

# DAILY BLADE-TRIBUNE

OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA

Exemption Registry  
8-2271

April 26, 1956

Thomas W. Braden, Publisher

Dear Allen:

Thanks for sending me your speech. You will see by enclosure number one that it was reviewed in the editorial columns of this newspaper.

I am also sending you an editorial on the same subject that appeared in the Blade-Tribune three or four weeks ago in which you might be interested.

Regards to Clover.

Sincerely,

*Tam*

Enclosures

DOCUMENT NO. 20  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS.   
 DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: SECRET  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: HR 704  
DATE: 18 MAR 81 REVIEWED: 300652

Mr. Allen W. Dulles  
Director of Central Intelligence  
2430 E Street  
Washington, D. C.

# Trade Tribune

THOMAS W. BRADEN, EDITOR-PUBLISHER

EDWARD S. RIDLEY, Business Manager  
STEPHEN F. UNDERWOOD, Advertising Manager  
JAMES GARRISON, Asst. Advertising Manager

GERALD J. BROWN, City Editor  
BURT E. HOBBS, Circulation Mgr.  
JOHN S. RONSSSE, Mechanical Supt.

OCEANSIDE, CALIF. — PH. SA 2-8225

Entered at the Oceanside Postoffice as 2nd Class Matter under the act of Congress March, 1879.  
Published daily except Saturday, Sunday and certain holidays.

By Carrier or Mail — Payable in advance  
At newsstands—Single copies 10c  
Month ..... \$ 1.25  
Six Months ..... 7.50  
Year ..... 15.00

Out of State  
Mail Rates — Payable in advance  
Month ..... \$ 1.50  
Year ..... 17.50

4 — An Independent Newspaper

Wed., April 25, 1956

## The CIA Looks At Russia

The highest authority in the United States Government on the subject of Soviet conduct and intentions had something to say a few days ago about the purge of Stalin now taking place in Russia. The authority is Allen W. Dulles, the Director of Central Intelligence. As chief of the United States secret services, Mr. Dulles has the responsibility of providing the government with information on Soviet conduct and of offering his educated guesses on Soviet intentions. Almost every newspaper in the United States, including this one, has had its say on the recent events in Russia but Mr. Dulles, who was not the first commentator to speak, may be the commentator most worth listening to.

"To find the real reason for the de-Stalinization campaign we must, I believe," Dulles said, "look to the . . . recent past, particularly to the hard autocratic period during the last six or seven years of Stalin's life." . . .

Both internationally and domestically, Dulles said, these last few years had been a failure for the Soviet.

In the international field, Dulles points out that beginning about 1947 in Europe, and somewhat later in Asia, the free world at last began to realize the implications of the forward drive of international communism and started to take counter measures. First came the Marshall Plan which Stalin and Molotov rejected and opposed. Next in Greece, the Soviet effort to take over was thwarted. Later in Berlin, the blockade was frustrated by the air lift. With the help of western countries, Tito survived his ejection from Stalin's favor. Later the North Atlantic Alliance was organized despite Soviet threats and the way was opened for German rearmament in union with the West. Finally, when he turned to the Far East, Stalin was thwarted in his attempt to grab Korea.

Mr. Dulles thinks therefore that to some extent the blame for the events which have befallen the world is upon Stalin in order to explain away a suc-

cession of serious defeats in foreign affairs.

But he does not explain the campaign against Stalin in terms of these foreign defeats alone. He apparently believes that the domestic reasons for the upheaval give cause for a mild and extremely cautious expression of hope.

Mr. Dulles thinks that the Soviet leaders discovered that in order to compete with the West in the scientific and technical field necessary to their armament program, they had to accept a certain measure of the spirit of individual inquiry and of free education developing the critical faculties of human beings — two of the very foundations of Western democracy. And in order to convince the Soviet people that their government was done with arbitrary policy-making, secret trials and prison camps for those who ventured to show the most elementary spirit of inquiry, they had to make a scapegoat out of Stalin.

Obviously the degradation of Stalin is insincere. The same men who served him faithfully are trying to discredit him and at the same time to uphold the Communist Party and the basis of the dictatorship which he led for so long. But Dulles asks an interesting question: "Is it not possible that the Soviet people with the leaven of education they are now receiving will demand some decisive share in the selection of their own leadership and some checks and balances against the danger of tyrannical dictatorship and the cult of personality?"

If Mr. Dulles is right in his analysis of the internal dilemma of the Soviet leaders, it may be that during the next few years the Soviet dictatorship will have to go even farther in the direction of the right of free speech, free worship and protection of the individual from arbitrary power. In that event we shall all be living in a different kind of world.

# Blade-Tribune

THOMAS W. BRADEN, EDITOR-PUBLISHER  
 EDWARD S. RIDLEY, Business Manager  
 STEPHEN F. UNDERWOOD, Advertising Manager  
 JAMES GARRISON, Asst. Advertising Manager  
 GERALD J. BROWN, City Editor  
 BURT E. HOBBS, Circulation Mgr.  
 JOHN S. RONSSSE, Mechanical Supt.

OCEANSIDE, CALIF. — PH. SA 2-8225

Entered at the Oceanside Postoffice as 2nd Class Matter under the act of Congress March, 1879.  
 Published daily except Saturday, Sunday and certain holidays.

By Carrier or Mail — Payable in advance	Out of State
At newsstands—Single copies 10c	Mail Rates — Payable in advance
Month .....	Month .....
Six Months .....	Year .....
Year .....	Year .....
	\$ 1.50
	17.50

4 — An Independent Newspaper

Thursday, March 29, 1956

## How Many Hoops In A Lifetime?

One means of imagining what is going on in the mind of the average citizen of the Soviet Union today is to pretend for a moment that there has been an enormous upheaval in the Catholic Church.

Imagine for a moment that your newspaper has just informed you that Pope Pius has gathered a conclave of cardinals and informed them that he was resigning in disgust, that while he believed in the tenets of Christianity, he had discovered that the symbols of his religion were a mockery, that the cathedral was not founded upon the grave of Peter, that many of the relics were doubtful, that in fact, he had positive proof that Peter had intended to found some other kind of church altogether.

We hasten to say that this is not meant in any sacrilegious sense. It is not meant in any sense of comparison between the Catholic Church and the Soviet Union. You cannot compare two institutions which have nothing in common.

What can be compared is one shock with another shock, and the shock, the sense of disbelief, the sense of a world turned upside down, of values reversed and the truth become false is what citizens of the Soviet Union are coping with today. It cannot be understood in any less harsh analogy.

Stalin, to continue the analogy, was Peter. To most Soviet citizens he was the builder of the church for which Lenin had laid the faith. He had built the church, and the strife and effort with which he built it were part of the Soviet religion. He and his predecessor Lenin were religion.

Now, suddenly, and in the year 1956, this son of the church is assailed. The faithful are told that they have been misled, that Stalin was a perverter of the true religion, and that in addition he was a cruel, intemperate, childish, ignorant, petulant, and ruthless old man, a dissipated dictator who far from being the fatherly friend of the people which false history had made him, was comparable to a cruel and profligate Nero. Moreover they are told so, not by rumor or whispering, but straight from the pulpit, from Stalin's chosen successors, from the platform of the All-Soviet Congress. In other words, they are suddenly given this new and shattering doctrine and told to believe it as an act of faith.

This is a measure of what is going on in

the minds of Soviet citizens today. Around the world, other men will be watching to see whether they can absorb the blow.

The reactions of these other men will themselves be interesting to watch. In Yugoslavia there must be great rejoicing in high government circles. This is what Tito has been saying, that all was right except for Stalin. There will be a strong impulse to stretch out a hand of friendship and to say, "Now we see eye to eye."

In India, and Indonesia, in Pakistan and China, the educated who learned about the Russian religion and wonderingly compared it with what they were reading in Western newspapers or learning from Western spokesmen will be recalculating their doubts. They will be pressed between a tendency to accept the new doctrine as evidence that the people in Russia, admitting their errors, have at last found democracy, and a tendency to wonder about a government of Russia that could, through the years since Stalin's death, so easily live with a lie.

What about the Communist Party in the United States? The Daily Worker has not yet found a path of logic. Communists are writing to complain and to wonder out loud, bemused with the sudden twist of the line, unable to explain to themselves how the "bourgeois press" could have been right about Stalin and the Daily Worker wrong. It will take some time.

It will take time, too, for the rest of us to react, those of us who are lucky enough to live in a part of the world dedicated to fact, and to governments, beliefs and religions based upon fact. The tendency in Washington is to let this latest Soviet upheaval run its course, to see what happens, and how far it goes, whether it is merely a brief caveat intended for foreign consumption or whether it will strike so deep as to bring about "a spontaneous people's demand" for the removal of the god-Stalin from the tomb where he lies alongside the father, Lenin.

It will take time to see whether the Soviet people can react. Thus far in the past they have done so. They welcomed and then hated Hitler, revered and then despised Beria, and whatever the rulers told them to think, they have, as far as the rest of the world can determine, hastened to heartily think and act in a lifetime, how many hoops can they jump through?