the public, pro-Communist records of 2,109 Methodist ministers, 1,411 Protestant Episcopal rectors, 614 Presbyterian clergymen, along with the publications ‘Recognize Red China,’ and 30 of the 95 men who gave us the ‘Revised Standard Version of the Bible.’

“These last two publications portray the National Council of Churches as - one of the most infiltrated and exploited operations in the United States.

“The Air Force can burn its manuals; but in so doing, it has focused more light on this situation

than patriotic organizations have managed to do.

“The vast majority of U.S. clergymen are loyal to God and to the United States: they have not taken part in an attempt to neutralize against world conquest by the Soviets, which the liberal church programs and church organizations have done, propagandizing for peace-at-any-price and compromise-with-atheism,

“If the public would like to have some of the material which Homer H. Hyde used in the Air Force Officer Manual which outraged the National Council of Churches of Christ and, thus, terrified the Department of Defense, they can obtain it by writing to Circuit Riders.”

Some of the general information about communism in religion, which Homer Hyde put in the Air Force manual, was taken from material published by Dr. Billy James Hargis, Protestant evangelist who is president of Christian Crusade, Tulsa, Okla. Dr. Hargis says:

“Newspaper stories, say the ‘Communism in Religion’ section of the Air Force Reserve Training Manual was based on: (1) a booklet entitled ‘The National Council ‘of Churches indicts itself on 50’ Counts of Treason to God and Country,’ which I wrote and published 4 years ago; (2) a Christian Crusade broadcast, still in ‘print, entitled ‘Apostate Clergymen Battle for God-Hating Communist China’; and (3) a booklet entitled ‘30 of the 95 Men Who Gave Us the Revised Standard Version of the Bible,’ published by Circuit Riders, a Methodist laymen’s group concerned about subversion in its particular denomination.

“I had sent all these publications to Mr. Homer H. Hyde, of San Antonio, when he asked for documentations last November.

“In my opinion, the National Council of Churches of Christ has done more to nurture communism than any other organization in the United States. It is nothing short of folly for the United States to spend \$60 billions a year to defend our country against communism abroad, and here at home hide our eyes to the realities of Communist infiltration.

“I would gladly debate the charges of Communist infiltration of American churches With the national council president, Dr. Edwin Theodore Dahlberg.

“Mr. Hyde is concerned about losing his job with the Air Force. I have offered him a research position at his present salary on my Tulsa staff if he is fired. Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has asked me to extend an invitation to Mr. Hyde to join his staff in event of his dismissal,

“As an ordained Protestant minister, I have asked the House Committee on Un-American Activities to make a thorough investigation of alleged Communist infiltration into American churches. After 12 years of research and study on this subject, I am convinced that there is evidence to prove that Communists have infiltrated the National Council of Churches, its affiliated denominations and the Unitarian denominations.”

Edgar C. Bundy, general chairman of the Church League of America, Wheaton, Ill., said he would testify under oath that— “The National Council of Churches is one of the greatest enemies in regard to national security.”

Bundy said his organization can give documentary proof of his charges. Bundy’s book, “Collectivism in the Churches,” published by the Church League in 1958, is a heavily documented account of the leftwing political activities of the National Council of Churches.

Verne P. Kaub, president of the American Council of Christian Laymen, Madison, Wis., says:

“In 1949, our American council published a brochure, ‘How Red is the Federal (now National) Council of Churches?’ making substantially the same charges as those made in the questioned Air Force manual. Our brochure reports, among other things, that in 1935 naval intelligence branded the Federal Council of Churches as subversive. No legal action has ever been brought against us and no statement in the brochure has been successfully challenged.”

Dr. Ralph I. Yarnell, general secretary of the American Council of Christian Churches, said the charges about Communist infiltration into American churches can be “more than sustained.” He said the Air Force withdrew the manual “merely to shield and satisfy the National Council of Churches.”

Dr. Carl McIntire, president of the International Council of Christian Churches, 801 Haddon Avenue, Collingswood. N.J., says:

“The quick and unjustified surrender of the Air Force and Defense Department to the demands of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. leaves up in the air the truth of the Air Force manual’s statements about Communist infiltration of religious institutions. The manual’s statements are true, and point up a serious problem facing the Nation. There is no field today where

the Communists are more successful with their 'peace' and 'peaceful coexistence' propoganda than in the field of religion."

A BRIEF HISTORY

The Federal Council of Churches was organized in 1908. By 1950, Communist infiltration into the organization was so well known that anti-Communist intelligence agencies regarded it as an arm of the Communist Party.

In November 1950 the Federal Council merged with a few other church organizations and formed the National Council of Churches. The old Federal Council leaders became the leaders of the National Council. Indeed, the Federal Council Bulletin for December 1950 officially announced "All the work of the Federal Council will continue under the new auspices."

The constituting convention, which converted the Federal Council into the National Council and merged it with other similar organizations, was held in Cleveland, Ohio. It was composed of delegates from 29 Protestant denominations. Delegates of 28 of these denominations took their whole denominations into the National Council. Thus, denominational churches with a total membership of something like 28 million people became members of the National Council of Churches by the arbitrary action of a few score delegates at the Cleveland convention. The question was never submitted to church congregations, or even to individual churches, for approval or ratification. Today, the national council is composed of 33 cooperating Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations representing 38 million people.

The National Council of Churches of Christ is probably a powerful political lobby for socialism, hiding behind the facade of a Christian name and enjoying the tax exemption of a church institution. The anti-Communists who complain about the socialism and Communist infiltration into the National Council are precisely the people who want to protect the Christian churches; want to protect them from the pro-Communist leadership of the National Council.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

The best way to prove the pro-Communist orientation of the leadership of the National Council, and of the interlocking leadership in its affiliated denominations is to look at the record of what they do and say.

In November 1958 the Fifth World Order Study Conference, held under the auspices of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., at Cleveland, Ohio, went on record, by unanimous vote, in favor of diplomatic recognition of Red China by the United States. The Cleveland conference was composed of about 600 delegates, two-thirds of whom were laymen, one-third clergymen. One-half of the clergymen at that conference had public records of affiliation with leftwing operations, which followed the Communist line. During the past 20 years, 719 officers of the Federal Council and National Council of Churches have been affiliated with one or more organizations of a leftwing character.

It is revealing to look at the pro-Communist propoganda about Red China which was insinuated into church publications, prior to the 1958 Cleveland conference, thus preparing the way for the great Communist propoganda victory which resulted from that conference.

Volume II, No. 2, 1957, of the Episcopal Overseas Mission Review, 606 Rathervue Place, Austin, Tex., has an article entitled "China and the Chinese Church" by the Right Reverend Ronald O. Hall, Anglican bishop of Hong Kong. Here are excerpts:

"To our brethren in the Chinese Church * * * all that has happened is God's answer to the prayers of the church throughout the world for China and her people. That, my dear friends, is the one thing they beg you to understand.

"They do want you to know that for the first time for several centuries China has a government of which her people are proud and for which China's Christian people thank God. * * *

"Let us with God's help adjust our thick skulls and eager hearts to the fact that the Chinese church has come of age. Their country has been rescued from moral corruption and seemingly irreparable war damage by a new technique for governing as yet not 40 years old as far as its testing in history is concerned.

From the Presbyterian Outlook, volume 139, No. 42, dated November 25, 1957:

"With a full measure of caution, Prof. Walter Freytag, of Germany, describes developments in the Christian Church in China (after a 3-week visit there). * * *

"Dr. Freytag pointed out that he was impressed with the 'look of the people' and a new spirit of

self-respect.' Certain national evils like opium smoking, gambling, and prostitution seem to have disappeared, he said. * * *

"For China, no other way has emerged than the one which it has followed, and it is unthinkable that they should give it up. * * *

"Christians are clearly impressed with the moral strength of the Communist movement."

Presbyterian Survey is a magazine published monthly under the authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. Presbyterian Building, Richmond, Va. In the November 1956 issue of this magazine there is a report on a meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, held in Communist Hungary during the summer of 1956. Here are passages from the report:

"Bishop (K. H.) Ting, Anglican, from Peiping, China, was the first Christian from his land to attend a WCC (World Council of Churches) meeting since 1948. * * * He said that although Christians in the West may regard the new China as a judgment of God, Chinese Christians in the past 6 or 7 years have come to see it as 'an act of God' and a demonstration of His love for China.

"The Communists do not believe in God or Christ * * * (but) we thank God for the good things they do and feel humbled * * *. We think we know the essence of the Communist. He is a child of God, and in him there is something God regards as worth saving."

The Lutheran (1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia) is a news magazine of the United Lutheran Church in America. In the July 3, 1957, issue there is an article. "I Went to Red China," by Shiro Aoyama, who is pastor of the Lutheran Theological Seminary Church in Tokyo. Here are some passages from the article:

"One leader reported as follows:

"The Church of China and the Christians of China are fundamentally opposed to communism. * * * However, both individual Christians and the church as a whole are loyal to the policies of the Government. This is true because in the present Chinese society there no longer exist such social evils as gambling, bribes, and prostitution. Rather, the whole moral level has been so raised that the church need not take a hand in such matters.

"Further, religious liberty is guaranteed us. * * * The Government merely said, worship without hindrance, only don't cooperate with the counterrevolutionaries. We have no freedom for counterrevolution, but within this limitation the Government upholds us, makes church property tax free, and grants aid in cases of need.' * * *

"All schools, social agencies, hospitals, and so forth, formerly conducted by the church have been turned over to the Government, and such works have been nationalized, The Government is putting much effort into this kind of work. The Government pays rent to the church for its property now used in these agencies and in this way aids the finances of the church.

"Thus the church is now restricted to worship and evangelism alone. It seems that the Government places no restriction on faith or evangelism and gives no directions pertaining thereto."

The Communists having created heaven on earth in China, Christians need not concern themselves with temporal things any more; and they are happy in their freedom to keep their mouths shut, This whole article—which, incidentally, is the lead article in the July 3, 1957, issue of the Lutheran—could very well have been prepared by the Communist minister of propoganda of Peking.

Church publications of the great denominations affiliated with the National Council still carry such obvious Communist propoganda pieces, not only on the subject of Red China, but on all aspects of the current Communist Party line.

THE TRUTH

Anyone who wants to prove that the picture of Red China given in the foregoing quotations from church publications is a frightful Communist distortion, could begin his research by reading the March 26, 1959 publication of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, setting out the testimony of five Protestant leaders from the Far East who had firsthand experience with the Communist.

Here are passages from the official report:

There are no longer any truly Christian Churches operating in China. * * * The only ones in existence are propoganda churches operated by the Communists with communist ministers "picked by the Government to fill the pulpits and indoctrinate the people in communism." describing the incentive the Communists' offer to the young people of Red China to join the Communist Party,

Reverend (*Peter Chu*) Pong (general secretary of the Hong Kong International Christian Leadership) said:

In 15 years, they are told, Red China will surpass the United States. They are told they will be the masters of the whole world: that by 1965 Red China will be celebrating their victories in San Francisco. As an immediate reward, the Communist young men are given their choice of the young women and they have wine to drink.”

Rev Shih-ping Wang, East Asia director of the Baptist Evangelization Society International, described at some length the commune system recently instituted in Red China.

“The family unit is broken up. Husbands and wives are separated into different barracks. The children are taken away from the parents and placed in government-run nurseries. Husbands and wives may meet only once a week for 2 hours—they have no other contact. Because these places of meeting are few, couples must stand in line at the special rooms waiting their turn. And after they are finished, they must report to the commune group leader to tell the date and time and how long they stayed together. They must also report what they said and did together. The parents may see their children once a week and when they see them they cannot show affection toward their children. The idea is to have the children and the families sever their affection and direct it toward the state. Names are taken away from the children, and they are given numbers. * * *

There is no morality because the love of the family is taken away. There is no honesty and respect among men or between men. There is no human dignity; they are all like animals. There is no guilt associated with the murder of individuals for the improvement of the state. There is no prostitution on the mainland in the communes. * * * In Communist Party circles a woman must submit herself to any Party member who desires her favors. If a woman refuses a party member, she may be thrown into jail or stripped and nailed to a wall until she dies. Another punishment is to cut the breasts off the woman who refuses. * * *

“All the elderly people 60 years of age *and above*, who cannot work are put in the old people’s ‘Happy Home.’ After they are placed in the homes they are given shots. They are told these shots are for their health. But after the shots are taken, they die within 2 weeks.” Rev. Tsin-tsai Liu, pastor of the Gospel Baptist Church in Taipei, said that “the Communists * * * began wholesale persecutions of Protestant churches in 1950. Christian leaders were placed under house arrest * * * were blacklisted, and * * * had to be reeducated and attend confession classes to reveal their past associations and beliefs. If the self-confessing classes are not successful, the Communists resort to other means.

“They stop the noses of the people and pour water in their mouths. Every time the person breathes, he swallows water. After he swallows enough water, his stomach swells up, and then they stand on it. Then they use 24-hour questioning. The questioning goes on day and night with different shifts of Communists asking the questions. The person being questioned loses all sense of time. Also used are threats of violence to loved ones.”

After the Christian ministers and leaders were arrested, they were replaced with Communists. The Government now uses Chin Ling Theological Seminary in Nanking and the Shanghai China Theological Seminary in Shanghai to train their own preachers.

The only churches that were allowed to remain open were Communist-run churches that serve as showcases for visitors.

Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng, who received theological training at Princeton Theological Seminary and is superintendent of the Gospels Friends Mission in Taipei, stated that since 1949 the Communist government of China has confiscated over 20 million U.S. dollars in church property; about 140,000 mainland Christians have been killed by the Communists; 5 million Chinese have fled as refugees to Hong Kong, Formosa, and other parts of the world, and over 30 million Chinese have been killed or persecuted. * * *

Reverend Cheng described what had happened to the family of a member of the Chinese Nationalist House of Representatives on Formosa because he was intensely anti-Communist: “His family and his cousins, brothers, all relatives, altogether 180 persons, have been killed. * * *

“This writer’s sister-in-law is a very good woman. The Communists thought she had a whole lot of money and asked a lot of her, and she said she had lent it. So it made the Communists very mad at her. They used five horses. One horse was tied to her neck and the other horses were tied to her arms and legs and they went in all directions. The biggest horse ran and it just tore her body into pieces. The blood streamed all over the public square, and the people shut their eyes and cried. They could not stand to see it.”